## [Opening of Meeting // 8 September 2016]

Adv T Madonsela: Perhaps we can start. Thank you, Doctor Stals.

Dr C Stals : Pleasure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Adv T Madonsela: Advocate De Jager ...

Dr | De Jager : Thank you.

Adv T Madonsela: ... and Mister Moraitis, for meeting with us this morning. We

sincerely, sincerely appreciate making the effort to meet with us.

Doctor Stals, we are aware that you have long retired and therefore

we have taken a bite into your private time on a matter ...

Dr C Stals : And golf.

Adv T Madonsela: ... that happened many years ago and we appreciate you graciously

availing yourself to assist us on this matter. We also are grateful to

the Reserve Bank for interacting with you and assisting you in

preparations for this meeting. I received communication from the

Reserve Bank yesterday, which is a follow-up to several interactions

I have had with the Reserve Bank, and basically there are just some

questions that again Adv De Jager has raised. I thought therefore in

commencing this meeting today I have to start again and explain

what are we doing, why are we doing this and what outcome is

envisaged from this process, but before doing so if you could just

kindly, all of you indulge us. We are recording these, as we record all

of our conversations. You are entitled to the record. If you want it

immediately, a disk can be made for you today and if you want it

transcribed it can be done as soon as possible, although our

resources are limited when it comes to transcription, but when

Meeting held between the Public Protector South Africa & Dr Chris Stals  $$8\mbox{ September 2016}$$ 

432

1			requested we do it. Because of that then we all have to indicate what
2			our names are and designations. So I will start just for the record,
3			I'm Adv Thuli Madonsela, the Public Protector.
4	Mr B Dhlamini	:	My name is Bonginkosi Dhlamini, I'm the Chief of Staff, Public
5			Protector South Africa.
6	Adv L Tshiwalule	:	My name is Adv Tshiwalule, Investigator in this matter.
7	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Dr Johan de Jager, General Counsel, South African Reserve Bank.
8	Dr C Stals	:	I'm Chris Stals, unemployed pensioner.
. 9	Mr C Moraitis	:	Chris Moraitis from Werksmans Attorneys, I'm the Legal Adviser to
10			the South African Reserve Bank.
11	Adv T Madonsela	:	Thank you, Sirs. Doctor Stals, you remind me, when we interviewed
12			Mr Mboweni, he emphasised right at the beginning of the discussion
13			that he is an unemployed pensioner who had been dragged to this
14			meeting and he was concerned about the time he was going to spend
15			here without being paid for the time and also concerned about the
16			fact that somebody had to pay for the transport he had used to come
17			here, so I do understand and we apologise for intruding into your
18	,		time.
19	Dr C Stals	:	I'm a little bit easier, I wasn't dragged here. I came with pleasure at
20			your invitation and secondly you don't have to pay me.
21	Adv T Madonsela	:	Thank you, Sir. Right, we are here to look into alleged failure by the
22			South African Government, the National Treasury and the South
23			African Reserve Bank to implement recommendations of the CIEX
24			Report regarding recovery of funds that were paid by the Reserve
25			Bank on behalf of the South African Government to Bankorp in the

24

25

1980's. Our focus is not so much on what happened in the 1980's. Our focus is the non-recovery when that CIEX Report was received. We have information that shows that a first copy of the report was received in 1998 and a final report was delivered in 1999, but a final conversation between Government and Mr Mike Oatley was around 2003 when he was asking what exactly is the way forward, after having had the benefit of the commissions that had been given a mandate by Government to look into the same matter. From our side we thank you sincerely for honouring the invitation to meet us today, Doctor Stals. From your side we are not going to be asking too many We will be asking questions questions around the recovery. regarding the background to the CIEX Report. From what we know at the moment it deals with what are referred to as "lifeboats" given to several banks, which eventually came together as Bankorp over a period of time up to 1985. That is what we are looking at. I think we have a timeline map here, which we are going to give you in terms of what appears to have happened based on the evidence we have. We are going to just ask you to assist us about two deals. I think the focus of our conversation today is going to be on two deals, the original deal that led to the money being given or the bonds being given, the bonds being given to Bankorp. That is the first deal we are interested in. Not all of the deals, because we understand there were several lifeboats. We are interested in the last lifeboat, the one with the 1% interest. Then the second focus of our conversation today will only be around the acquisition by Absa, what was the deal? We

25

have requested Treasury, we have requested Absa and the Reserve Bank to kindly give us copies of the two deals. To date we have not been given copies of the two deals. We are referred to the Davis Report, but the Davis Report doesn't write reports like us, where you say, "My conclusions on this are 1, 2, 3 based on this document that is dated whatnot, where it was stated" ... and then you state a paragraph, because we are just looking for paragraphs that said, "We agree to do this" or "We agree to do that". None of the reports that Government keeps relying on is telling us exactly what was the first deal, with who ... well, not the first deal, what was that deal with Bankorp, what was the nature of the agreement with Bankorp regarding payment, the amounts to be paid, the timeline for payment and whether or not there was payment during that period? The second part would be when Absa then came to the party, you will note that the Davis Report says Absa paid value for money, but that is not helpful for us. What we want to know is, what was the deal between Absa, Government and the Reserve Bank or Absa and Government, or Absa, Bankorp and whoever. If they had just given us copies of those deals Sir, we really wouldn't have called you to this meeting. We would have read those deals and said this is what was agreed and did the conduct that ensued after those deals comply with what was agreed, because all we are looking at is what was agreed and did the parties act according to what was agreed? Then the Davis Report and all of the others have looked at the legality of the agreement itself. We are not concerned about the legality of the

agreement, because we are saying whether the money was stolen or 1 whether the money was loaned or gifted ... whether the money was 2 stolen or the money was ... maybe "theft" is not a good language. 3 Whether the money was improperly given over or whether the 4 money was legally loaned, it still would have been payable and then 5 our interest would be then what was the agreement regarding 6 payment and was that agreement changed? If it was changed, which 7 clause and what agreement changed the nature of the agreement, 8 which takes us to where we are then, but before we hand over to you Sir, I just wanted to deal very quickly with some of the questions that 10 have been raised by the Reserve Bank in the letter that has been 11 graciously forwarded to me by Dr De Jager yesterday. It is not the 12 first time these issues are raised. The first one is the question of the 13 Reserve Bank, do we have jurisdiction over the Reserve Bank? 14 Do we have? Dr C Stals 15 Jurisdiction. Dr JJ de Jager 16 Adv T Madonsela: Do we have ... does the Public Protector South Africa have iurisdiction over the Reserve Bank? That is the question that has 18 been raised by the Reserve Bank. 19 Dr C Stals 20 I see. Adv T Madonsela: The answer for me is yes and then this is not the first time we are 21 investigating the Reserve Bank. This is just one of many 22 investigations we have done with the Reserve Bank and all of those 23 requests by the Reserve Bank to clarify our mandate, we have 24 clarified our mandate. From where we are sitting, the Reserve Bank 25

is clearly an institution exercising a public power.

Mr C Moraitis If I ... 2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

Mister Moraitis, I haven't explained the rules then and I don't want Adv T Madonsela:

us to start on a wrong footing. I am going to speak and then finish.

Mr C Moraitis Okay.

Adv T Madonsela: When I have finished with my welcoming remarks – I think we have

given you the program - we will then have maybe the remarks from

the Reserve Bank.

Mr C Moraitis Perfect. Thank you, I apologise.

The second part that I want to explain in terms of the rules is that Adv T Madonsela:

ordinarily as the Public Protector Act says you have access to legal

assistance, we prefer that then we hear you, because these are

inquisitorial proceedings. We prefer to hear your views, to hear you

as a person with your mouth and that obviously your legal assistance

involves people sitting next to you, and every time you say

something that they think needs clarification, to be clarified, if they

want to withdraw a statement, they can ask that it be withdrawn. If

there is a technical matter that can only be explained by the Lawyers,

the Lawyers also have an opportunity first to express that technical

matter. It is a fairly informal arrangement, as you can see yourself,

but we do try to just make sure that we don't interrupt each other,

we let one person speak, because also from a recording point of view

when there is an overlay of voices, they have indicated that they then

don't know who said what. So if we speak one person at a time they

will capture our voices or at least those voices that are more distinct

25

than mine, right. Okay, the issue of jurisdiction, from our side we have explained this, consistently to the Reserve Bank, that the Reserve Bank, yes, is a statutory body and we do understand that the Reserve Bank ... the Government is one of the shareholders and there are other private shareholders there. We understand that the Reserve Bank ... the important part though is that the South African Reserve Bank is tasked with a responsibility of overseeing, regulating and supervising banks and the financial system as a whole. Therein lies the part about the Reserve Bank, that it is not an entity. The Reserve Bank doesn't occupy space similar to Absa, similar to Barclays Bank or whoever. The Reserve Bank is an entity to whom the Government of the Republic of South Africa has delegated some of its own regulatory authority and decided the Reserve Bank will do that. So it operates as a Central Bank of this country or the regulator and a bank, and to that effect it does fall under our jurisdiction. I in the actual report Doctor Stals, will clarify exactly the statutory foundations of our powers over the Reserve Bank, but that is about investigating the acts and conduct of the Reserve Bank. But when it comes to asking questions, the Public Protector has the power under Section 7 of the Public Protector Act to ask questions from any person in the Republic and to request any document from any person in the Republic. Even the Financial Intelligence Centre is not exempted from assisting us with (indistinct). So we for example are grateful that you came, because you would say to us you are no longer the Governor and you haven't

25

been the Governor for two decades, why have we dragged you here? The part now is not coming as an actor, you are coming as somebody who can assist us to piece together this puzzle and get a sense of what happened. From the law we have a sense from our side what should have happened. What we are looking for is what happened and if what happened is in line with what should have happened or is it at odds with what should have happened, and if so, what do we do two decades - or more than two decades - down the line, but again what happened for us at this stage is what happened under the Government of the Republic of South Africa from 1997, but people then are asking why are we asking old questions? To understand what happened in 1997 we have to understand the history of this matter and for us to adjudicate the correctness or propriety of the decisions taken or not taken post 1997, we have to have information about what kind of deal were they confronted with and whether the way they handled it was rational, reasonable and generally proper in the circumstances? So that is the first part about our jurisdiction over the Reserve Bank. The second part is the whole question of when you deal with the Reserve Bank there may be a systemic impact. I have heard that word from day one, having my first interview with Judge Bertelsmann, who had to educate me about the run on the rand, systemic impact, etcetera and he takes a totally different view from the one that is taken by the Reserve Bank, so but what does it say then for me, is I can't go with the Reserve Bank's view about systemic impact, I can't go with Judge Bertelsmann's view

1		on the systemic. He is just one of those. Even Judge Heath, who had
2		initially worried about the systemic impact, he has now come back
. 3		and said he thinks the systemic impact card was overplayed, if you
4	,	look back now. So I'm just saying again you must bear with me that
5		as an adjudicator – and the two Lawyers will confirm this – is that
6		you are not an expert in any of these areas. The value you bring to
7		this is the ability to listen to all of the experts and if you are not
8		agreed with these experts, you go to others, other experts. In this
9		matter, the CIEX Report, you will recall that one of the people who
10		were Investigators in the CIEX Report is a former Governor of the UK
11		Reserve Bank. He also disagrees with the systemic impact.
12	Dr C Stals :	Who is that?
13	Adv T Madonsela :	I have been asked Mr McMahon. I have been asked that actually
14	Mr C Moraitis :	Yeah, I have heard of him.
15	Dr JJ de Jager :	He was never a Governor, not a Governor of the Reserve Bank.
16	Adv T Madonsela :	He was the Deputy, Sir.
	Dr C Stals :	He was a Deputy, yes.
18	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay.
19	Dr C Stals :	Frustrated, because the Government did not appoint him and
20		(indistinct) a vendetta against Central Banks.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay. Doctor Stals, I will just let that go, but I was just saying the
22	•	point I was making just for the record is, we take no view about
23		whether there was going to be a systemic impact or not at this stage.
24		We are just listening to every part and my job is to weigh all of these
25		ideas, and then apply my mind in terms of what of those arguments

25

are more rational, are more persuasive and more reasonable to any human being who is sitting in the position where I'm sitting. Then there is a second part, the point that has been raised about that even this investigation itself could lead to a systemic impact. Doctor De lager, I read that Sir and I understand. I would just say for me, whether we leave this matter or we deal with it conclusively, there are consequences and the fact that it has been dragged forever with people having their own interpretation of what happened, and people creating their own storylines ... as we are sitting there is Black First Land First, because Mr Michael Oatley has been trying to find anybody in South Africa who can listen to his cause and who can also be persuaded to look at the possibility of getting a fair value for their contribution to recovering of the money, because he is still hoping that he will recover the percentage of whatever he believes is recoverable. So me dropping this matter is not going to stop a public debate on it and a continuous debate on it about there was wrongdoing. Even the amounts involved it gets different in the public out there. I think the running figure in the public is, we are talking about 26 billion. The figure that we are dealing with is far less than 26 billion. However, there is something Sir, where you say that conjecture and speculation in the market about the nature of the financial assistance provided to Bankorp by the South African Reserve Bank and its effect on Absa was therefore not conducive to stability in the banking sector. My approach would be, I don't think any of the investigations that have been done were supposed to be

25

about conjecture and speculation, and we have to be careful about which of the reports are we saying is more about conjecture and speculation. There has been the Davis Report, the Heath Report and the CIEX document, but from our side we don't plan to speculate. If we wanted to speculate we would have sat in our little corner and arrived at conclusions. We have been trying to find the truth the best way we know how and we have tried to look under any stone where somebody said the truth might be hiding there, and that is why Sir, we have asked you to be here. The Davis Report made some findings, but you will understand that the Davis Report is a report of ... Judge Davis is an excellent Judge and one of my former mentors, but my process here is different from the Davis Report, because the Davis Report was an internal investigation commissioned by the Reserve Bank. So this matter has now come to the ultimate administrative oversight body in South Africa, which is the Public Protector South Africa. We cannot say just because Judge Davis, there was an internal investigation, we can't investigate. In fact a lot of the things that we do in Government, sometimes there would have been an internal forensic report that arrived at some figures. Nkandla for example there were two internal reports, there was the Ministerial Task Team Report that said there was no wrongdoing and there was the SIU Report that said something else, but much as we were told, "Don't touch it because there has been internal investigations", we said we will consider those internal investigations, we will apply our mind to them, but we are a different body with a different mandate

and those internal processes aren't a bar to us, but of course they are 1 useful materials too and again I have interviewed Judge Davis. I will not indicate what he has said to me, but I have interviewed him right 3 at the beginning of this process, I think it was 2013? 4 Adv L Tshiwalule: 2013, yes. 5 Adv T Madonsela: Yes. You then quote Sir, that I had said at that stage I didn't want to 6 go for a wild goose chase. That is true. I initially refused to 7 investigate this matter and then Adv Paul Hoffman said there is low 8 lying fruit, because ... 9 Advocate who? Dr C Stals 10 Adv T Madonsela: Adv Paul Hoffman. The complainant ... 11 Hoffman? Dr C Stals 12 The complainant in this matter is Adv Paul Hoffman, although other Adv T Madonsela: 13 people have now jumped on the bus and make more noise than him, 14 but from his side he said the money was wrongly given, but that is 15 not the issue. The issue is the money was loaned and loans are 16 recoverable, and he said that Absa had made a provision to pay for 17 this loan, and all we needed to do then was to ask Absa to reopen 18 their vaults and find that money that they had provided for. I won't 19 indicate where are we in terms of finding out whether the money 20 was provided for or not, but when we entered of course it was here is 21 money, Government money that was wrongly given away. Whether 22 wrongly or rightly given away, but this is Government money that 23

When the opportunity

presented itself for it to be recovered, Government did not recover

was given away, it was recoverable.

24

25

and the reasons Government gave or was ... or the information circulating that indicates why Government chose not to recover is not convincing, and then I was asked then to investigate. Indeed when I ... and then I started with a preliminary and my preliminary firstly took me to these key people. Judge Bertelsmann was one of those people who I interviewed at the beginning and he told me the money is recoverable. So by the time then I made a decision to proceed with the investigation, which is what we do after a preliminary, it is when we have credible information or sources that suggest that the matter is worth pursuing, but whether the money is recoverable or not is not dependent on what Judge Bertelsmann told me or Judge Heath told me, or the former Head of NIA, Mr ...

Mr B Dhlamini : Billy?

Adv T Madonsela:

-13

Billy Masetlha. What all of those people have said ... we have their statements in terms of what their view is, but it is not their views. Ultimately I have to make a decision that I think takes into account all rules, rules of commerce, your systemic impact and general fairness, rationality, reasonableness and lawfulness, I will have to take all of those. So I haven't made any decision, but I'm just explaining why I move from a preliminary to a full investigation. I didn't just do so foolhardy. I did do this preliminary and I did consult these people who are as competent as Judge Davis. He himself I interviewed him and he didn't pose an impediment to me proceeding forward. In the report I will indicate what his view was about some of the difficulties and how I could explore ways to overcome them.

You then have a complaint saying about the fact that we kept postponing meetings. I sincerely apologise. It was not my intention to do so. It was just scheduling errors and emergencies emerging, and I will again maybe extend another written apology to former Governor Gill Marcus. I had written to her on each postponement to apologise, but I do apologise. We finally did meet in September, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of September 2013, as you have indicated. For us ... I explained again that I'm not going to the old enquiry, but I do need that background.

Dr C Stals

I understand that.

