Part 1

VERBATIM NOTES

OF

COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY INTO CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED TO THE COLLAPSE OF THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE 1990s

HELD AT

THE JAMAICA PEGASUS HOTEL 81 KNUTSFORD BOULEVARD, KINGSTON 5 ON

WEDNESDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 2009

PRESENT WERE:

COMMISSIONER

The Hon. Mr. Justice Boyd Carey (Ret'd) MEMBERS

Mr. Charles Ross Mr. Worrick Bogle

COUNSEL FOR THE COMMISSION

Hon. R.N.A. Henriquez OJ, QC, LLM

SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSION

Mr. Fernando DePeralto

MARSHALLING THE EVIDENCE

Miss Kelly Wong - Attorney-at-law

REPRESENTING HON. OMAR DAVIES

Hon. Mr. Michael Hylton, Queen's Counsel

REPRESENTING JAMAICA REDEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

Mrs. Sandra Minott-Phillips - Attorney-at-law Mr. Gavin Goffe - Attorney-at-law

REPRESENTING MR. BENTLEY ROSE, BENROS LIMITED AND MICRO FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. Gayle Nelson - Attorney-at-law REPRESENTING MR. MICHAEL LEVY

Mr. Raphael Codlin - Attorney-at-law Melissa Cunningham - Attorney-at-law

REPRESENTING ASSOCIATION OF FINSAC'd ENTREPRENEURS

David Wong Ken - Attorney-at-law

1	CHAIRMAN:	Good morning everybody.
2		This Commission of Enquiry into the
3		Collapse of the Financial Sector is now
4		in session.
5		(Witness sworn) 9:50 a.m.
6		Thank you take your seat.
7		(EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF) CONT'D
8	MR. HYLTON:	Morning Chairman, Commissioners, morning
9		Dr. Davies;
10	DR. DAVIES:	Morning, sir.
11	Q:	Yesterday Dr. Davies, you were asked
12		whether you had granted any exemptions
13		under the Money Lending Act. Do you have
14		any current information on that issue?
15		Yes, I have researched. Yes, I granted
16		to FINSAC; I granted to the Financial
17		Institution Services limited; FIS which
18		was the predecessor to FINSAC; well it
19		was of the first institution established
20		primarily to intervene with the Blaise
21		financial institutions. And I also
22		granted one to Refin Trust. Those are
23		the ones which I have.
24	Q:	Could you tell us the years in which
25		they were granted?

1	A:	To FIS, Financial Institution Services
2		Limited, this was granted on November 20
3		1996. That to FINSAC was granted on
4		March 6, 1997 and that to Refin Trust
5		was on June 26,1998.
6	Q:	Mr. Chairman, we have copies available
7		for the Commissioners.
8	CHAIRMAN:	None was granted to JRF?
9	MR. HYLTON:	Yes sir. He spoke to those already. The
10		questioning yesterday was in relation to
11		those granted to JRF and he had given
12		reasons for giving to JRF.
13	CHAIRMAN:	I don't know the reasons but I am
14		That question wasn't fully, shall I say
15		analysed? Dr. Davies began by telling
16		us about having to examine some other
17	MR. HYLTON:	Yes, I was going to point out that
18	CHAIRMAN:	He hasn't completed it?
19	MR. HYLTON:	Correct sir, where that answer has been
20		left is that the
21	CHAIRMAN:	Which we did immediately after the
22		hearing yesterday.
23	MR. HYLTON:	The Secretary tells me sir, that he has
24		made enquiries to get the files.
25	CHAIRMAN:	Oh! I see. So we can't get the reasons

1		yet until we get the files.
2	MR. HYLTON:	I will complete that, sir. So in
3		relation to where we are now sir, may I
4		suggest that we then turn to the other
5		questions.
6	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, I would say the same thing.
7	MR. HYLTON:	My friend wishes to at this time as it
8		relates to
9	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
10	MRS. PHILLIPS:	Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, just to
11		point out that the May 20, 2002
12		exemption order which was among the JRF
13		exemption order was handed up yesterday
14		was amended by a subsequent Gazette
15		dated the 27^{th} of June, 2002. I gave the
16		Secretary to the Commission a copy of the
17		admentment and if you wanted to know what
18		the precise amendment was No, we just
19	CHAIRMAN:	wanted to get our facts in
20		order so we can see what you are
21		referring to.
22	MRS. PHILLIPS:	Yes. It is the JRF exemption orders I am
23		speaking about.
24	CHAIRMAN:	You say there was one May 30?
25	MRS. PHILLIPS:	Yes, the first one.

1	CHAIRMAN:	That is the one that has been amended?
2	MRS. PHILLIPS:	It has been amended and replaced by one
3		dated June 25, 2002 which I don't think
4		you have a copy of but I made copies.
5	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, we have a copy.
6	MRS. PHILLIPS:	You have a copy of the admentment?
7	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, we have a copy.
8	Q:	I just wanted to be sure for
9		completeness.
10 11	CHAIRMAN: MR. HYLTON:	Thank you for that. Dr. Davies, I think the Commission will
12		now allow other persons to ask you
13		questions.
14	CHAIRMAN:	As we announced at the outset, the
15		procedure is we will allow a little
16		flexibility because this of course, is
17		neither a trial nor as they say, a witch
18		hunt.
19		We are are going to allow members of the
20		public who are desirous of asking
21		questions to seize this opportunity of
22		doing so. We have a microphone at the
23		back and if you wish to question the
24		Minister you may do so either through
25		your counsel of course if you have one