Adv T Madonsela:

It is not for me at this stage to judge whether it was a gift, it was a loan or it was stolen money, but I just have ... I mean my concern is, was the money recoverable, whatever package it was and if it was recoverable I have to find that information from the two deals, the deal that led to the money being given away and secondly, the deal that led to the Absa takeover or the Absa decision. A lot has been said about the Bounty Hunter, Government has also complained why are we investigating, because there was a Bounty Hunter involved? Our approach has always been we don't care who complains. Sometimes the person who tells you that somebody was murdered is the guy who had been promised part of the money and they don't get part of the money and then they tell us about who murdered who. So we are not going to not follow up on the murder because the person who is giving us the information has ill motives, or wants some of the money. Like in some of those murder cases in fact people are told



that "You will get this money if you tell us who murdered?". So we do take that into account. I think what for us is important in that case, it is not about who wrote this report. It is the quality of the information and the reliability of the report.

Dr C Stals

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

: Is that the Davis Report?

Adv T Madonsela : 6

No. that is the CIEX one.

Mr C Moraitis

CIEX, CIEX, Doctor Stals.

Adv T Madonsela: We will assess the report in terms of the quality of this report, in terms of the reliability of the information it provides and the concreteness of the information it provides, but that has nothing to do with who wrote it. The team itself was a competent team, which includes Mr McMahon, former Deputy Governor and it also includes somebody who is now a Judge. So they are standing their ground, but we do not look at who, we look at what and each statement must defend itself, because of its rationality and reasonableness. Just lastly again we thank you for being here and we assure you that we have made no decision about what happened, whether it was right or wrong. We are looking for answers. What we do firmly believe though is that leaving this matter without a written report will do no justice to the people affected, but it will also do no justice to the South African economy, because this matter will remain a wound to the future generations, about why this one was never dealt with? I think Government should have dealt with it openly at the end of that very first process. I must indicate to you we have been asking for Cabinet minutes on how this matter was resolved. We haven't found

them. We have asked for minutes of a meeting of the Reserve Bank on how this decision was made. We haven't found them. On the other hand Mr Durr ... you know Mr Durr? Mr Durr ...

Dr C Stals : The bare feet one, is it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr JJ de Jager : The bear feet one.

Adv T Madonsela: Mr Durr. Mr Durr was a shareholder in the Reserve Bank, so he is a witness on the other side and so you have to understand then Sir, that we are sitting in the middle of this thing. We hold no view, we

We do ... Mister De Jager, you reminded us that we made a promise,

are just trying to do everything that we can to conclude this thing.

that once we have arrived at conclusions, we will share those

preliminary conclusions with you. We will do so. We are trying to set up a meeting around the  $23^{rd}$  of this month, where we will share

those conclusions, because our preliminary conclusions were shared

with the Minister of Finance, the current Minister of Finance in 2013

when I met with him. I already had a draft report and then

unfortunately I lost the Investigator. So that explains Sir, why the

matter lay totally unattended from 2013 until now, I had nobody,

because we decided that we would not burden our investigation

teams with it. We would have a single Investigator who would assist

me. That is just basically then the end of the story. That is the

purpose of the meeting Sir, is to find out what happened according to

you in terms of those two transactions, and if you have any

information regarding when this report came back, how was this

report dealt with or if it wasn't this report, the Davis Report, how

TRANSCRIBUS CC · www.transcribus.co.za · transcribus@gmail.com · (Rindi) 082 323 7937 · (Office) 087

DIA

was the final decision ... who made the final decision regarding what 1 is going to happen with this (indistinct) and how was this decision 2 made? I just want to ask you, Sir and the people accompanying you, 3 the two Lawyers, at this stage to make any preliminary comments if 4 you would like to? I know that Mr Moraitis has ... Moraitis, sorry Sir, 5 wanted to already make a comment. 6 Yeah, I just want to make a technical point. I will not say anything in 7 Mr C Moraitis respect of what you want information in respect of. I wasn't around then. Dr Stals is best place to answer, if he can answer what you want. 10 Adv T Madonsela: Yes. Sir. 11 I do not want to say anything about that. You are correct, Dr Stals 12 Mr C Moraitis must speak for himself. Dr De Jager and I cannot speak for Dr Stals in 13 these matters. The only technical point I wanted to make, there is 14 two points. The first one was the South African Reserve Bank has 15 never questioned your jurisdiction to investigate the South African 16 Reserve Bank. The South African Reserve Bank fully accepts the Public Protector's jurisdiction to investigate the South African 18 Reserve Bank and if there is any misunderstanding on that part, I 19 would like to clear that up immediately. 20 Adv T Madonsela: Okav... 21 The South African Reserve Bank questions your jurisdiction to 22 Mr Moraitis investigate the 1990's and pre-constitutional issues around the 23 1980's and the 1990's, not because he does not want you to 24 investigate that, but he doesn't believe your Act allows you to do 25

that. However, you have explained what your position is with regard 1 to background information from the 1980's and 1990's. We do not 2 want to take issue with you in that regard. We do not necessarily 3 agree that your Act authorises that position, but we take no issue. 4 That is a matter, which can be dealt with if it needs to be dealt with 5 later. You have asked to speak to Dr Stals and Dr Stals is here, and 6 would like to speak to you in that regard. I just wanted to clear that 7 up. The South African Reserve Bank would never challenge your ጸ jurisdiction in that regard. 9 Yeah, can I confirm that? It was never ... I mean in our letters we also 10 Dr IJ de Jager set that out, so that is not a problem, but you know may I just add to 11 12 this? Adv T Madonsela: Thank you. 13 I understand you are pressed for time, I understand you need to get Dr II de Jager 14 this issue resolved now. Let us rather leave whatever we have there, 15 it is there on record. If you want to speak to Dr Stals, he is there on 16 his own volition. He never ... I must be clear, Dr Stals - and I'm 17 saying it in his presence you know so that you can hear it - he never 18 19 expressed any dismay or anything with regard to the fact that he had to come here. He was always willing. It was only these issues that 20 we needed to clarify and those are the issues that we raised there. So 21 I think you know maybe it is the best thing for us and for you under 22 23 the circumstances to assist you to get this thing finalised, that you speak to Dr Stals. 24 And if there is one last point I may make, if there is any information

25

Mr C Moraitis

1			specifically that you would like from the South African Reserve Bank,
2			I know you have indicated that you have asked for specific
3	•		information.
4	Adv T Madonsela	;	Yes.
5	Mr C Moraitis	;	I can't recall if there is any outstanding requests on our side, but
6			please if there is, won't you put it in writing and ask the Reserve
7			Bank again, because at best we can come to you and say we don't
8			have it or we don't agree that it is relevant, or something like that,
<b>ે</b> 9			but I cannot recall Dr
10	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Yes, no, I can maybe I can come in here.
11	Mr Moraitis	:	Yes.
12	Dr JJ de Jager	:	There was a request for certain information. We did check for the
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		information and we have in the South African Reserve Bank, the
14			bank's Provision Department, we have certain information that we
15			have identified that is there. The reason why we haven't actually
16			supplied it yet was because of the problems that we had and that we
7			still felt you know we wanted some clarification on what this is for,
18			because I must just hasten to add that we must also be very careful in
19	,		terms of Section 33 of our Act, that we should not under
20			circumstances where it is not justified in terms of that section to
21			provide the information. That is the first part. The second part, I can
22			actually just give you the information. If we talk about Government
23			bonds - because I know that at some stage you were interested in
24			the Government bonds - we were requested by the National
25			Treasury to see if we could identify those Government bonds. Now

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr Moraitis

Mr C Moraitis

Adv T Madonsela

obviously the Government bonds – the paper, the specific paper that was issued at the time - that would only be in the possession of ourselves, or whoever, but Dr Stals will explain that and once that has matured and it is paid, the paper goes back to Government, so it is there for cancellation. It is like when I have a debt instrument from you and I keep the debt instrument as long as you don't pay it and the day you pay it, I hand it back to you and it is for you to decide what you are going to do, so we checked our records. There was no way in which we could identify ... that is according to the staff in our bank, we didn't have any information anymore about the debt instruments themselves. So the only persons that would be able to give it to you would be Treasury, because they issued it in the first instance and I did try and we did speak to Treasury, and they needed information from us to see if they could identify that and my understanding was you know those documents, the actual specific certificates, they ... I don't know where they are. They are not in our possession anymore. Adv T Madonsela: Thank you, Sir. Thank you, Madam. Adv T Madonsela: Before we then move to Dr Stals, I just want to firstly then thank you Doctor De Jager and Mister Moraitis ... is it Mister or Advocate? Sorry Sir. No. Mister. Mister. Okay, thank you. I may have misread the letter, but thank

TRANSCRIBUS CC · www.transcribus.co.za · transcribus@gmail.com · (Rindi) 082 323 7937 · (Office) 087 150 8703 0 1/ A

you for clarifying. Then that is not going to be an issue in the report.

1	Dr JJ de Jager :	No, we definitely don't stand outside the law, the Reserve Bank,
2		definitely.
3	Adv T Madonsela :	Thank you, Sir. The second issue then, you have indicated that your
4		concern was about us digging something that happened before the
5		Act that establishes the Public Protector Act, which Act is 1995 and
6		the office itself opened doors in October 19 the Act is 1994, the
7		office opened doors in 1995 and we have explained ourselves, in that
8		we said we are only looking at alleged maladministration of 1997
9		and to make sense of that we need to then know what had
10		precipitated that. It is going to be impossible to judge the acts of the
11		actors of 1997 without understanding what were they dealing with.
12		That is the context of looking back in the past.
13	Mr Moraitis :	Okay.
14	Adv T Madonsela :	Regarding outstanding documents, I am grateful that you are saying
15		you do have some of the documents and hopefully now that we have
16		clarified that we are not only reinvestigating the propriety or
<b>1</b> 7	r	impropriety of what happened in the past, but looking at the
18		propriety or impropriety of what happened post 1997 only, we could
19		get that information. The Reserve Bank has given us secret
20		information, despite Section 33. The only not on this matter only,
21		on other matters. The only requirement was that we were supposed
22		to undertake that we will have the proper mechanisms in our offices
23		to keep that information secret and secondly, we will use that
24		information only for the purposes for which it was procured, and
25		thirdly, that before we issue a report we will talk to the Reserve Bank

1 to then look at whether the report may somehow compromise some of the secrecy requirements of the Reserve Bank. Of course when we deal with that, we will have to ... Doctor De Jager and Mister Moraitis, 3 as the lawyers helping Dr Stals, we have to also balance the Reserve Bank Act, which precedes the Constitution and the Constitution, 5 because when we dealt with the security cluster again on Nkandla, 6 7 there was always balancing that, that our Act says the default position is transparency and then we have some of those Acts that 8 9 require secrecy, and for good reasons. So we have to just find a good balance between the purposes of the secrecy and the constitutional 10 11 requirement of transparency and openness. The issue of the bonds 12 that you say you cannot find ... Dr II de lager Well, it is a question, you know I don't know if ... it won't be ... it is not 13 14 in our possession, because as I have explained to you it is the debt 15 instruments. Adv T Madonsela : Yes. I was coming to that, that the interesting, but sad thing, is 16 Treasury has washed its hands and said, "We know nothing". At that 17 18 time the Reserve Bank was delegated the powers of Treasury as well. 19 So the issuing of the bonds, the looking after the bonds, the work that 20 should have been done by Treasury at the time was being done by 21 the Reserve Bank and that Treasury knows nothing. We had a 22 delegation from Treasury here that we asked the same questions and 23 Treasury washed its hands about any knowledge of anything to do 24 with the bonds and everything, but again for us what would help 25 though would be if ...

1	Dr JJ de Jager :	If I can just maybe help you there?
2	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes?
3	Dr JJ de Jager :	Maybe Dr Stals can give you a better explanation you know how
4		these bonds work, because the South African Reserve Bank acts as an
5		issuer of bonds for Government as well, you know, so in other words
6		but the instrument itself is still drawn by
7	Dr C Stals :	I think I will cover that.
8		[Indistinct // Speaking simultaneously]
9	Adv T Madonsela :	That is super, because we are now going to go into the questions. I
10		just wanted to clarify that Treasury has basically passed the buck
11		back to the Reserve Bank and we then have to
12	Dr C Stals :	Okay, I think Treasury is right. I agree with them, they didn't have
13		anything to do with that.
14	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, thank you, Doctor Stals. Now coming to you, Doctor Stals, we
15		just would like to know if you have any objection to taking the oath
16		and if you don't, would you consider the oath binding on your
<u></u> 17		conscience and if so, would you say, "So help me God", Sir?
. 18	Dr C Stals	I have no objection. It will not make any difference to me whether
19		I'm under oath or not under oath, but I will take the oath and I am
20		under oath. I have got no problem. I will tell you the truth, that is all.
21	Adv T Madonsela	: Thank you, Sir. So you do swear that the evidence and information
22		you shall give shall be the truth and nothing but the truth, and if so,
23		please say, "So help me God"?
24	Dr C Stals	: God help me.
25	Adv T Madonsela	: Thank you, Sir. We have specific questions, but perhaps before we

1		go into the specific questions, from an inquisitorial point of view I	
2		have always found that it is easier for people to tell us a quick story,	
3		rather than me asking question by question. So let's just firstly	
4		confirm your full names, Sir?	
5	Dr C Stals :	You want me to start speaking?	
<i>.</i>			
6	Dr JJ de Jager :	Full names?	
7	Mr Moraitis :	Full names?	
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Your full names?	
9	Dr C Stals :	My full names? Christian with one "A", Lodewyk Stals.	
10	Adv T Madonsela :	Thank you, Sir. If you can just tell us about your understanding of	
11		what happened when this deal between the Reserve Bank,	
12		Government and Bankorp was originally struck and leading to the	
13		point at which we where we are right now? What you know about	
14	·	this so-called Bankorp lifeboat please?	
15	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, do we have the full day?	
16	Adv T Madonsela :	No, just cut the corner, Sir and just what you know is this, this is	
17		what was agreed and yeah, this is how it came about?	
18	Dr C Stals :	It will bring back so many memories in my mind. Yeah. Okay, you	
19		will respect firstly that I have been out of the Reserve Bank for 17	
20		years now. Secondly, that I'm getting older, at 81 and a half years I	
21		don't remember everything anymore.	
22	Adv T Madonsela :	No, congratulations on your long life.	
23	Dr C Stals :	But as you went through all these things, a lot of memories came	1
24		back. Thirdly, I didn't have time to prepare myself for exactly what	-
25		you wanted to know, but certainly I do know a lot of things that you	ì

asked. Now your first question and then I thought I could go through 1 this, a lot of things and give you a long story, but let me concentrate 2 first on what do ... how do I remember, recall this whole situation. 3 Well, I think you pointed out it started in 1985. Well, it goes back 4 even further. It goes back years before that. 1985, middle of the year 5 I was asked by the Minister of Finance to come and help him out, 6 because he couldn't find a Director General for Finance. I didn't want to go, but in the end between the Governor of the Reserve Bank, the 8 Minister and myself, I accepted that I will go on secondment to the Treasury for 5 years and help them out, serve as Director General for 10 Finance. At the same time the whole problem of the South African 11 international debt crisis developed. I was the Senior Deputy 12 Governor in the Reserve Bank then in charge of the Reserve Bank's 13 foreign operations. I had very little to do with domestic operations 14 of the bank. So I was extremely busy at that time, but then I think the 15 negotiations between the Reserve Bank and Bankorp started. I did 16 attend the Governor's committee meetings, because all those kinds of things are decided ... or those days were decided within the 18 Governor's committee, that is the Governor and the three Deputy 19 Governors. Decisions like that can be ... belong to the Board of the 20 Reserve Bank, but there is a very formal document available in the 21 bank on the delegation of powers, from the Board of the Bank to the 22 Governor and the three Deputy Governors, or for members of the 23 Board and they have full power from the Board of Directors of the 24 Reserve Bank to take important decisions. So the Governor's 25

1

Committee met very regularly and things like this came up in the Governor's Committee, so surely when that first kind of assistance was considered, I was in the Governor's Committee, but I had very little to do with that whole first transactions that took place. I said this before, then some or other fortune hunter in London came out with a letter and said I told lies, but they produced a letter that I signed and they said I wrote the letter. Nonsense of course. As the Senior Deputy Governor to sign the letter doesn't mean I wrote it and it doesn't mean I had much to do with it, but the Governor happened to be oversees, so I had to sign important things, but the letter they then produced and published. It was a letter addressed to Merca Bank, about an assistance to Merca Bank, so it wasn't to Bankorp at all. In any case, that is the kind of things that I have to go live with for years and years and years, blamed for things. Well, okay, that is more or less when it started. Now then I left for the Treasury in any case and I worked at the Department of Finance for 4 years when Gerhard de Kock died and I was ... 1999, 7th of August 1999 I had to go back to the Reserve Bank, Gerhard ... on the 8th of August. Gerhard died ...

20 Mr C Moraitis

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

25

: 1989.

Mr B Dhlamini

1989.

22 Dr C Stals

: 1989, sorry, yeah.

23 Mr B Dhlamini

The 7<sup>th</sup>?

24 Dr C Stals

Gerhard de Kock died on the 7th and I went back on the 8th of August.

Okay, lots of things happened in those 4 years or so when I was away

from the bank. I was very busy, extremely busy. I came back to the 1 bank two or three weeks before the Annual General Meeting had to take place. I had to prepare a Chairman's address for a meeting and 3 so on, but early the next year in the course of 1990 Derek Keys came 4 to see me. Derek Keys was then the Chairman of Bankorp and later 5 also Minister of Finance in Mr Mandela's Cabinet and so on. Derek 6 Keys came to see me and explained to me that they owed the Reserve 7 Bank, I think it was something like R600 million, which they 8 renegotiated every year and they had to start repaying this loan in the middle of 1990 or somewhere, and there was no way they could 10 do it. As a matter of fact they were running into more serious 11 problems and the bad book loans, loans that were no longer serviced, 12 was growing all the time and so on and so on and so on. Okay, we 13 negotiated it, went to a Governor's Committee and we approved it 14 that we would continue to provide support for another year. I think 15 we increased the amount then, but I can't give you the exact details. 16 Well, as it turned out the situation in Bankorp got worse and worse, and the next year again by the end of 1990 they could not make the 18 repayments. Then I think around about that time we decided in the 19 Governor's Committee and I decided that listen, this can't go on 20 forever, that we have to make loans to this bank every few months, 21 extend the loans, give more loans and so on. So I asked the Registrar 22 of Banks - it was in those days the Registrar of Deposit Taking -23Institutions I think - to do a thorough investigation into what is 24 going on in this bank, what is the position of the bank, how long 25

25

would we have to go on supporting the bank and so on. Okay, it took a couple of months and the Registrar then came to me with a report that he prepared, together with the External Auditors of the bank and they presented to us a useless situation for the bank from the Auditors of the bank, and with a warning that the next report that the Auditors will have to issue for this bank will have to be a qualified report. To issue a qualified report is a death sentence, because the public will immediately lose full confidence in the banks and there will be a run on the bank and it will be forced into liquidation. The bank was not insolvent, I must make that clear to you. That was a very important issue for us. We were reluctant to help a bank that was insolvent. Its assets still exceeded its liabilities, but it could no longer comply with the minimum capital requirements of the Banks Act, and the Registrar was then in the difficult position that he had to withdraw the licence of the bank and he had to tell the bank, "You can't go on doing banking business, because you are not complying with the minimum capital requirements of the Reserve Bank Act. Your assets may still exceed your liabilities, you are not insolvent, but you will have to stop doing business as a bank if that qualified report is published by your Auditors". Okay, that is where it all started and then we had to take that difficult decision you had referred to, shall we just let this bank go or is this where this problem of systemic risk, the domino effect - if one bank falls, it pushes over the next bank, the next one, the next one, and the whole banking system can collapse - the "contagion effect". A confidence, it

is based on confidence of people in the bank. Now what ... the third 1 or fourth biggest bank in South Africa, R35 billion of assets and 2 liabilities, 25 000 clients, offices operating in Hong Kong, London and 3 New York, a big amount of foreign assets and liabilities, foreign 4 clients. South Africa is sitting in a situation of a debt rescheduling 5 arrangement with international banking institutions. There was a 6 big shortage of capital in South Africa. What are we going to do with 7 this bank? Sure, it was a difficult decision to take. We consulted with 8 the Minister of Finance. We consulted with ... then at that stage called in the major shareholder in Bankorp, who no longer does talk 10 to Derek Keys, the Chairman of Bankorp. We also started talking to 11 Marinus Daling, who was the Chief Executive of Sanlam and we said, 12 "Look, listen, we are sitting here with a major problem, a big risk for 13 the stability of the South African banking system and thousands of 14 clients, international relations. What are we going to do?". Well, one 15 of the reactions that came in one of the meetings we had in the office 16 of the Minister, Sanlam said, "Well, as the major shareholder what can we do? We can just accept the situation and walk out of it, take 18 our losses. We have an investment of so many million rand of capital 19 in the bank and in terms of the Companies Act our loss is limited to 20 that amount of our share capital. We have already used up all the 21 reserves of the bank, so we will just walk out of it and let the bank be 22 liquidated, and take our loss of R500 million". I'm not so sure it was 23 500, but I think it was R500 million. "We will take our loss and the 24 bank can be closed". Okay, we started talking, thinking, talked to 25

25

Eddie George in the Bank of England, I talked to Fisher in the We had long discussions and International Monetary Fund. eventually we decided that listen, as lender of last resort the Reserve Bank will have to step in here and incidentally the Reserve Bank was established in 1921, started its operations on the 1st of June 1921. You go and read the first balance sheet that the Reserve Bank published at the end of June 1921, it had consisted of one big asset, a special loan to the National Bank of South Africa to rescue the bank, okay? That is the function of the Reserve Bank. The very first transaction it did in its life was to give a lender of last resort facility to the bank. Okay, then we talked to the Minister again, the Minister said, "There is no way that Government funds can be put into the bank, but we agree with you, we can't let this bank be liquidated now". We thought of all the implications it could have, so we put a lot of force on Sanlam as the major shareholder. We said, "Well, we can't liquidate this bank, you can't walk away from it. As the major shareholder you have to work with us to try and keep this bank going". All kinds of alternatives were considered, despite what you will read in some reports, which is blaming us that we did not consider the possibility of a merger of the bank with other banks. Seriously considered, but we came to the conclusion that no bank in South Africa had enough capital to absorb this bank and big shortage of liquidity in the markets, capital, so we couldn't approach another bank to try and absorb this bank. The Reserve Bank had to provide the necessary assistance. Okay, then my clever advisors in the bank,

including Prof Jan Lombaard, the Deputy Governor and Chris de 1 Swardt, the Deputy Governor in charge of Bank Regulation and 2 Supervision, and Dr Hennie van Greunen, the Registrar of Banks 3 started working, "How can we provide this lender of last resort 4 facility to this specific bank in this specific situation that we find 5 ourselves in, in South Africa at this stage?". Well, now some people said we did not comply with best practices in the world. I challenge anybody to show me a list of best practices that existed in 1990 or what best practices must be. I again discussed it with the Bank for International Settlements, with the IMF. They all said, "You know, 10 most banks have what you have in your Article 33. They must keep it 11 confidential if they give any assistance and there are no standard 12 rules or regulations around in the bank". There is one that compares 13 what we did with best practices in the world. It is funny and 14 sometimes I laugh about these things, sometimes I want to cry. They 15 stumbled over a speech that Eddie George held in 1993 in Hong 16 Kong, which Eddie George gave six things that he thought a bank as the Central Bank should comply with when it gives assistance to 18 banking institutions. Eddie had discussed ... we had a conference of 19 Central Bankers in London a month before Eddie held that speech. I 20 gave a presentation at that meeting in London with the Bank of 21 England. I can tell you a lot about what I said in that speech, but in any case Eddie more or less used six things that we agreed to in that 23 Bank of England meeting 1993. Okay, wonderful. If we should have 24 had those standards in 1985 or in 1989 or in 1990, we could have 25

25

used it, but incidentally we did. We got very much close on that, because I think we had a big influence on that speech ... on that six things that Eddie George then mentioned in his speech, but in any case we go back to 1990. We are confronted now with this situation and my advisors all came up and I said, "Number one, we must comply with all legal requirements. There is a Reserve Bank Act, there are rules, there are regulations. Make sure that we comply with this", and I went further. I said, "Employ outside legal advisers to assist you with drafting this agreement". We went to ... we appointed the respected firm of Rooth and Wessels. They appointed two senior Attorneys, Tippy Luttig and Willem du Plessis, both dead at this stage. One of my problems that I had to live so long, but in any case with the assistance of the two legal advisers they drafted a document, a Loan Agreement, that you have to enter into with Bankorp to consolidate everything that has happened so far, to make sure ... and I said, "Please, let's get something that will have ... that will terminate, that will come to an end at some stage. We can't go on every year and every year", and so on. Okay, they worked for a few months and they produced a massive document of 61 pages as a Loan Agreement between the Reserve Bank and Bankorp. Finally this document was signed in 1991 for a 5-year period, working back from 1990 and it will go up to 1995, and during this period this Loan Agreement will apply. Now I have seen legal opinions. You know sorry for all the legal people around me here, but I have really come to the conclusion that something as difficult as this lender of last

resort facility is like going to a casino to try and get a legal opinion on 1 what it is worth. It depends on how the dice will drop that day, to 2 what legal adviser you go to. We had two legal advisers to help us 3 draft it. At a later stage there came the Hoberman investigation into 4 the Duros Tollgate affair. I don't know if you have taken notice of 5 that very important investigation that took place on the Tollgate affair, because it was a wonderful opportunity. All kinds of stories 7 went around about this donations and money that was given to 8 Bankorp, but it is all nonsense. Nothing like that every happened, but we couldn't say anything, because we committed and we were 10 bound by Article 33 of the Reserve Bank Act, not allowed to disclose 11 anything about a transaction between the bank and anyone of its 12 Then came this Hoberman, Article 21 individual clients. 13 Investigation into the Tollgate affair and there appeared the two 14 criminals and crooks of Haskins and Diedericks, and the stories they 15 told about this lifeboat, it is just amazing. The Reserve Bank then 16 decided but listen, this is the opportunity. We approached Hoberman and said, "Please, can we come and give you evidence 18 before this meeting about this lifeboat?" and then he subpoenaed us 19 and we said, "Wonderful". Rooth and Wessels came to us, "Use this 20 opportunity, because the Reserve Bank Act says you are not allowed 21 to disclose any information unless forced to do so by a competent 22 Court of Law". They established that this investigation 21 ... Article 23 21 Investigation is a competent Court of Law. Wonderful, we have 24 the opportunity and it is a public Hearing, and now we have the 25

25

opportunity to disclose everything. Okay, so we went there. We gave them all the information, I gave them evidence and all those bigmouth people who shouted at the Reserve Bank, after I talked for three hours, they had no questions to ask. One of our other enemies also said, meaning ... a criminal that should have been in jail long before that, David Gleason, the last man to see Kibble alive, had dinner with him a few hours before he was murdered, shot, but in any case let me not elaborate on David Gleason. But he wrote a letter to say that "This ability to be an oralist(?) like Plato Aristotle were in the Greek civilisation, still has a lot of influence today, because Stals convinced everybody and told them a lot of lies" and so on and so on and so on, but there were no questions asked. Hoberman said to me afterwards and in his final report said he could find nothing wrong with the Reserve Bank's assistance, and it had nothing to do with Tollgate and these were just excuses used by those people, but in any case then we disclosed everything. Now okay, we laid on the table the document, the Loan Agreement and I emphasise "Loan Agreement", because again there is a legal interpretation that it is a simulated transaction. Well, sorry, I'm not a legalist. I'm just a simple economist and banking expert, but if that Loan Agreement should really be construed as a simulated agreement ... well, the Reserve Bank is doing simulated transactions every day, today, I can assure you. Go and look what the bank is doing today. It is exactly the same transaction that they are doing every day today with the banks when they give them liquidity and money market assistance

on a day to day basis. Okay, what was the essence of that Loan 1 Agreement? It said, "The Reserve Bank will make a loan to you, so 2 you consolidating all the outstanding positions and so on" ... 3 That is to Bankorp? 4 Mr B Dhlamini To Bankorp, "To you as Bankorp. The Reserve Bank will make a loan Dr C Stals 5 to Bankorp of R1.5 billion. We will credit your account in the books 6 of the bank with R1.5 billion. The Reserve Bank Act does not allow to 7 give a loan to anybody without the necessary collateral, so what is 8 acceptable collateral to the Reserve Bank? In our daily operations of giving loans to banking institutions, Government bonds, Treasury 10 bonds and certain commercial paper with a maximum surety of 21 11 days. We will need collateral for this loan that we give you". Now we 12 go into the second step, "You must use this R1.5 billion to buy 13 Government bonds". The interest rate on Government bonds at that 14 stage was 16/17%, that was the normal market rate of interest. "So 15 you will buy Government bonds for R1.5 billion with that loan that 16 we extend to you and you will deposit those Government bonds in the Reserve Bank, and cede it and leave it open to the bank. That is 18 our collateral. That is how we do it every day when we make loans 19 to banking institutions on a day to day basis at daily clear-in". 20 Discount window? Mr B Dhlamini 21 Discount window nowadays. So okay, that was worked out in detail Dr C Stals 22 then. "You will pay the Reserve Bank 2% interest on this loan". That 23 was incidentally at a much later stage reduced to 1%. 24 Because that will cover all the administration costs of the Reserve 25

25

Bank to manage this loan and you will pay us 2% interest, you will earn 16% or 17% on the Government bonds that you buy and that difference ... income, that is what you must use to get your books right again over the next 5 years. This is the contribution we can make as a lender of last resort to get your books right again. Now what must you do with this income stream that you will be earning?". R225 million a year I think it worked out more or less. "You must write off your bad book. So the next step, we require from your Auditors to divide the total book of Bankorp into two divisions, the good bank and the bad bank. You will put in the bad bank all your bad loans, unrecoverable loans, loans that you have to write off, that if you have no chance to get it back again. We need a certificate from your External Auditors for every one of those accounts, we want the name of that account, we want the outstanding amount and this is the bad book". Okay, now Davis(?) says we didn't put all the loans in a different company. We did put it in a different account, which I think was in any case a better way to do it and we ring-fenced that account, and we said, "This is the bad book and this is what you will correct over the next 5 years with this assistance that the Reserve Bank is giving you, and that means that your External Auditors now accepted this, that they will not have to issue a qualified statement anymore and what is more, go and read the Loan Agreement. You, the main shareholder, Sanlam, will carry half of this book. Sorry, you have already made losses, but you have to provide for a further one half of this bad book". The bad book was R2 billion more or less.

"The Reserve Bank's contribution will be close to 1.1 ... 1 or 2 billion, 1 or something like that, but the rest you must carry as the main 2 shareholder in the bank. You must go much further, you must close a 3 lot of branches, you must reduce your staff, you must" ... oh, yeah, 4 "You are not allowed to get any dividends on your shares anymore. 5 The dividends that you get every year that will accrue to you, Sanlam 6 as the main shareholder, will be reinvested in the bank to get it right 7 again, to get its capital right again" and so on - a lot of restrictions -8 and "You change your top management" and so on, and they did. Chris van Wyk was asked to resign or to leave the bank, Piet 10 Liebenberg took over. A lot of staff changes were made, branches 11 were closed. "Restructuring of the whole organisation, get rid of all 12 these loose subsidiaries, like Merca Bank and all these others, 13 consolidate them all in one big organisation", and these are all 14 conditions. "The Registrar of Banks will attend all your meetings, 15 regular discussions on this restructuring. The Registrar will report 16 to the Governor of the Reserve Bank regularly on what is happening and we have the right to appoint a Director to the Board, if necessary, 18 to attend all your Board meetings". Okay, that is all in the Loan 19 Agreement and further, "The loan will be fully repaid after 5 years 20 when you will be able to sell your Government bonds again or when 21 the Government bonds come to maturity, but in any case at the end 22 of 5 years you will use these Government bonds, they belong to you, 23 they have been ceded to the Reserve Bank and they have been made 24 transferable to the Reserve Bank, but they belong to you, you earn 25

1			the full interest on it, you are the owner of these Government bonds,
2			but at the end of the 5 years either you give the Reserve Bank
3			permission to use that cession and sell the bonds or you take the
4	·		bonds back and sell it, or you do whatever you want, but you repay
5			the full loan, the full amount of the loan that we have extended to
6			you, the R1.5 billion, you will repay at the end of the 5 years". Okay,
7		-	that was the Loan Agreement and I'm surprised to hear that you say
8			you don't have the Loan Agreement. This is it. No, this is not
9	·		(indistinct), but it is in here, 61 pages.
10	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Could we make a copy?
11	Adv T Madonsela	;	Yes, we would appreciate it. We could perhaps make a copy.
12	Dr C Stals	:	Well, this is my own personal thing. This is what I presented to the
13			Tollgate affair.
14	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Okay, shall we make
15	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Yeah, you can.
16	Dr C Stals	:	Maybe you wait a bit, because there are more things in here.
17	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Okay.
18	Dr C Stals	:	Okay, so that is the Loan Agreement. At least ten places in this thing
19			you will find reference to this Loan Agreement. Now to say this is
20			not a Loan Agreement, sometimes I just laugh at this, but that is the
21			Loan Agreement, 61 pages and after the Tollgate affair it became a
22			public document, because we presented this thing. I tabled it myself
23			in that Tollgate Enquiry and this is it, you can see it is signed by a lot
24			of people, it is and I can read to you from this document. It is a
25			Loan Agreement that the Reserve Bank extended on the normal basis



1			to a bank. The difference is, it is a longer term, it is not a very short-
2			term loan and the 2% interest we charged on it. That is where the
3			subsidy came in. We charged them only 2% and they earned
4			15/16%, and that difference that is the assistance that we provided
5			to them. Now that thing worried me, about this low interest at 2%
6			and there came a time when Heath started investigating all these
7			things, but I was still worried about it. So I agreed with the Registrar
8	·		of Banks that we shall get a special investigation by Senior Advocate,
, 9			an independent Advocate from Johannesburg and we appointed
10			Ginsburg?
11	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Yes, Philip Ginsburg.
12	Dr C Stals	;	Philip Ginsburg (SC) and said, "Now these are all the things that
13			happened with this bank, with this agreement and so on. Just can
14			you give us an opinion ex parte, what is called a funny thing in legal
15			terms, an opinion on this whole Loan Agreement and in particular
16			about that low interest rate that we charged". Okay, this man
<b>)</b> 7			presented the report, which I think we still have it somewhere, but
18			he said there is nothing wrong with this whole agreement. The
19			Reserve Bank acted fully within its powers. "Opinion, lender of last
20			resort assistance", ex parte opinion given by the Honourable Philip
21			Ginsburg (SC).
22	Adv T Madonsela	:	Would you care to share that with us, Sir?
23	Dr C Stals	:	Uhm?
24	Adv T Madonsela	:	Would you care to share that with us?
25	Dr C Stals	:	I don't mind.

Adv T Madonsela: Thank you.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr C Stals : I don't think this was ever published anywhere, but I have no

problem.

Mr B Dhlamini : No problem?

Dr C Stals : This is ... okay, so we had two legal advisers. We did get a legal

opinion at some stage, we made this Loan Agreement. Okay, what

happened to the loan? On the day that it was effected we went

through the normal procedures that we do every day when we give

loans, we debit loans and advances in the books of the Reserve Bank,

we credit Bankorp. We say ... like any bank will give you an

overdraft, we say, "Now okay, you have a credit of R1.5 billion, which

you can now use. First consolidate the outstanding positions,

whatever it was. There was an additional amount. This is your

R1.5 billion, but now we want full coverage for this loan, so you must

deposit R1.5 billion with the Reserve Bank in Government bonds

before we will allow you to use that overdraft account that we have

given you, the overdraft loan, the loan that we have given you". Then

I think ... and I'm not so sure exactly how it was done, but I think the

bank or Sanlam people came back to us and said, "Well, it is difficult

to buy R1.5 billion of Government bonds in the marketplace. Can you

help us?". We talked to the Treasury at the time and they said,

"Wonderful, this is a bonus for the Treasury. We have to issue about

R5 billion of Government bonds to finance the budget, normal

Government expenditure and we will just make an issue as part of

our normal issue of Government bonds to finance the budget deficit,

and if Bankorp should come to us tomorrow with R1.5 billion, sure, 1 we have no problem, we will issue them on normal conditions, normal interest rates, normal maturities". I think they even agreed 3 to give it 5-year bonds, which is more or less over the same period as 4 the Loan Agreement and those bonds were issued. Nothing special 5 issued, not a special issue, not a special interest rate, normal 6 Government bond issues to finance the budget of the Government. 7 They could have just as well bought bonds in the marketplace as far as the Reserve Bank was concerned, but in any case wonderful, we helped the Treasury, one of the big beneficiaries of this whole Loan 10 Agreement, enabled the Treasury to issue R1.5 billion of bonds 11 without going to the marketplace. It reduced the pressure on 12 interest rates on Government bonds, it made it easier for the 13 Treasury to finance the budget of that year, because here came a 14 sudden demand, a sudden source of funds that we did not rely on 15 and they did not expect. So if anything, Government, Treasury 16 benefited from that whole loan operation, because they could sell R1.5 billion of Government bonds out of their normal budget 18 procedures. Okay, that is the only way that Treasury came into it, 19 Government, except for negotiations and talks, but they didn't 20 finance anything. They financed the budget deficit, they got money 21 for the budget deficit, money as in the budget deficit and they issued 22 Government bonds for it. That is why I said earlier I understand 23 Treasury will say, "Well, we can't identify those bonds". I can't think 24 how they can, it is part of the Government bond issues of that year, 25

1991 or whatever it was, and if they paid the annual interest on the 1 2 3 4 5 .6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Dr II de Jager 21 22 23 it is its own debt instrument, so it is a liability. 24 25 Dr C Stals

bonds, together with all the other interests they paid on all the outstanding bonds, there was nothing special in it for them. It wasn't a special issue, it wasn't a special interest rate, it wasn't something that special. They sold Government bonds to Bankorp and they sold Government Bonds to Barclays, and they sold Government bonds to Nedbank. As I say, there was nothing in it for the Government. Where did the funds come from? That is something that (indistinct) again. I spent hours with Heath and I will tell you in honesty now and it will be recorded - Heath could not read a Balance Sheet, he couldn't understand an Income and Expenditure Account and the finances. I spent hours with him and he didn't understand it, and when I tried to explain to him that the Reserve Bank issues money, that is what makes the Reserve Bank a very special institution, it can issue money, it can create money, it can issue bank notes. Then I tried to explain to him that on the Balance Sheet of the Reserve Bank ... it is the only institution in the world you will find that, but on the Balance Sheet of the Reserve Bank bank notes never appear as an asset. It is a liability. Now that is what confused Heath. He thought this was magic, you know. We cannot allow the Reserve Bank ... Maybe if I just can come in here. If you take your rand and you put it

into your bank account, it is going to be for your benefit, but if it is the South African Reserve Bank that receives a rand in its own hands.

It is a liability of the Reserve Bank. Even if you take the Balance

Sheet of the Reserve Bank tomorrow – they are publishing nonsense 1 and nonsense - you will find bank notes is a liability. You will find no 2 South African bank notes on the asset side of the Balance Sheet of the 3 Reserve Bank. So the Reserve Bank has ... that is - you referred to it -4 Treasury delegated some of its powers to the Reserve Bank. 5 Government delegated its power to create money to the Reserve 6 Bank and that power, you create money out of nothing, out of the blue. That is the power of a Central Bank and that is why it is so important to have a responsible Governor in the Reserve Bank, because you can create money and if you create too much money, 10 you destroy the money, you create inflation. You have the example 11 on your border, Zimbabwe. Go to Zimbabwe tomorrow and find out 12 what happened to them in the last 5 years. Mugabe took over the 13 Central Bank and started issuing money and the Rhodesian dollar 14 lost its total value, to such an extent that they can't use it anymore, 15 nobody wants to accept it. They have to use US dollars and South 16 African rand. That is the danger of creating too much money from the Reserve Bank and that is why the Reserve Bank must be an 18 independent institution. It must not be controlled by Government, it 19 must not be directed by Government, it must not be instructed by 20 Government what to do. It must be an independent institution. 21 Independence given to it by Government, sure, but it must be 22 independent and that is why it is important that the Reserve Bank 23 should not just create money, and spend money and give money 24 away. No, surely, that is why you needed a 61-page Loan Agreement 25

25

when you gave R1.5 billion loans to a bank and what happened in the end? The loans were fully repaid. Every transaction, every cent during that 5-year period were recorded in the books of the Reserve Bank in the normal way. The income of 2% and later 1%, well that is all that it is actually worth for us, that we reflect it from year to year. The outstanding claim on Bankorp on the asset side of the Reserve Bank it stayed there for 5 years and finally it was repaid, Bankorp sold its Government bonds back to Government or somewhere ... well, Absa at that stage and used the proceeds, and repaid the loan to the Reserve Bank. Sure, it is fully repaid, the loan was repaid, every cent of it and if you have doubt about that, why not go into the books of the Reserve Bank? Appoint your Auditor, ask them to go through the books of the Reserve Bank. Why not get ... yeah, well you can ask the Reserve Bank's Auditors, but go back in 1990, go back to 1985, go back anyone of those dates, you will find all those entries in the books of the Reserve Bank, sure. It was a normal loan operation of the bank.

## [Cell phone interference]

Dr C Stals

I should have switched this off long ago, sorry. One of my golf partners. Okay, so that is what I say, you know if you have doubt, if you don't believe me, if you have doubt about it, why not get Auditors to go through the books of the Reserve Bank? You will find every detail of all these transactions. I don't know if the bank keeps its records for 35 years, because we are talking about 35 years ago, in 1985, yeah, but surely all those entries went through the books of

the bank and were recorded, and were handled as a normal banking 1 transaction. Why ... well, you come back to Article 33, you are not 2 allowed to disclose any information. For that reason the Auditors, 3 the External Auditors of the Reserve Bank, they were Deloitte's and T 4 don't know who the other firm was, they had to see me every year -5 I mean was Governor for 5 years - to discuss with me the report they 6 will issue. For 5 years every year this came up in the final statements 7 that we are going to publish, "Drawn up by you, the External 8 Auditors, how did you handle that transaction, because we must make sure nobody will be able to make any deductions from it". It 10 was never an issue, it was never a problem, because in banks ... loans 11 and advances to banking institutions in those years amounted to 12 R5 billion, and that included the R1.5 billion to Bankorp and from 13 R5 billion nobody would make any deductions and so on, could make 14 any deductions, but it was recorded in the books of the bank. It was 15 published in the annual Balance Sheet of the Reserve Bank as part of 16 loans and advances paid by the bank. The interest earned came into the profit and loss account of the bank. Okay, that is the bank's story 18 and the loan was fully repaid. Okay, you are talking about reclaiming 19 something. Well, number one, what is it you are talking about? 20 Certainly not the loans. The loans were extended, the loans were 21 repaid, the loans were covered by collateral, the loans were handled 22 in absolutely the normal way. Sure, but there must be somehow or 23 other that assistance was provided, because we wanted to rescue the 24 bank and we wanted to help them cover this huge big bad book that 25

25

they developed through bad management in the 1970's and early 1980's. Surely there must have been some kind of contribution? Well, easy, the contribution came from the difference in the interest we charged them and the interest they earned on their investment in the Government bonds. Now to whom did that accrue? I mean that was your next question. If you want to claim something you have to claim that interest flow. You can't talk about a loan. The loan was fully repaid, a normal loan. Now that again is fully spelled out in this document. Nobody after 1990 in any case, when that final Loan Agreement was entered into - and the same apply to the previous sections of it - it is difficult to define who benefited from the loan. I think it is the wrong word to use. The loans were not intended ... or the assistance was not intended to benefit anybody. It was intended to protect somebody, it was intended to protect the clients of Bankorp, the depositors with Bankorp, the people who made investments in Bankorp, loans, they were protected, because if in liquidation they would have had to accept a big loss and that is where the problem of systemic risk comes into it. People want to have confidence in their money. If I have money in a Cheque Account with a registered commercial bank institution, I want to know I can use my money, I can write out a cheque against it, I can nowadays use electronic transfers against it and it is safe, otherwise I will not put it with a bank. I will insist on getting bank notes and putting it under my bed or something like that. So you must protect the confidence that people, the clients of the bank have in a banking

Now surely if clients start losing their money in a institution. 1 banking institution, they need to ask questions about the safety of 2 the banking institution. Why should I put my money with this 3 banking institution? Shouldn't I take my money away from all the 4 banking institutions, if I'm going to lose billions or millions of rand in 5 a banking institution? I agree with you, it is difficult to make that 6 assessment. For legal people it is a different kind of an attitude or an 7 exercise to try and make that assessment, is there a systemic risk or not? For Central Bank it is a very difficult decision to take and it was an extremely difficult decision for us to take. Should we not allow 10 this bank just to go the full way and be liquidated? What will happen 11 to the next bank, the other bank? Is it then not going to cost us much 12 more to try and-solve this problem? What is going to happen to the 13. safety of our banking institution, the confidence in our banking 14 institution, in our banking structure? Yesterday somebody boasted 15 again in Parliament - was it Ramaphosa or somebody - about how 16 sound our banking system is and how well it is regulated, and protected and so on. Sure, why don't we appreciate what we people 18 had to go through in those periods? I can assure you if we didn't go 19 through this exercise, we would have had a depleted banking sector 20 now. We would not have had this best banking system in the world, 21 now in 2008 and I again got compliments from many places -22. including Kit McMahon interesting enough - that we managed our 23 banking system so well that we have such a sound and healthy 24 banking sector or banking system at the moment. I mean yeah, we 25

25

can differ, we can have different opinions on that, but looking back with the advantage of hindsight, obviously we did the right thing in 1990 and the period around Bankorp. We protected the banking sector of South Africa. We made sure that their stability, confidence will be retained in the banking sector and the way it worked out, again with the advantage of hindsight, nobody lost any money in the transaction. The Reserve Bank was fully repaid for the loan that it made to the other bank. The Reserve Bank was fully covered for its administration costs, even with the 2% and the later 1%. Government was never involved in it. No Government money was ever used in this transaction. You can say, "What about the interest on the Government bonds?". The Government would have had to pay that interest in any case, were it for Bankorp or lifeboat or lender of last resort assistance that the Reserve Bank gave, it was part of the normal budget expenditure of the Government, the budget deficit, the need to issue Government bonds. As a matter of fact, as I have explained to you, the Government benefited from it, because an additional demand was created that helped the Government to keep interest rates marginally lower than what it would otherwise have been. So no Government funds ever came into the picture there. You can talk about the money that the Reserve Bank created. It cost the Reserve Bank nothing, not a cent to create. So we earned an additional 2%, 1% on this loan that we made, that we would not have earned otherwise. So the income of the Reserve Bank actually increased because of that loan facility. Again, funny, it is magic, but it

is true. You can say the Reserve Bank could have used that money to 1 make its own investment in Government bonds and earned 15%. Yes, but we would not have done it, because we have a responsibility 3 to fight inflation. We don't create money to earn income. That is not 4 a function of the Reserve Bank and if it becomes a function, you go 5 the Rhodesia way or the Zimbabwe way. So surely it makes no sense 6 to say yes, but the Reserve Bank could have invested the R1.5 billion in some other place. No, the Reserve Bank would not have created that money and again the way that the transaction was designed helped us to control the money supply. We are creating R1.5 billion. 10 It worried me a lot. I was very committed to fight inflation. Inflation 11 was 17% when I was appointed Governor in 1989. It was less than 12 2% when I retired 10 years later. So I was very committed that I 13 fight inflation. The one way to make sure that you fight inflation, you don't create money unnecessary. Now I'm forced into a situation 15 where I have to create money for helping Bankorp or a banking 16 institution. Okay, we said now you know if we have to create this money, let it not go into the private sector to be spent. At least if it 18 goes to Government it helps, because Government must finance its 19 budget in any case and the Reserve Bank does help the Government 20 from time to time by investing in Government bonds. So we said let's 21 try and channel it to Government, so at least its inflationary effect 22 will be less when it goes to Government. So you know now we go 23 back to ... and then I say again there was very little example, very 24 little experience, very little information of what the Central Banks 25

25

did around the world as lenders of last resort. 2008/2009 the whole situation exploded in the world, just about every Central Bank in the world had to step in and provide assistance. My Gosh, if I compare with what we did in 1990 around and what the Central Banks did in 2008/2009, well ... I agree, our arrangements did not comply with best practices in the world. They were just better. So you can go back now and compare. There are many examples now on how Central Banks provide a lender of last resource facility. They were not available in those years. We had to do our own things based on Walter Bagehot and (indistinct) Adam Smith of 1694 when the Bank of England was created, but I have no problem, I have no reservation today looking back on this, despite what all the people are saying about what the Reserve Bank did at that time. I think we did the right thing, I think we achieved the right result. It is the agony of Central Banking, you have to go through that. If you are Governor of the Reserve Bank, bad luck, you have to go through this. Nowadays they are being paid for it. In my time it was a great honour for me to do that job and I had to accept these kinds of problems, and that is why I went to the Tollgate affair, that is why I went to the Heath Commission, that is why I went to this Davis Commission. I had the responsibility, I was Governor of the Reserve Bank. I had sometimes very little to do with some of the things, but I was the Governor of the Bank and I was the head, and I was prepared to defend it and I'm still prepared to defend it today. Now again you raised some things that I really must - in your own interest - refer to, whatever you

1			want to write and so on to protect yourself and your institution's
2			very good name. Reserve Bank owns no shares in a Reserve Bank.
3			You say the Reserve Bank is one of the shareholders. As far as I
4			know it never got issued, not a single one. The Reserve Bank is not a
5			shareholder in the Reserve Bank.
6	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Government hasn't got shares in the Reserve Bank.
7	Dr C Stals	:	Government hasn't sorry, the Government has no shares in the
8			Reserve Bank.
9	Dr JJ de Jager	:	There may be things like I know the Police Widows Fund, the
10	•		Police Widows Fund have about 3 or 4 shares, but that is about
11			(indistinct).
12	Dr C Stals	:	But in any case if they do hold shares, they are restricted by the
- 13			R10 000.00.
14	Dr JJ de Jager	:	No, but they don't (indistinct), they don't.
15	Dr C Stals	:	But they never had shares in the bank, no, no way, but in any case, so
16			that is irrelevant. I said you know I looked at it and that is why I
			remember it. I said in that conference in the Bank of (indistinct), as
18			far as 1992, South Africa event well, I can tell you a lot about the
19			independence of the Central Bank, but in any case I was very
20			independent at that time. Why? Because the South African
21			Government was going out in transit(?) and didn't want to take any
22	·		responsibility. They had Ministers of Finance, like Chris Liebenberg
23			and then Derek Keys and so on, and they couldn't tell me anything
24			what I had to do, from experience I have had 45 years in the bank
25			and so on, and I couldn't go to them for any advice. I said in that

	<del></del>		
1			speech in London, I said, "You know a Central Bank can only be as
2			independent as the Government of the day wants it to be".
3			Remember it was created by a Special Act of Parliament, the Act of
. 4			(indistinct). So this independence of the Reserve Bank also is
5			something that you have to have be realistic about.
6	Dr JJ de Jager	:	May I just maybe ask just for clarity, the link between Absa and
7			Bankorp won't you just elaborate a little bit on that?
8	Dr C Stals	:	Okay. Okay, in any case I said to them at the Bank of England
9			meeting that "I can assure you, it can get very lonely if you become
10			an independent Central Bank". You need your Minister of Finance,
11 .			you need your Government, you need to talk to them at times, you
12	·		need to understand their policies, you have to work closely together
13			with fiscal policies, but in any case the Reserve Bank is an
14			independent institution and I have to emphasise that. Okay, you
15			want me to say something about the link with Absa?
16	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Just the link, yeah.
17	Mr C Moraitis	:	Yeah.
18	Dr C Stals	:	Okay, now this then in this Loan Agreement of 61 pages we did
19			take into account the possibility of a merger, of a takeover of this
20			troubled bank, of this problem bank. So it reads in that document
21			you will find 3 full pages making provision for a takeover of Bankorp
22			by another bank. Okay, this event then came in 1992, again to the
23			relief of the Reserve Bank, wonderful. This could now terminate this
24			critically sick problem, a problem that we have with this critically
25			sick bank, Absa can take it over. Now there again I was not so much

involved in it. It wasn't much of an administrative problem. My 1 Deputy Governor, Chris de Swardt, handled that whole situation. 2 The only important thing was, it said in this Loan Agreement that 3 Sanlam cannot sell its shares to anybody without the approval of the 4 Reserve Bank, as long as this Loan Agreement would apply. So they 5 had to approach the Reserve Bank and for another reason, they had 6 to ask the Reserve Bank what would now happen to this Loan 7 Agreement, this special assistance agreement? Okay, the Reserve Bank then negotiated with Absa, entered into a special agreement with Absa, signed by Chris de Swardt - I didn't sign that one - the 10 Deputy Governor and that Loan Agreement more or less just 11 confirmed to Absa that the existing agreement will continue. Absa 12 will take over the bad book loan, the good book loan and Absa will do 13 the administration of that bad book loan, Absa will use the proceeds 14 they get from the Government bonds to write off the bad book loan 15 and Absa will make full repayment of the loan at the end of its 16 maturity, when it comes to maturity, and that is more or less the essence. Absa then wanted to substitute some loans and I think the 18 Reserve Bank said, "No way, that is fixed and cast, that was fixed in 19 1990, that was the list provided by the Auditors of the bank and 20 which must be certified every year by the Auditors". Then a loan 21 agreement provision was made that if they should recover any of 22 those loans, it will be deducted from the assistance given to the bank. 23 When it came to the end of the period the External Auditors of Absa 24 had to provide the Reserve Bank to confirm to us that the full amount 25

25

was used for the write-off against the book. The External Auditors came to us then with a report that said that the total bad loan book had increased beyond expectation after Absa took over the bank, and therefore the shareholders of Absa had to provide additional funding for that loan. What they received from the Reserve Bank was far less than the total loss and therefore that clause that said if they recover anything, they will refund to the Reserve Bank a part of that income stream assistance that we gave them. Well, obviously then it did not have to apply, because it was proven by the External Auditors of Absa and by the Registrar of Banks that the total bad loans book was something like R2 billion. Okay, the Reserve Bank's assistance funded about 1.1 or R1.2 billion of it. The special assistance that Sanlam had to give financed another 5 or R600 million of it and therefore the Absa shareholders had to absorb something like 2 or R300 million. So Absa, it cost them the 2 or R300 million extra, which now again I was not involved in that. I think that part was covered very well in the Davis Report, the negotiation that took place between Absa and Bankorp or Sanlam at the time of the takeover. I think it is very clear. I wish ... it is so straightforward, it is so simple if you understand bookkeeping and accountancy, and financial transactions. Here comes Absa and say to Bankorp, Sanlam, "I'm interested in taking over your bank. What does it look like? Sure". The first thing they want, "I want your Balance Sheet, I want your financial accounts. Sure, here are my financial accounts. It exists of two books, a bad loan book and a good loan book". Obviously Absa

would say to them, "Well, I'm interested in your good loan book, I'm 1 not interested in your bad loan book. Why should I buy a bad loan 2 book from you? That is losses that have been incurred by you and 3 your bad management many years ago, why should I buy that? I'm 4 not interested in that. I'm interested in negotiating with you to buy 5 your good loan book". Okay, then obviously Bankorp had ... Sanlam 6 will say, "No, don't worry about the bad loan book. It has been 7 covered with a special facility from the Reserve Bank. Leave that out of the account. That will be covered by the income that we earn on this Reserve Bank loan, on condition that you just confirm with the 10 Reserve Bank that they will be prepared to transfer that same facility 11 to you, that same Loan Agreement will apply". Okay, Absa did that, 12 the Reserve Bank confirmed so and if I should have been ... so I don't 13 know, I have no idea what happened in those negotiations, but if I 14 should have been involved on the Absa side I would have said, 15 "Wonderful. I'm not interested in that income that will be earned on 16 the Reserve Bank facility, because I can't use it. It must be ... it has 夏7 already been used, it is finished, it doesn't exist anymore. It is there 18 to absorb the bad loan book, so leave that out of account. There is no 19 income that I'm going to earn. As a matter of fact I have to do the 20 administration of that book, that is all, but otherwise forget about 21 that book. Let's negotiate about your good book". Then obviously 22 Bankorp will say to Absa and the Auditors will say to Absa, "Well, in 23 the good book there are also bad loans, bad loans had accumulated 24 after 1990", because that bad loan book we are talking about was 25 w.transcribus.co.za · transcribus@gmail.com · (Rindi) 082 323 7937 · (Office) 087 150 8703

TRANSCRIBUS CC . ww

established in 1990, it was defined, it was ring-fenced, but then it worked out that there were more bad loans that developed after 1990, and that is where Absa tried us to put those additional loans also into that agreement. We said, "No way. Sorry, if you buy Absa now ... if you buy Bankorp now, we cannot change the agreement and the facility. It will be applied exactly the same way". So how Absa then negotiated with Sanlam and Bankorp to buy the good book of Absa I can't comment on that, but I mean just ... I don't know what the word is, but ...

Mr B Dhlamini

Logic?

Dr C Stals

The logic of it all is, they must have negotiated some kind of a price for buying Bankorp, fully taking into account the existence of the bad book and the funding of the bad book, and the financing of the bad book. Surely that is logical, but in any case that is what I read in the Davis Report and I think it is fairly ... very technically, but it is explained there and what he says is more or less what I said now. Yes, sure Absa did take account, but they put it aside. They said, "That is something that has been taken care of. I'm not really interested in that. I buy the good book and I negotiate a price for the good book". So Absa was in no way involved really in the lender of last resort facility of 1990 and 1991. They took notice of it and they knew it existed, but it was there in a separate book, the bad book and it was funded in the bad book, and Absa did not have to look at it. The takeover, well okay, again if there should be any good, decent court case, all this evidence will certainly be produced, that Absa will

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

. 13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr C Stals

say, "Well, you know okay, we put that book aside and we realised that that was covered, but we made a bad buy, because afterwards we discovered there were more bad loans that we had to take care of". I don't know to what extent that was included in the price or towhat extent that was negotiated, or when they discovered that. Again I just have a newspaper cutting here to say, where Absa officials said that the total losses exceeded R2 billion and that was said by a senior Absa representative at some place ... in some place. Okay, that is you know the full story. As I say, I can tell you a lot about those bad loans and so on, and Absa. Now as I say, you want to find somebody. Firstly you want to know what should be claimed? Now again can I ask you this question, if I go today to any bank and I borrow money from that bank for 10%, and I invest it at 12%, is there anything wrong with that 2%, am I not allowed to earn it? Now the banking institution comes to the Reserve Bank and it is given a loan at 2%, should it not be allowed to use that additional income that it can earn on it? Why not? I don't know. I mean as I say, I'm not a Lawyer and surely some of these Lawyers must find it funny and difficult to understand if I try to explain financial transactions to them, but then they go on to their own interpretation, and they make their own stories about it, but as I say I sometimes must just laugh at it and sometimes I want to cry at it you know. Adv T Madonsela: It is four of us actually. Because I have grown beyond that stage now where I take it personally.

1 ·	Mr C Moraitis	:	But I think the important point you made, Doctor and the point is,
2			even the difference that they made, 14 or 15%, wasn't for their own
3			benefit. It was to pay to the bad book. That was your evidence as I
4			understand the commission.
5	Dr C Stals	.;	That is right, that is right.
6	Mr C Moraitis	:	So it wasn't something they made for their benefit.
7	Dr C Stals	:	But who created the bad book, you see?
8	Mr C Moraitis	:	Yeah, no, but that is before then.
9	Dr C Stals	:	Who created that bad book? We were confronted with the existence
10			of the bad book after it happened, okay. That is the problem, that is
11			where the Central Bank have to take that difficulties. I spent days
12			not days. I spent a day, a full day in an Arbitration case, Judge Rabie
13			I think it was Judge Rabie.
14	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Yes, it was Judge Rabie.
15	Dr C Stals	:	In an Arbitration case between the Cape of Good Hope Investment
16			Bank and the Railways Commuter Corporation, because we were
17			the Reserve Bank was attacked for not giving lender of last resort
18	·		assistance to the Cape Investment Bank and why did we decide not
19			to give it to Cape Investment Bank? Because people like Andy Swartz
20			and the other one I mentioned earlier?
21	Mr C Moraitis	:	David Gleason.
22	Dr C Stals	:	David Gleason did fraudulent transact
23	Mr C Moraitis	:	And Pickard.
24	Dr C Stals	:	and Jan Pickard did fraudulent transactions within the Cape
25			Investment Bank, so the Reserve Bank and it was completely

1		insolvent at the time. They gave to Gleason a loan three times the
2		total capital of the bank. It is completely against the Banks Act and
3		they submitted for 6 months false returns to the Reserve Bank. Now
4		sure, the Reserve Bank can use its discretion and say, "Sorry, there is
5		no lender of last resort assistance to a bank like Cape Investment
6		Bank". Then the Railway Commuters Corporation had a huge deposit
7		in Cape Investment Bank, which they lost, because Cape Investment
8		Bank was liquidated. Then they approached us in the Reserve Bank
9		to refund them for that loan and we said, "No way. You made that
10		investment with the Cape Investment Bank, it is a bad investment
11		you made. Yeah, but you gave assistance to Trust Bank and Bankorp
12		Absa, why can't you not give assistance to Cape: Investment Bank?".
13		Okay, then they went to Arbitration and Judge Rabie was the
14		Arbitrator, and I had to give evidence to Judge Rabie why we did not
15		give the loans and then the next month to the Tollgate investigation,
16		why we did give loans? You see, so it is the agony of Central Banking,
17		it is a "no lose" situation. If you give loans, you will be criticised by
18		some people. If you do not give loans, you will be criticised by other
19		people. So okay, you said I must give you a copy of this. You can
20		make a copy of this. It is a long thing.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	But they can make copies of it straight away, so that they can give
22		you back then the original, Sir.
23	Mr C Moraitis :	What I can also do, if you oud prefer, is take it away, copy it and have
24		it delivered to your offices tomorrow morning.
25	Dr JJ de Jager :	At your offices.

			b September 2010
1	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Do you have it? You should have it, but, but we can make a copy of
2 ·			it.
3	Mr B Dhlamini	:	No, we can do it, yes.
4	Mr C Moraitis	:	Okay, it is up to you.
5	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Yes, we have got a facility.
6	Mr C Moraitis	:	Alright.
7	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Because there is more in the file and
8	Mr C Moraitis	:	Do you want a copy of it now?
9	Adv T Madonsela	:	Are they able to do it immediately and the opinion?
10	Mr C Moraitis	:	Let me take it and I undertake you will have it tomorrow morning. I
11			will have this delivered to your offices tomorrow morning.
12	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, but then you must just discuss this with I just want to go to
13			this one.
14	Mr C Moraitis	:	That is why I wanted (indistinct).
15	Dr C Stals	:	Okay, you see I have first the Loan Agreement.
16	Mr B Dhlamini	;	Yes
17	Mr C Moraitis	:	It is all in Afrikaans, it is an Afrikaans document.
18	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, you see that is what
19	Adv T Madonsela	:	But don't we don't mind (indistinct).
20	Mr C Moraitis	:	No, I know, but you have the misfortune
21	Dr C Stals	:	But somebody will have to translate to English.
22	Mr C Moraitis	:	No, no, they will do it themselves.
23	Dr JJ de Jager	;	Will you be able to do it?
24	Adv T Madonsela	:	We have Lawyers here who are fully Afrikaans speaking, yes.
25	Dr C Stals	:	I say this with a little bit of reservation.

1	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes?
2	Dr C Stals :	My one deduction was that Davis and his group could not read
3		Afrikaans, because I think they never read this agreement.
4	Mr C Moraitis ;	Do you want the (indistinct) now?
5	Dr C Stals :	Just (indistinct) let me go through this now, let us first go through
6		this. In this book you have the full Loan Agreement and as I told you,
7		here it is, more than 60 pages. There is the list of the bad book, every
8		single loan that Bankorp and its predecessors made, and we agreed
9		to in 1990 these are the bad loans and this is what you will never get
10	•	back again, you will never recover it and this is what somehow or
11		other we must put right in your books.
12	Adv T Madonsela :	And the agreement is dated 1991?
-13	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, it is in this agreement.
14	Mr C Moraitis :	The agreement?
15	Dr JJ de Jager :	Date.
16	Adv T Madonsela :	What is the date that you have?
27	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, the date of this agreement I think is somewhere you will go
18		back into it. I think it was
19	Mr C Moraitis :	Let me have a look at the last page.
20	Dr C Stals :	It started
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay.
22	Dr C Stals :	It started 3 <sup>rd</sup> of August 1990.
23	Adv T Madonsela :	Right. I think Doctor Stals, on behalf of my team we thank you so
24		much for taking us on to that historical road, which then gives us a
25		sense of where everything started and why things were done like

1		that in the past, which then leads us to 1997. So before I ask any
2		specific questions about the historical information you have shared
3		with us, I would just want to when did you leave the Reserve Bank,
4		Sir?
5	Dr C Stals :	7 <sup>th</sup> of August 1999.
6	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay.
7	Dr C Stals :	Okay, sorry, in this file I also have a copy of the agreement entered
8		into between the Reserve Bank and Absa at the time of the takeover.
9	Adv T Madonsela :	Pardon?
10	Dr C Stals :	In this file I also have a copy of the agreement that was entered into
11		between the Reserve Bank
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Then you are a lifesaver, because we have been just asking for these
·13·		two agreements.
14	Mr C Moraitis :	It is a public document, which is it is the Tollgate thing, we must
15		give it to.
16	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, but I think you asked for this one.
17	Adv T Madonsela :	Pardon?
18	Mr C Moraitis :	It is the Tollgate Enquiry, so we must give you this document. It is a
19		public document, so
20	Adv T Madonsela :	No, thank you, because none of the other actors seemed to know
21		where to find that, so, but we
22	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
23	Mr C Moraitis ':	Yeah, but it is such a big thing.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, it is (indistinct).
25	Dr C Stals :	Okay, there are three agreements in this book. You can (indistinct).

1	Ir C Moraitis : I will have them delivered to you tomorrow morning.
2	or C Stals : And this is that Ginsburg thing that I referred to.
3	Adv T Madonsela: Plus okay, documents.
4	Dr.C Stals : I'm sorry, I can give you (indistinct).
5	Mr C Moraitis : Can we mark it for your attention when I deliver it?
6	or C Stals : I think this is very important. Have you read the Heath Report?
7	Adv T Madonsela: Uhm (positive).
8	Or C Stals : It starts off by saying:
9	"The Special Investigation Unit has decided not to institute any
10	litigation following its investigation into the financial aid
11	package provided by the South African Reserve Bank to Bankorp,
12	where investigation into the validity" and so and so and so.
13	Adv T Madonsela : Right.
14	Dr C Stals : Yeah and it more or less comes to exactly the same conclusion as
15	(indistinct).
16	Adv T Madonsela: Can we get a copy of the Heath Report, because we interviewed Judge
<u> </u>	Heath, but he didn't have a copy of his report at the time we
18	interviewed him?
19	Dr C Stals : Okay, this okay, then the Davis Report you have?
20	Adv T Madonsela: The Davis Report we have?
21	Mr B Dhlamini : Yeah, we do.
22	Adv T Madonsela: I think we do, yeah.
23	Dr JJ de Jager : We gave you a copy in 2011 I think. It is part of our
24	Adv T Madonsela: Yes.
25	Mr B Dhlamini : Yeah, those we did receive.



1	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yeah, the Heath Report nobody seems to have had, although I had
2			extensive discussions with Judge Heath on the report.
3	Mr C Moraitis	:	It is not his report. It is the statement that he issued on a lot of
4			(indistinct).
5	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, he never issued a report.
6	Adv T Madonsela	:	No, because the report was given to the President and when we tried
7			to get that
8	Mr C Moraitis	:	That is right.
9	Dr C Stals	;	He never issued it.
10	Mr C Moraitis	:	Yes, that is right.
11	Adv T Madonsela	;	Okay, but we would love to see the statement.
12	Dr C Stals	:	Because of disputes between the Treasury and the Government, and
13			Heath.
14	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yeah, because all of the SIU reports are given to the President and he
15			has no duty under the law to share them with anyone.
16	Dr JJ de Jager	:	That is the Davis Report.
17	Dr C Stals	;	Yeah, it is the Davis Report.
18	Adv T Madonsela	:	Although we could subpoena those reports from the President.
19	Mr C Moraitis	:	Yeah, you could.
20	Adv T Madonsela	:	We could, in terms of the Public Protector Act.
21	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Yes.
22	Mr C Moraitis	:	They would never find them at his (indistinct).
23	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Because II tried to look for them in the SIU, but I couldn't find, but I
24			think you know
25	Dr C Stals	:	Can I offer you another document? "Submission by Dr CL Stals,

1		Governor of the South African Reserve Bank, with a Section 417
2		Commission of Enquiry into the affairs of Tollgate Holdings".
3	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay. Oh, that would be great because incidentally I don't know if
4		you have all read "Dangerous" what is that book? Julian Askin's
5		book, "Dangerous" what?
6	Dr C Stals :	You know I know I'm talking a lot. I know I'm talking a lot, but
7	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes. No, no, but I'm saying they blame you. I mean saying from that
8		book it then
9	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, but that is where the letter was published, that you know he
10		said I said I had nothing to do with the bank of loans initially and
11		then
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, "Dangerous Deceit".
13	Dr C Stals :	And then he publishes something in the end, a letter which I signed,
14		assistance to Merca Bank.
15	Adv T Madonsela :	Right. Well, I just it would be interesting then to hear your side of
16		the story, this is his side.
	Dr C Stals :	You know what, I will tell you my experience. I can start with a lot of
18	·	people, I can mention them all to you and I will start with Martin
19		Welz of Noseweek and so on. What happens is
20	Adv T Madonsela :	So this is is the statement
21	Dr C Stals :	What happens is, somebody tells a story and then somebody else
22		tells a story, and then the third person makes his own story and it
23		goes on and on, and in the end it becomes a mythical illusion for
24		somebody. Then the mythical illusion becomes a mythical dream for
25		somebody and then somebody tries to make the mythical dream a

r		
1		mythical reality, and then you run into problems, because if it is
2		mythical it can't be reality and it goes on and on.
3	Adv T Madonsela:	Right, thank you.
4	Dr C Stals :	This is the kinds of thing that happen and you know it is a narrative
5		approach of analysis, and I'm sorry to warn you, you are relying a
6		hell of a lot on a narrative analysis.
7	Adv T Madonsela :	Sorry, Sir, I have some specific questions, Sir. Some you have
8		answered, some you have not.
9	Dr C Stals :	Okay, CIEX.
10	Adv T Madonsela:	I'm going to ask because you were still Governor
11	Dr C Stals :	Okay, that is very easy
12	Dr JJ de Jager :	She will ask.
13	Adv T Madonsela :	in 1999, the first CIEX Report was submitted in 1998. What was
14		your contact with the CIEX author, Michael Oatley? Did you have any
15		contact with Michael Oatley?
16	Dr C Stals :	No, no knowledge of him, never met him.
17	Adv T Madonsela :	No contact. You were not involved in any way in the Cabinet
18		grouping that was dealing with him, that was meeting with him?
19	Dr C Stals :	No, I didn't attend Cabinet meetings myself. I'm a Governor of the
20		Reserve Bank (indistinct).
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Did you get the report that Michael Oatley submitted in 1998?
22	Dr C Stals :	No, never heard of it, nothing.
23	Adv T Madonsela :	At the time when you commissioned Judge Davis relating to this
24		matter, what was the basis of you looking into that or when with
25	•	the Reserve Bank?

1	Dr C Stals :	I was never involved. I never knew anything about the CIEX Report
2		in my lifetime, in my lifetime in the Reserve Bank.
3	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes, so what triggered the Davis investigation?
4	Dr JJ de Jager :	What triggered the Davis investigation?
5	Dr C Stals :	I don't know, I don't know. That was after I retired as Governor.
6	Dr JJ de Jager :	That was Governor Mboweni.
7	Mr C Moraitis :	That is Mboweni.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, Davis yes, no, you are right, Davis.
9	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, Mboweni is
10	Adv T Madonsela:	Oh, yes.
11	Dr C Stals :	It happened after I Mboweni never discussed it with me.
12	Adv T Madonsela :	And then Heath.
13	Dr C Stals :	Heath?
14	Adv T Madonsela :	The Heath report is dated
15	Dr C Stals :	Heath was about 1998 or something like that.
16	Adv L Tshiwalule:	Heath was 1998.
7	Adv T Madonsela :	1998 and of course you were presented with it?
18	Dr C Stals :	No.
19	Adv T Madonsela :	You were not presented with the Heath Report?
20	Dr C Stals	No, I did get a copy of that statement that he issued to the press. It
21		was the statement issued to the press.
22	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes. Alright, I just wanted to know did you have so you had
23		nothing to do with any decision that was made regarding how to deal
24		with this matter after 1997?
25	Dr C Stals :	No. I will give you a copy of this. That is the first time I ever heard

1 about the CIEX Report. Adv T Madonsela: That was 1999? 2 : Yeah, exactly. Seven days after I retired from the Reserve Bank I Dr C Stals 3 read it in a newspaper. That was ... and that was about the only thing 4 I heard about it until recently again. I have never ... I didn't know 5 about the existence of the CIEX Report and I really don't ... I was 6 never ... it was never discussed with me, it was never ... 7 Adv T Madonsela: And they never spoke to you as the Governor of the Reserve Bank 8 when they were engaging him to look into this matter? 9 No. No, I have never met any of those people, I have never known Dr C Stals 10 them. It was very funny to read that report in the newspaper, but in 11 any case that is the only ... that is ... and that happened as I said about 12 a week after I retired from the bank incidentally, but then even after 13 that I was never involved and I never heard about it, until recently, in 14 the exchange of letters between you and the Reserve Bank on your 15 disputes and so on, I learnt about the CIEX Report. I asked the 16 Reserve Bank, "What is the CIEX Report? I don't know about it". I 17 have never had anything to do with it and whoever did that report 18 investigation didn't have the decency to even mention it to the 19 Reserve Bank, as far as I know, that they were doing that research 20 and that they were doing that, and the Government of South Africa 21 didn't have the decency to tell the Reserve Bank that they were doing 22 this investigation. I never heard of it again. 23 Adv T Madonsela: Right, thank you, that is duly noted. I just want now to confirm the 24 That agreement that you have with Bankorp is it an 25 timelines.

1			agreement between the Reserve Bank and Bankorp?
2	Dr C Stals :		Yes.
3	Adv T Madonsela :		And what timeline is that, Sir?
4	Dr C Stals		What?
5	Mr C Moraitis :		The date.
6	Adv T Madonsela :		Did you say 1991 or is it 1990?
7	Mr C Moraitis	:	I'm going to give you the date.
8	Dr C Stals	:	No, it is 1991 sometime. It was signed finally in 19
9	Mr C Moraitis	:	September 1991.
10	Dr C Stals	:	I think some of the basic things were agreed long before that and that
11			is attached to the agreement. There is a letter between the Reserve
12			Bank and Bankorp to confirm "That we are prepared to investigate
13			this and see what we can do for you", more or less and so on and so
14			and so, so but the agreement is the date of that agreement is
15	Adv T Madonsela	:	So that is an agreement between only two parties?
16	Dr C Stals	1	Yeah. Nobody else was involved. Well, the Minister was fully
7			informed about it and many discussions took place with the Minister
18			about it, but he wasn't involved in the agreement.
19	Adv T Madonsela	:	Okay and then the agreement was, you would as the lender of last
20			resort?
21	Dr C Stals	ř -	That is right.
22	Adv T Madonsela	:	So you have a lender of last resort agreement?
23	Dr'C Stals	:	Yes.
24	Adv T Madonsela	:	And then you said that was for R1.5 billion?
25	Dr C Stals	;	Yeah, I think so. It ended up as 1.5 billion in any case.

: The first capital was a billion. 1 Mr C Moraitis : It was first a billion and then ... Dr C Stals : It says, "Die tweede bedrag 500 miljoen", so 500. Mr C Moraitis 3 4 **Adv T Madonsela**: So it was initially a billion ... Yeah, so it is 1 billion plus then 500 million. Dr C Stals 5 Adv T Madonsela: ... 1 million. Then plus? 6 7 Mr C Moraitis : 500. Mr B Dhlamini : Plus 500 million. 8 Yeah, but it really started off as R200 million I think in the 1985 ... 9 Dr C Stals Okay, received it? Adv T Madonsela: 10 And it was gradually raised I think to 1 billion and then the last ... Dr C Stals 11 latest one was a consolidation that increased to 1.5 billion and this 12 agreement is about at 1.5 billion. This is really a consolidation of all 13 14 the transactions, everything that happened. **Adv T Madonsela**: So this is what happened in 1991? 15 Yeah. Dr C Stals 16 Adv T Madonsela: This was the agreement and then you are saying ... I just want to 17 confirm, the 1.5 billion meant you credited the account of Bankorp? 18 Dr C Stals 19 Bankorp. 20 Adv T Madonsela: Right, so executed through ... Dr C Stals And we debited loans and advances to banking institutions. 21 Adv T Madonsela: Correct, so then they find themselves with a balance of 1.5 billion? 22 23 Dr'C Stals Yeah. Adv T Madonsela: Then you were the custodian of Government bonds at the time, am I 24 25 correct?

-		
1	Dr C Stals :	We insisted on it, yes, as collateral.
2	Mr C Moraitis :	They took it as security.
3	Dr C Stals :	We took it as security, collateral for the loan, cover for the loan.
4	.Adv T Madonsela :	Yes. I'm just trying to check that apart from using the loans as
5		security or as collateral, you were also or that is Treasury's
6		submission.
7	Dr C Stals :	Treasury.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Treasury's submission says you were the custodians of those
<b>9</b>		Government bonds. So instead of Government issuing its bonds,
10		those bonds would have still been issued. In other words, you were
11		wearing your head as the Reserve Bank and also wearing Treasury's
12		hat, because during those days they said
13	Dr C Stals :	No, Treasury was not involved in any way.
14	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes, that is what they say. That is exactly what they say.
15	Mr C Moraitis :	I think let's just clarify, did you Doctor Stals, did you issue
16	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, exactly, Treasury was not involved in any way.
<b>A</b> 7	Adv T Madonsela :	Because they are saying you had the power to issue those
18		Government bonds yourself?
19	Dr C Stals :	No.
20	Mr C Moraitis :	No.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Not true. That is what they are saying.
22	Dr C Stals :	The Reserve Bank never has not in my history. The Reserve Bank
23		has no power to issue Government bonds (indistinct).
.24	Adv T Madonsela :	Well, that is what Government said. Treasury's submission was that
25 -		the fragmentation of the Reserve Bank and Treasury is a recent

1		thing. During that time you would have been both the conceivers of
2		this transaction and the ones executing it, because they had ceded
3		the power to manage Government bonds to the Treasury. That is
4		what they have submitted.
5	Dr C Stals :	No, I don't understand exactly what they mean, but look, it is fairly
6		straightforward. The Treasury issues Government bonds to get
7		money to finance the budget.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes, they said that, but they did that through the Reserve Bank
9	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, they often do it.
10	Adv T Madonsela :	because they didn't have the capacity to do that in those
11		(indistinct). So they said it was Treasury's bonds, but they were
12	, i	managed at South African Reserve Bank.
13	Dr C Stals :	No, managed
14	Adv T Madonsela :	We want to because that would have meant then you made the
15		transaction, you also executed it yourselves. It wasn't Treasury that
16		issued those bonds. It was yourselves.
17	Dr C Stals :	Treasury issued the bonds, it is Government bonds. We can't the
18		Reserve Bank can't issue Government bonds. There is no way.
19	Mr C Moraitis :	I think Dr Stals' evidence to you is that the Reserve Bank never
20		issued the Treasury bonds.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay. I think we have to go back to Treasury on that one, because
22		Treasury
23	Dr C Stals :	No, it is quite possible that the Reserve Bank approached Treasury
24		and said, "You know, Bankorp needs the bonds", not the Reserve
25		Bank.

1	Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, that would be then the evidence we heard. That would have
2		the split in terms of a fragmented decision making, where you have
3		Treasury there, you have SARB and then you have Bankorp?
4	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
5	Adv T Madonsela :	And then you are having a deal with Bankorp, but would still get you
6		know Treasury to issue the bonds?
7	Mr C Moraitis :	Bankorp got Treasury to issue the bonds, yeah.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	That would be your submission?
/ 9	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, Treasury to issue the
10	Adv T Madonsela :	With their submission they said no, because they had sort of like
11		signed their like Power of Attorney or something?
12	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
13 -	Adv T Madonsela :	You had access to the bonds. You made the decision to do it, you
14		executed your own decision?
15	Mr C Moraitis :	So what they are saying Doctor Stals, if that is correct, is that you
16		actually issued the Treasury bonds on behalf of Treasury
<b>1</b> 7	Dr C Stals :	No, but we can't do that.
18	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes.
19	Mr C Moraitis :	No, but that is exactly correct. That is the evidence, Dr Stals is saying
20		no.
21	Dr C Stals :	We don't have a right to do that. We can say to Treasury
22	Adv T Madonsela:	No, no, they are saying now it is different Sir, that they issue the
23		bonds, but they are saying when this happened in 1991, it
24	Dr C Stals :	Yeah. No, it is quite possible. I think it is true that the
25	Adv T Madonsela :	The current separation of powers (indistinct)?

_			
1	Dr C Stals	:	that the Reserve Bank approached the Treasury and said, "Now
2			listen, with this final deal we will make we are making the loan to
3			Bankorp and Bankorp must buy Government bonds. Should they go
4			to the marketplace or should they approach you?".
5	Adv T Madonsela		And where would the Government bonds be sitting?
6	Dr C Stals	:	Well, the Government bonds were issued to Bankorp and Bankorp
7			ceded them and deposited them in the Reserve Bank.
8	Adv T Madonsela	:	No, I'm saying at the time they had to be issued who signs them?
9	Dr C Stals	:	Who?
10	Adv T Madonsela	:	Who signs them, the issued (indistinct)?
11	Dr C Stals		Would finance them?
12	Dr JJ de Jager		Who would sign I mean that is a who would sign on behalf of
13 -	*		Government?
14	Adv T Madonsela	;	Like they signed them like it was yeah, who signs them?
15	Dr C Stals	H	I don't know who signs the Government bonds when they issue
16			Government bonds. It must be somebody in the Treasury.
17	Adv T Madonsela	:	So you are saying it wasn't. I just think we just wanted to confirm
18			that. Either we misunderstood them
19	Dr C Stals	:	I mean it is the same person who signs all Government bonds that
20			they issue.
21	Dr JJ de Jager	:	It will be a debt instrument that has to be signed by (indistinct).
22	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, it is a Government bond, a negotiable Government bond that
23	·		you
24	Adv T Madonsela	:	You see from their side they said <i>now</i> they do it, but at the time – for
25			whatever reason – that authority had been delegated to the Reserve

1		Bank, but I think all of that can be confirmed.
2	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, as I said the normal procedure would have been that the
3		Reserve Bank would approach the Treasury and say, "Now listen,
4	,	these people must invest R1.5 billion on Government bonds with us.
5		Should they go to the marketplace and buy it, or should they come to
6		you and you will issue it to them?". The Treasury must have said,
7		"We will issue it to them. Wonderful, we need the money, so we will
- 8		issue Government bonds to Bankorp". Bankorp then had to bring
9		those Government bond pieces of paper to the Reserve Bank, sign a
10		transfer certificate and deposit them with the Reserve Bank to serve
11		as security for the loan.
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes, right. Other than just crediting the account, from your side what
13		would this reflect, this 1.5 billion?
14	Dr C Stals :	Well, as I say we credit the account of Bankorp for R1.5 billion and
15		we debit loans and advances to banking institutions for R1.5 billion.
16		That is a norm, if you give a loan if the Reserve Bank gives a loan to
<b>1</b> 7		anybody, that is the procedure you will follow, you credit the account
18		of the borrower, you debit loans and advances.
19	Adv T Madonsela :	So then you debit it?
20	Dr C Stals :	The debit entry stays on the books of the Reserve Bank as an asset,
21		the credit entry is used by the borrower.
22	Adv T Madonsela :	I think that is the part that I wanted to understand, because you then
23		said okay
24	Dr C Stals :	It is important, yes.
25	Adv T Madonsela :	So at this stage you have your book is reserving is showing that

1		you are owed 1.5?
2	Dr C Stals :	Sure.
3	Adv T Madonsela:	Theirs is showing a credit of that, but it is showing that that is a
4		credit of a loan in the same way as my overdraft would show that?
5	Dr C Stals :	Yes, yes, sure.
6	Adv T Madonsela:	So it is still on their side it is still showing as a loan of some sort,
7		although it still shows creditor Bankorp. Now then you then you
8	·	have the bonds to secure it?
9	Dr C Stals :	Yes.
10	Adv T Madonsela :	Or what we find
11	Dr C Stals :	I suppose the next logical step there was to debit the Trust Bank
12		account and credit the Treasury account. We transferred the money
13 -		from
14	Adv T Madonsela :	So did that happen?
15	Dr C Stals :	Uhm?
. 16	Adv T Madonsela :	Did that happen Sir?
17	Dr C Stals :	They can't both have them.
18	Adv T Madonsela:	I'm asking did it happen then that when they got the bonds from
19		Government for 1.5, Government was paid the money that
20	Dr C Stals :	Sure, the R1.5 billion, sure.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	The 1.5 was paid for them?
22	Dr C Stals :	Sure, they were paid for the money by the Reserve Bank.
23	Dr JJ de Jager : :	You see, otherwise
24	Dr C Stals :	The Reserve Bank transferred the funds from the Bankorp account to
25		the Treasury account, the Exchequer account.

1	Dr JJ de Jager :	You see in terms of the South African Reserve Bank Act one of the
2		assets that you can actually which is a liquid asset, because you
3		need liquid assets as security. One of the liquid assets that actually
4		then qualifies as an asset that you can take as a liquid asset, that you
5		can take as security or as a collateral, is Government bonds. So it is a
6		liquid asset, the reason for that being that it is easily converted into
7		cash and the Government is the counterparty. So in other words, it is
8		not a loan which has got a huge credit risk, because you have got the
9		Government. So what actually happens then is, Government sits
10		here, it needs to fund a shortage for the deficit on its budget, it needs
.11		to fund that. So what it does is, to lend to borrow money from the
12		general public, it issues paper, debt instruments that are issued
13	Adv T Madonsela :	Which we understand, but that would mean they actually normally
14		issue those and they advertise to us, the general public
15	Dr C Stals :	And the Reserve Bank.
16	Adv T Madonsela :	I'm just saying the Government bonds, they do that.
77	Dr C Stals :	Very often they are issued to the Reserve Bank.
18	Adv T Madonsela :	But the difference between the loan (indistinct) scenario explaining,
19		is that I take my own private money and I buy Government bonds.
20		They regularly advertise them, anyone from the street can buy them?
21	Dr JJ de Jager :	Correct, yeah.
22	Adv T Madonsela :	But this is unusual, because
23	Dr C Stals :	No, there is nothing unusual about it.
24	Adv T Madonsela:	No, I'm saying from where I'm standing, because as you are
25		explaining, Doctor De Jager

1	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, but that is what I have explained.
2	Adv T Madonsela	:	you would then pay from your own pocket to buy those
3			Government bonds?
4	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, not necessarily. You can pay from your overdraft to get it.
5	Dr JJ de Jager	:	You can go to the bank and you can get an overdraft, and you can
6			take your money and you can then go and buy the bonds.
7	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah.
8	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yes, but it would be your money?
9	Dr C Stals	:	Yes.
10	Adv T Madonsela	:	Whether you got it from a loan from your friend or you got it from
11	•		the bank, it would not be a loan by the same person to buy from the
12			same person?
13 ·	Dr C Stals	:	No
14	Mr C Moraitis	:	No, no, no, but you don't buy (indistinct).
15	Dr JJ de Jager	:	We understand, sorry.
16	Adv T Madonsela	:	I'm saying the normal scenario is the loan comes from it is either
17			my money that I already have or I get it from him, or I get it from my
18			bank in order to buy Government bonds, in the same way as I can
19			invest in any other thing, but here you have a scenario where
20			Government is loaning me money.
21	Dr C Stals	:	No, not Government.
22	Mr C Moraitis	:	It is not Government.
23	Dr C Stals	:	Government was never in the picture in loaning you money.
24	Dr JJ de Jager	:	No, no, Government is not in the picture, because Government is
25			selling off its bonds to a bank that has actually got the money from

1		the Reserve Bank.
2	Mr C Moraitis :	The Reserve Bank is not Government.
3	Dr JJ de Jager :	The Reserve Bank has granted a loan to this bank, so the bank goes
4		and it buys, takes the money that it received as a loan and he goes
5		and buys from Government its paper.
6	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay.
7	Dr C Stals :	What is the difference between you borrowing money from your
8		bank to buy Government bonds and Bankorp borrowing money from
9		the bank to buy bonds?
10	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, so we have now okay, we have Government, we have the
11		Reserve Bank, we have Bankorp?
12	Dr C Stals :	Yes.
13	Adv T Madonsela :	So Bankorp is taking money from the Reserve Bank to buy here?
14	Dr C Stals :	Borrowing, yeah.
15	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, but then that means there is still a debt owed to the Reserve
16		Bank of R1.5 billion?
17	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yes.
18	Mr C Moraitis :	Correct.
19	Ady T Madonsela :	So that is where I was going to
20	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, but that is not right.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	because there is still that amount that you are owing. So the one
22		person then that we will say you are not owing is Government,
23	,	because you have taken the money from the Reserve Bank and given
24		Government instantly the same amount that you had advanced to it,
25		isn't it, the 1.5 billion?

				_
1	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, but there is nothing wrong with that, but your picture is not	
2			right. I mean that is where part of your problem is. You say there is	
3			Government and you say there is the Reserve Bank, and you say the	
4			bank.	
5	Adv T Madonsela	:	The bank, yes.	
6	Dr C Stals		Now okay, the first part of the transaction is, Reserve Bank gives a	
7			loan to Bankorp.	
8	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yes, 1.5 billion.	
9	Dr C Stals	:	1.5, so	1 .
10	Adv T Madonsela	:	Meaning then this one is 1.5 billion in debt to this one.	
11	Dr C Stals	:	So one (indistinct).	
12	Adv T Madonsela	;	Yes.	
13	Dr C Stals	:	Bankorp takes the money and buys bonds from the Government.	
14	Adv T Madonsela	:	Right, which means then Bankorp has no money, but it owes the	
15			Reserve Bank money?	
16	Dr C Stals	:	No, they have money. They have an overdraft facility that they can	
17			use as money. Now Bankorp comes to the Reserve Bank and says,	
18			"Listen, that R1.5 billion that I have on deposit with you, please pay it	
19			to the Government on my behalf', not on the Reserve Bank's behalf.	
20	Adv T Madonsela	:	No, no, yes, it is on their own behalf.	
21	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, so you see this is not right.	
22	Adv T Madonsela	:	In the same way he was explained to me that, so the no. Okay,	
23			okay, okay. I think we are on the same page	
24	Dr JJ de Jager	:	Yes, we are.	
25	Adv T Madonsela	:	because you have said the Reserve Bank at the moment is like any	

1			other lender?
2	Dr C Stals	:	Bank, yes.
3	Adv T Madonsela	;	But it is just a lender of last resort?
4	Mr C Moraitis	;	Correct.
5	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah.
6	Adv T Madonsela	:	So they have given you 1.5 billion, you bought from Government and
7			you paid Government, but what then we have is that on your debit
8			side, on the bank's debit side you are still owing 1.5 billion?
9	Mr C Moraitis	:	Correct.
10	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Yes.
11	Adv T Madonsela	:	Is that okay, Sir?
12	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah, yeah, it is fine.
13	Adv T Madonsela	:	If you are owing 1.5 billion, then he said that the agreement was that
14	•		having borrowed money from my bank – if I like that scenario – to
15			pay you, so I have paid you in full immediately, but because I bought
16			bonds from you I mean bought from you, then the bonds will trade
17			and I will get interest. Now I want to know, you were saying they
18			were supposed to feed off the 2% interest?
19	Mr B Dhlamini	:	Yes.
20	Dr JJ de Jager	ţ	Remember that is the interest that
21	Adv T Madonsela	1:	From the 16 you said there was
22	Dr JJ de Jager	;	That should pay your bank. You are paying your bank. You see,
23			maybe if I just there is just one little thing in here that makes it a
24			little bit more complicated. You can give me (indistinct) or I can talk
25			from here.

Adv T Madonsela: Okay, but can I finish my thoughts on that, then you address me, Sir? 1 2 Dr II de Jager : Alright, sure. Adv T Madonsela: We are on the same page. My understanding is that then the capital 3 loan that ... so now they are sitting here, it is 1991. The capital ... 4 : It is 1.5 billion. Dr II de Jager 5 Adv T Madonsela: Yes, loan is 1.5 billion. 6 7 Mr C Moraitis : Yeah. **Adv T Madonsela**: This is as at 1991, whatever the date. 8 Dr II de lager : Okay, yeah. 9 Adv T Madonsela: Then you said in your submission Sir, over 5 years they were going 10 to pay 2%, in other words ... and that 2% they were going to get from 11 12 the 16%? Dr II de lager 13 Yes. They are going to get from? 14 Dr C Stals : The 16%. 15 Dr JJ de Jager 16 Dr C Stals : Yes, every year, yes. Adv T Madonsela: Okay, I just want to clarify that. If then I'm paying 2% of bonds that 17 are worth ... interest that I'm earning ... okay, my bonds are now 18 mine, they are my property because I bought them? 19 Dr C Stals 20 Yes. 21 Dr JJ de Jager : Your return is 16. : So they earn the 16%. 22 Dr C Stals Adv T Madonsela: But you understand the ... you gave me a loan, I bought, so they are 23 24 mine, I'm paying only 2%? 25 Mr C Moraitis

1	Adv T Madonsela :	So how does 2% become 1.5 billion in 5 years?
2	Dr JJ de Jager :	No, no.
3	Dr C Stals :	That has got nothing to do with (indistinct).
4	Mr C Moraitis :	No, no, no.
5	Adv T Madonsela :	Well, obviously it can't even be 1.5 billion, because it should be
6	;	1.5 billion plus 2% and then compound interest on 2%, because you
7		still owe the
8	Mr C Moraitis :	No. The firm submission of Dr Stals is this, they borrow 1.5 billion,
9		they pay you 2% interest. They pay the bank every year 2%. It is not
10	,	compounded.
11	Adv T Madonsela:	Okay, but
12	Mr C Moraitis :	And then they get the 16%, so they keep 14% every year, so
13	٠, ٠	1.5 billion stays 1.5 billion.
14	Adv T Madonsela :	But that is what I'm asking you. The reason I'm asking is that if all
15		then I have been paying is the paying you 2% of what I'm getting
16		from my 1.5 billion worth of
17	Mr C Moraitis :	I will answer your question. At the end they paid the 1.5 billion back.
18	Dr JJ de Jager :	Back, by the bonds that matured. Remember Government needs to
. 19	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, so the bonds when did the bonds mature? Because that was
20		the part that I
21	Mr C Moraitis :	5-year bonds, yes.
22	Dr JJ de Jager :	5 years.
23	Adv T Madonsela :	But that was the part that had confusing and I was confused about,
24		about you paying, yeah, 2%
25	Mr C Moraitis	1996 they paid it back.

1 Dr JJ de Jager : Yeah, you have bought ...

2 | Adv T Madonsela : Okay, so 1996 you have bought bonds?

3 Dr JJ de Jager : Yeah, finance.

4 Adv T Madonsela: So are you then saying the bonds were then given back to the

5 Reserve Bank?

6 Dr JJ de Jager : No.

7 Mr C Moraitis : No.

8 Dr C Stals : The bonds were sold ...

9 **Dr II de Jager** : Sold and the money returned was given to the bank.

10 | **Dr C Stals** : And the money was paid back to the Reserve Bank.

11 **Adv T Madonsela**: So we will find the Reserve Bank now being credited?

12 Mr C Moraitis : Yes.

13 **Dr JJ de Jager** : Yes, with the proceeds of the bonds.

14 Adv T Madonsela: With 1.5 billion?

15 Dr JJ de Jager : Yeah.

16 | Adv T Madonsela : Because nobody has given that evidence ever that the 1.5 billion was

17 paid.

22

23

24

25

18 **Dr C Stals** : It should be in the books of the bank.

19 **Dr JJ de Jager** : That is in the books.

20 Adv T Madonsela: So basically then it was ... okay ...

21 Dr JJ de Jager : So remember the bonds took 5 years to mature. Okay, so when the

bonds ... just you know if ... so here is the loan – you spoke about the

loan in the beginning - which is totally correct. So you have this loan

of 1.5 billion. So it is loaned by the Reserve Bank, sold and that you

understand as well, so it is loaned to them at 2%. So the capital sum

	is 1.5 billion.
Adv T Madonsela :	Yes.
Dr JJ de Jager :	For security for the capital sum the Reserve Bank needs to get
	security. So the security of those bonds that they buy, so they buy
	with the loan they have they buy the bonds. They cede the bonds to
	the Reserve Bank. They have also 5 years. After 5 years the capital
	sum needs to be repaid. What happens? Government repays the
	bonds and that is in the report(?).
Adv T Madonsela :	So we want that amount that money, because that is the same thing
	as your bond
Dr JJ de Jager :	No, but that has been repaid.
Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, but we want evidence that that money was repaid, because at
-	the moment
Mr C Moraitis :	Okay.
Dr C Stals :	No, but send your Auditors to the Reserve Bank.
Adv T Madonsela :	Because until today no person has ever said the 1.5 billion was
	repaid.
Dr C Stals :	Ag, that is nonsense. There is no way that that can be
Mr C Moraitis :	So can I
Adv T Madonsela :	Nobody has ever said that, because we were sitting then with the
	Reserve Bank
Dr C Stals :	No, it didn't go to the budget, of course.
Adv T Madonsela :	with everyone and said when we were asking the question,
	"Where are the bonds now?"
Dr JJ de Jager	The bonds had been repaid.
	Adv T Madonsela:  Dr JJ de Jager: Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis: Dr C Stals: Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis:  Dr C Stals: Adv T Madonsela:  Adv T Madonsela:

·1	Adv T Madonsela :	I was just that was the question we were asking, because the
2		answer should have been, "They are in the open market"
3	Dr C Stals :	But what does the Government do
4	Adv T Madonsela:	"because we sold them, we got the money and we paid back the
5		loan".
6	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
7	Adv T Madonsela:	Nobody, nobody from Treasury or the Reserve Bank
8	Mr C Moraitis :	So Dr Stals
9	Dr C Stals :	No, but Treasury is not in the picture at all.
10	Adv T Madonsela:	No, but I'm saying the Reserve Bank people themselves have never
11	**	given evidence that says that they took this asset now that they
12		bought with the loan money, sold it and then paid back the money in
13		full.
14	Dr C Stals :	It is not right. No, that is not right.
15	Adv T Madonsela :	They have never said that.
16	Dr C Stals :	No, they gave the assets, the Government bonds, the pieces of
17		paper
18	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes.
19	Dr C Stals :	theoretically they gave it back to Absa and say
20	Adv T Madonsela :	Then you can sell it?
21	Dr C Stals :	"You get the money".
22	Dr JJ de Jager :	"And give it to us".
23	Mr C Moraitis :	And pay back the loan.
24	Dr C Stals :	Whatever, "You get the money and you pay back the loan".
25	Adv T Madonsela :	For me the consequence

Dr C Stals :	And so in the books of the Reserve Bank they must show the
	repayment they received from Absa.
Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, that is the only thing that we need, because the concept is not
	rocket science.
Dr C Stals :	But the Auditors of the bank should be able to confirm that to you.
Adv T Madonsela :	The same thing is, I borrowed money from the bank, I bought my
•	house. Maybe after paying the bank, I then sell the house and pay the
	bank.
Mr C Moraitis :	But can I try and resolve it on this basis?
Dr C Stals :	That is very reasonable. I have no problem with that.
Adv T Madonsela:	But we just I have not found anybody Sir, who has said this money
	was paid and on what date was it paid?
Mr C Moraitis :	Can I try and resolve it on this basis? Okay, Dr Stals has given the
	evidence that it was repaid. He was the Governor at the time.
Adv T Madonsela:	Yeah, because that would help.
Mr C Moraitis :	So you are looking for the physical evidence from the Auditors that
	the 1.5 billion was received by the Reserve Bank?
Adv T Madonsela :	Yes. Yeah, because then this horror would not have do you
	understand Sir, that this investigation would not have even
	proceeded then? Because if this money was paid in 5 years the
	money was given in 1991. So if you are saying it was paid within 5
	years, it would have been paid in 1996?
Dr C Stals :	It was paid in 19 the date is available.
Adv T Madonsela :	Pardon?
Dr C Stals :	The date is available. The exact date when it was paid is available.
	Adv T Madonsela:  Dr C Stals: Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis:  Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis:  Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis:  Adv T Madonsela:  Adv T Madonsela:

1	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes.
2	Dr C Stals :	It was in 1995.
3	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, so it was paid in 1995?
4	Dr C Stals :	As a matter of fact
5	Mr B Dhlamini :	Can I also just ask, so
6	Dr C Stals :	Sorry, I just want to make sure that you understand. The loans did
7		not all mature on the final day.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Oh yeah, because they were not given on the same day?
9		Yeah.
10		You did indicate that.
11		So some of those Government bonds matured two months before the
12		time.
13	Adv T Madonsela :	I do understand. You did indicate that the 1.5 was a consolidated
14	nav i madonscia .	amount?
15	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, and then Absa came to the Reserve Bank and said, "Now listen,
16	Di Cotais .	we are not going to buy new bonds to replace those that mature,
17		because we are getting the money from the Treasury now, two
		months before the time" and we said, "Okay, place it on deposit with
18		
19		the Reserve Bank and we will pay you 16% until the final date".
20	Dr JJ de Jager :	As if the bonds were (indistinct).
21	Adv T Madonsela:	To Absa now?
22	Dr C Stals :	So the money came from Absa in instalments and the Reserve Bank
23	.	should be able to give you all those dates.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	Doctor Stals, I wanted to find out was it Absa that paid or was it
25		Bankorp, because the original loan was

## Meeting held between the Public Protector South Africa & Dr Chris Stals 8 September 2016

1	Dr C Stals :	No, no, Bankorp didn't exist anymore.
2	Adv L Tshiwalule :	It is gone.
3	Mr C Moraitis :	Bankorp remember, Absa took it over, so Absa paid it back in 1995,
4		is what Dr Stals has indicated to you.
5	Adv T Madonsela :	Alright. Okay, Bankorp, but
6	Dr JJ de Jager :	Is can we just maybe that last part
7	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, let's find out, when was Bankorp acquired by Absa?
8	Dr JJ de Jager :	Maybe we must just give you clarity on this last one.
9	Adv L Tshiwalule :	In 1992 and then in this loan kicked in in 1995. That is the
10		evidence we have, that it kicked in in 1995
11	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, that is right.
12	Adv L Tshiwalule:	and then it had to be repaid as if it was entered into in 1992. That
13	·. ·	was the agreement, but the information we have received is that in
14		1995 Absa couldn't pay back that loan. Then what then happened is
15		that there was then an agreement that was entered, which says that
16		these bonds now has to mature, the first one, which is the first
<b>1</b> 7		tranche, which is 150 of the bonds.
18	Adv T Madonsela :	But be careful about where you are reading from. Are you reading
19		from CIEX?
20	Adv L Tshiwalule :	No, this is not coming from CIEX. Is it an international paper.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	But let's leave that.
22	Adv L Tshiwalule:	Okay.
23	Adv T Madonsela :	I think let's I think what you have clarified, Absa has indicated to us
24	,	they were never part of the Loan Agreement, that whatever
25		happened between the Reserve Bank and Bankorp was between the

1		Reserve Bank. They bought an asset, they assumed that the asset
2		was clean and they thought all they had to do then the CIEX Report
3		has always argued that Absa knew there was a loan and Absa
4		continued to get interest on this loan.
5	Dr C Stals :	It could be.
6	Adv T Madonsela :	Now your evidence now is suggesting that actually Absa did know
7		about this loan and Absa was a party to an extension of it when it
8		came to the party in 1992. For me in my head it changes the picture
9		in terms of the arguments that have been presented by Absa and
10		Government, and your evidence today.
11	Dr JJ de Jager :	You see, the
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Because then you are saying the final sorry Sir. The final party that
13		should have paid the loan from your understanding was not
14	,	Bankorp, but Absa?
15	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
16	Adv T Madonsela :	And that is not their evidence.
17	Dr JJ de Jager :	Ja, because that is the persons that held the bonds, presents the
18		bonds, Government repays the loan and that is given to the Reserve
19		Bank.
20	Adv T Madonsela :	For me that changes the picture drastically for Absa, because they
21	·	have always argued that those were deals, they just paid good value
22		for money. There was never an arrangement that they would ever
23	ļ	pay anything and that contradicts what the CIEX guy says, who says
24		they have made an arrangement for it. Now you said actually they
25		paid the money. Not only did they make an arrangement, they paid

-		
1		the money. Now we need to just find evidence the money was paid.
2	Dr C Stals :	The bonds.
3	Dr JJ de Jager :	That is the bonds.
4	Adv T Madonsela :	No, that they sold the bonds and paid back the money to the Reserve
5		Bank.
<sup>-</sup> 6	Dr JJ de Jager :	But remember there is one thing that you must just remember, that
7		the maturity of the bonds - maturity being the date on which the
8		money needs to be repaid by the main debtor - the maturity of the
9		bonds didn't always specifically, precisely meet or match the term of
10		the loan. So in the end when it came to the last part of the thing, as
11		Dr Stals has given evidence, the bonds paid out, so they matured,
12		Government paid the money over to Absa and then Absa said, "But
13		what must we do now? Must we now" because now again we
14		didn't have security now remember, because the bonds had been
15		repaid. So they asked, "What must we do now? Must we now re-buy
16		new bonds?". The Reserve Bank's arrangement then was, "No, give
17		us the money"
18	Adv T Madonsela :	Extend (indistinct).
19	Dr JJ de Jager :	"Give us the money, we will keep it on account with us and we will
20		pay exactly the same interest that you earned on the bonds, so you
21		don't have to buy the bonds again".
22	Adv T Madonsela :	"But still the capital arrangement was still standing", as he said?
23	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yes, and it was paid.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	And it was still repayable and his evidence is that it was eventually
25		paid?

1	Mr C Moraitis	;	Repaid.
2	Adv T Madonsela	:	Whether it was paid in a lump sum or it was paid in little trenches,
3			but the evidence that is on the table is that the money was paid,
4			because I'm saying if we get evidence that it was paid, case closed.
5	Mr C Moraitis	<b>:</b>	So that is what I want to get to. Can we
6	Dr C Stals	:	Can I just you will get a copy of this document, that was agreement
7			between the Reserve Bank and Absa.
8	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yes.
9	Dr C Stals	:	It says very clearly – they agreed on a certain date – that the price of
10	,		the Government bonds that was paid but in any case the major
11			transaction took place, if I have it right here, on 1 June 1995.
12	Adv T Madonsela	:	Okay, Sir and that was
13	Dr C Stals	:	The repayment was made by Absa to the Reserve Bank.
14	Adv T Madonsela	:	So you say Absa made the repayment
15	Dr C Stals	:	So you will find in this agreement between the Reserve Bank and
16			Absa, and if you want to check it, you can go to the books of the
17			Reserve Bank and say, "What happened on 1 June 1995?".
18	Dr JJ de Jager	:	See if you see a huge amount on
19	Adv T Madonsela	:	Alright. Okay, here this is the agreement, but it is not the actual
20			payment, Sir.
21	Mr C Moraitis	:	Oh, you want the journal entry? You are looking for the journal
22			entry?
23	Dr C Stals	:	Yeah.
24	Adv T Madonsela	:	Yes, because you are saying this was when the agreement was
25			signed?

1	Dr C Stals :	I mean you can go to the Reserve Bank with this agreement and say,
2		"You, the Reserve Bank, entered into this agreement with Absa" and
3		in there they said
4	Adv T Madonsela :	Because that solves the whole problem.
5	Dr C Stals :	Yeah.
6	Adv T Madonsela :	Because Absa has always argued that they were never party to
7		anything, it never involved them.
8	Mr C Moraitis :	That is the agreement (indistinct).
9	Adv T Madonsela :	So I think then it is problem solved.
10	Dr C Stals :	You see this agreement says one thousand one hundred million rand
11		and that is the value of the Government bonds.
12	Adv T Madonsela:	Yes.
13.	Dr C Stals :	And then plus the R400 million that the Reserve Bank made an
14	,	advance to
15	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay.
16	Dr C Stals :	And it is in the agreement, here it is there, but all you have to go now
17		is go to the Reserve Bank and say, "I just want confirmation of this
18		transaction, that it did take place".
19	Adv T Madonsela :	That is true. Thank you, Sir. I think for us you have solved a big
20		problem, because we have asked all of these guys to just give us the
21		agreements, and then now you have given us the agreement and we
22		know who agreed with who. Then now the little stone that has to be
2'3	,	turned is the payment, is the transaction track.
24	Mr C Moraitis :	Can I then make a copy of all these documents and I will have them
25		for you by tomorrow morning?

_		
1	Adv T Madonsela :	Brilliant.
2	Mr C Moraitis :	And we will ask the Reserve Bank to give you the journal entries
3		from 1995 that you are looking for.
4	Adv T Madonsela:	Yeah, that would really be helpful, or even if they just go zero in on
5		the exact transactions only. We don't want everything, yes.
6	Mr C Moraitis :	No, you don't need everything. You just want the journal entries
7	•	from 1995, where Dr Stals has said the money was received back by
8		the Reserve Bank.
9	Adv T Madonsela:	Yes.
10	Dr C Stals :	You see I don't
11	Adv T Madonsela:	Because in that case you are right, then that the only thing you could
12		quarrel about was the interest, but that was the agreement then. So
13		that is the Davis then problem around whether the agreement itself
14		was ethical or not, but that was not our story. It was just like a
15		different story.
16	Mr C Moraitis :	Don't get Dr Stals started on that.
.17	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, but you are not worried about that. I mean the question is, was
18		money paid or not repaid? That is the thing.
19	Adv T Madonsela:	That is the thing, yeah.
20	Dr C Stals :	It should be very easy to check this from the Reserve Bank. In this
21		final agreement this was for the repayment arrangement, it was a
22		third agreement. It says that Absa will invest money with the
23		Reserve Bank from 1 June 1995, that is the proceeds of the bonds.
24	Mr B Dhlamini :	Of the bonds.
25	Adv T Madonsela:	Yes.

1	Dr C Stals :	It will invest the money at 16% per annum and this money will be
2		retained to repay the loan, as agreed in the original agreement and it
3	•	will be repayable on the first working day of every month, as from 1
4		June 1995.
, 5	Adv T Madonsela:	Right.
6	Dr C Stals :	So you have all the details of that repayment in the agreement, but
7		sure, check it in the books of the Reserve Bank. It should be easy.
8	Adv T Madonsela:	Okay, I think from me that that would then be (indistinct).
9	Dr C Stals :	And it should add up to R1 500 million, the total amount of the loan
10		was repaid in that way.
11	Adv T Madonsela:	It would have to 1?
12	Mr C Moraitis :	1 billion, 500 million, R1 500 million.
13	Mr B Dhlamini :	1.5 billion.
14	Dr C Stals :	1.5 billion, yeah.
15	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, thank you, Sir.
16	Dr C Stals :	So you said
17	Adv T Madonsela :	I don't know if there is anything else we wanted to ask you.
18	Dr C Stals :	Then if I just can give you my last view on that interest that was
19		earned and that was the subsidy, the support. I think you have no
20		legal status to try and reclaim that from anybody, but
21	Dr JJ de Jager :	That is your opinion.
22	Adv T Madonsela :	Well Sir, I have heard your views on that.
23	Dr C Stals :	So just finalise your report then.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	I know that there is one judge who feels very strongly about that
25		arrangement, but as I have said we sit at the meeting, we listen to

1			everyone and but you have been extremely helpful, Sir. I cannot
2			thank you enough for your
3	Dr C Stals	:	If you need me again, call me.
4	Adv T Madonsela	:	for your candidness, for your helpfulness and for your assistance
5			with documents, because we said we were accused in a court in
6			court papers, that we said we rely mostly on papers and then they
7			misunderstood us to be saying that we don't listen to people, but we
8			were saying that much as we listen to people, we prefer the
9			paperwork.
10	Mr C Moraitis	:	You want the facts.
11	Adv T Madonsela	:	We prefer the trail, you know the story as it happened.
12	Mr C Moraitis	:	You know I come from a long line of Greek shopkeepers and as you
13		-	will often see in the cafés, it says, "In God we trust, everybody else
14	·		pays cash". So yours_is, "In you all we trust, but we want the
15			evidence".
16	Adv T Madonsela	:	Absolutely. In fact that is what I was saying to my team actually a
17			few days ago, where nobody could understand what I'm saying, to
18			say, "Yes, we have heard these stories, but can we have something I
19			can"
20	Mr C Moraitis	:	Let's give you the journal entries and the agreements.
21	Dr C Stals	;	Let me give you a last final joke. "In God we trust", that is on the
22			bank notes of the American bank notes, "In God we trust."
23	Adv T Madonsela	;	Oh, right. I didn't know that.
24	Dr C Stals	:	So the Governor of the Swiss Central Bank, not many years ago, when
25			all these things happened in gold, he took one out in the IMF annual

1		meeting and he looked at it, he said, "You know I always thought it
. 2		said, 'In gold we trust'".
3	Adv T Madonsela :	Oh, "in gold". Oh, my gosh they put an "L" there.
4	Dr C Stals :	He said, "No, man, I just looked at it last night and I realised it said 'In
5		God we trust", he said, "But just as well, because the way you are
6		running your economy in America you will need some help from
7		God".
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Had they meant "In gold we trust"?
9	Dr C Moraitis :	No, no, "God". They always meant it. He just read it as he thought
10		(indistinct).
11	Dr C Stals :	He said he only made a joke you know.
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Yeah, he always thought it was "In gold we trust".
13	Mr C Moraitis :	When we were on the gold standard you had to match your assets to
14		gold.
15	Adv T Madonsela :	Oh yeah, before money, before the paper money was printed.
16.	Dr JJ de Jager :	No, no, when paper money was in.
77	Mr C Moraitis :	It is only when we came off the gold standard.
18	Dr JJ de Jager :	You must remember if you go back in history you will find, not too
19	,	many years ago, on a piece of note you would see, "I promise to pay".
20		There is a promise on that, that (indistinct) before there was gold.
21	Adv T Madonsela :	Oh yes, that the money was still
22	Dr C Stals :	The world finally went off gold on 15th March 1968 and I was present
23		at that meeting in Washington.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	Thank you so much, Sir. I cannot thank you enough, but can I just
25		keep that quote? You said, "In God we trust"?

1	Mr C Moraitis :	"In God we trust, everybody else pays cash".
2	Adv T Madonsela :	"Everybody else"
. 3	Mr C Moraitis :	And in your case it is, "In God we trust, everybody else produces the
4		evidence".
5	Adv T Madonsela :	I like that.
6	Mr B Dhlamini :	We must use that as our quote in the report.
7	Adv T Madonsela :	"Everybody else produces evidence". Well, I think this is a good story
8		for the team. I mean I'm just thinking about the team.
9	Mr C Moraitis :	You can have it, "In God we trust, but we prefer the facts from you".
10	Adv L Tshiwalule:	"We prefer the facts from you".
11	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, thank you, Sir.
12	Dr JJ de Jager :	Okay, so we will you will expect from us that we get something for
13		you that actually just confirms the payment of these funds?
14	Adv T Madonsela :	Yes, yes.
15	Dr JJ de Jager :	But I we may actually have to go into records and would you just
16		accept a record or would you accept something confirmed by a
17		Chartered Accountant, or by External Auditors or what would you
18		like?
19	Mr C Moraitis :	The journal entry Johan, I think would support
20	Adv T Madonsela :	It would help if it is a proper journal entry and not something that is
21		reproduced, because we would want something that is timeless, that
22		could not be
23	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, that you can show it.
24	Adv T Madonsela :	said to have been produced (indistinct).
25	Mr C Moraitis :	So you would have to ask your Accounts Department and they would

	8 September 2016
	have to go into the records to pull out the journal entries from June
	1995, to reflect that
Adv T Madonsela :	Absolutely, or everything that happened then from that stage
	onwards, because it must say first month of the first day of the
	month from that journal. So we would then have to look at how
	many transactions did they make and starting from there.
Dr C Stals :	Yeah, that is
Adv T Madonsela:	Thank you.
Mr C Moraitis :	And you would have to tie the best evidence to Dr Stals.
Adv T Madonsela:	Oh, thank you, Sir.
Adv L Tshiwalule:	I would also really appreciate if you can forward me the information
	that I requested, so that we can also cite it in the report, or at least
	some of the information that we consider in our (indistinct).
Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, I will you see the bonds I won't be able to give you, because
	the bonds would go back to who the original issuer were.
Adv T Madonsela :	Yes.
Dr C Stals :	Yeah and don't involve me in your disputes between you and the
	Reserve Bank.
Adv T Madonsela :	So would Treasury have copies of these bonds?
Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, they indicated
Adv T Madonsela :	Because they say have nothing, because they claim everything was
	done at (indistinct).
Dr JJ de Jager :	You never know. You must remember how many do they issue in a
	year.
Mr C Moraitis :	They issue billions and billions of them.
	Dr C Stals  Adv T Madonsela:  Mr C Moraitis  Adv T Madonsela:  Adv L Tshiwalule:  Dr JJ de Jager  Adv T Madonsela:  Dr C Stals  Adv T Madonsela:  Dr JJ de Jager  Adv T Madonsela:  Dr JJ de Jager  Adv T Madonsela:

1	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, they issue many. So you will have to have a sort of a sequence
2		where you can say these
3	Adv T Madonsela :	The numbers. I think somewhere we have the batches and the batch
4		numbers.
5	Dr JJ de Jager :	But you know that
6	Dr C Stals :	I can give you a logical answer. Once Government bond paper reach
7		maturity, it is useless paper.
8	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, so they would destroy those?
9	Dr C Stals :	I can't see why people anybody should keep it.
10	Adv T Madonsela:	Yeah, you (indistinct) that report.
11	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, you give me an old cheque of yours, I mean or even if you give
12		me a receipt of debt, or an acknowledgement of debt, once I have
13	·	paid the debt and you have given that back to me, I throw it away
14	·	you know because it is (indistinct).
15	Dr C Stals :	I can't see why anybody would keep those pieces of paper for you.
16		Well, maybe for 5 years or something like that, but then it would go
17		through the incinerator or something.
18	Adv T Madonsela :	I think though the importance of the bond if we will go with your
19		evidence, which we don't know because we have to weigh
20		everything, but if we go with your evidence, the importance of the
21		bonds themselves diminishes, because in your view they were paid
22		up front with the loan from the bank.
23	Dr C Stals :	Yeah, that is right.
24	Adv T Madonsela:	So then their significance starts (indistinct), then it is the loan that we
25		(indistinct).

		·
1	Mr C Moraitis :	You want to see that the Reserve Bank received its money back. That
2		is what you want to see.
3	Adv T Madonsela:	That is correct.
4	Dr JJ de Jager :	Look, if those bonds were not repaid if the bonds were repaid, the
5		only beneficiaries will be Government, because they
6	Mr C Moraitis :	It is Government, because they never repaid.
7	Dr. C Stals :	No, at maturity.
. 8	Dr JJ de Jager :	Yeah, at maturity, so because then Government was actually funded
<u></u> 9		for the 5 years
10	Mr C Moraitis :	And never paid it back.
11	Dr JJ de Jager :	but never paid it back.
12	Adv T Madonsela :	Okay, we will look at that.
13	Dr C Stals :	Okay and that Loan Agreement, the last one of the three, between the
14		Reserve Bank and Absa_spelled out the details how the loans were
15		repaid. The bonds matured in a series, the money came in the
16		Reserve Bank, the loans were repaid, but that should be no problem
7		to get that from the books of the Reserve Bank.
18	Dr C Stals :	Okay, thank you.
19		[Discussions amongst each other]
20	Adv T Madonsela :	You have been exceptionally, exceptionally helpful, thank you.
21	Dr JJ de Jager :	Thank you very much.
22	Adv T Madonsela:	It is us who are grateful, absolutely.
23		[Discussions amongst each other]
24		[Go off record // End of Meeting]