1		but at this moment we are not speaking
2		to counsel, we are speaking to persons
3		who are unrepresented so you may use the
4		microphone at the back and put such
5		questions because we may have to rule on
6		it. It has to be seen that the
7		questions are relevant to our terms of
8		reference and a question which the
9		Minister is competent to deal with. So
10		would you please when you go to the
11		microphone state your name or the
12		company you hope to represent, thank
13		1701
13		you.
14	DEBTOR:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name
	DEBTOR:	
14	DEBTOR:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name
14 15	DEBTOR:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the
14 15 16	DEBTOR:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and
14 15 16 17	DEBTOR: CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX
14 15 16 17		Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX Limited.
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX Limited. Yes, DEBTOR, please proceed.
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX Limited. Yes, DEBTOR, please proceed. Dr. Davies, you had mentioned yesterday
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX Limited. Yes, DEBTOR, please proceed. Dr. Davies, you had mentioned yesterday that FINSAC was set up primarily as a
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Commissioner and members, my name is DEBTOR, I am a member of the association of FINSAC Entrepreneurs and I am representing my company, XXXXXX Limited. Yes, DEBTOR, please proceed. Dr. Davies, you had mentioned yesterday that FINSAC was set up primarily as a process of healing to the sector. We as

1		we can't really heal dead so you just have
2		to but we were the ones that really faced
3		the brunt of the problems with the high
4		interest rates borrowing you know, starting
5		out at low rates and finding yourself in a
6		situation where rates have increased on you
7		sometimes ten fold you weren't able to.
8		Why weren't we part of the whole assessment
9		and trying to resuscitate us by getting us
10		back on track; by offering us I for one
11		had made representation for more than fifty
12		cents in the dollar for my debt for which I
13		was termed as a bad debtor. Up to the
14		collapse I was being classified as that
15		because actually I got
16		I am sorry. I don't want to seem to be
17		
18	CHAIRMAN:	
19		causing you any problem, but you have to
20		construct and conceive your question
21	DEBTOR:	Well, the question is
22	CHAIRMAN:	so that the Minister knows precisely
23		what it is he is required to answer.
24	DEBTOR:	The question is that, why weren't we
25		offered the chance to repurchase the

1		debts?
2	CHAIRMAN:	That's the question?
3	DEBTOR:	That's the question or one of them.
4	CHAIRMAN:	That's the question you are asking now?
5	DEBTOR:	Yes, sir.
6	DR. DAVIES:	Just a preliminary response. When you
7		indicated or you recited what you heard
8		me say about the objective of FINSAC, it
9		was a little broader than that which you
10		indicated but the records will show
11		that.
12		As regards your question, FINSAC and
13		FIS, et cetera, dealt with each
14		individual. So the issue of offering a
15		blanket 50 percent off, some people
16		could do better and some people couldn't
17		do that. But I know of instances where
18		virtually all interest was written off,
19		and so it had to be dealt with on a case
20		by case basis. And whilst I was not
21		involved in the day to day operations I
22		had every confidence that both Dr.
23		Bonnick, who was the Executive Chairman
24		and subsequently, Patrick Hylton dealt
25		with each client in an equitable way,

1		but the notion of blanket, across the
2		board, I have heard this notion being
3		raised before. Some people could afford
4		fifty cents in the dollar while others
5		could afford less than fifty cents in
6		the dollar.
7	WOMAN:	Most of us were never
8	CHAIRMAN:	Please, please! Yes DEBTOR please
9		go ahead.
10	DEBTOR:	With respect though Dr. Davies, that was
11		not offered to any member of our
12		association. I mean I have met with
13		Patrick Hylton on several occasions and
14		made offers. Property was sold that I
15		owned for less than 25 percent of the
16		value and using that property for
17		instance I would have been able to if
18		I had gotten back that property I would
19		have been able to repay a hundred
20		percent of my debt and still continue my
21		business but I was totally destroyed in
22		the whole thing.
23	DR. DAVIES:	Well again, I must confess that I am at
24		a disability in that I don't, for
25		obvious reasons, know the individuals

1		operations; every individual operation.
2		But Patrick at various times pointed out
3		to me that some of the requests weren't
4		possible; he couldn't hand back
5		property when that represented the
6		collateral which he had against the
7		debts. Whilst we tried to be flexible,
8		and as I said I don't have the day to
9		day details, but I reiterate my
10		confidence in the approach taken.
11		Patrick was an experienced banker.
12		Gladstone wasn't a banker but he is an
13		extremely fair person so I have to
14		reiterate my faith in them.
15		if you are asking if a policy decision
16		could have been taken, I would give you
17		the reason a policy decision couldn't be
18		taken because there would still be some
19		debtors who would not benefit from
20		whatenever that percentage of the
21		dollar is.
22	Q:	But in all deliberations though,
23		wouldn't it be in the country's interest
24		that the borrowers, the ones that really
25		drive the economy, the ones who provide

1		the employment and all that, was brought
2		into the mix as well as the banks. S
3		mean the depositors that were
4		concentrating on, the people who were
5		sitting down, placing money in the
6		banks, getting interest they could
7		never get anywhere else in the world,
8		they were the ones who were safe. Why
9		not the persons who were really
10		producing?
11	A:	Well, let me respond. I have said that
12		during my period as Minister, and even
13		now when I am not Minister, I am
14		approached by people for example
15		people call JRF FINSAC, so people come
16		to me still believing - I don't know
17		what has happened to the present
18		Minister but they I think that I am the
19		person able to influence FINSAC. So I
20		know many of these things. I meet one
21		lady every single morning at the Dam who
22		is seeking my assistance: so I know
23		these cases, so I am sympathetic to some
24		of these cases, but let me tell you
25		certain things. There is an issue of

1		equity also. There are persons in the
2		same institutions who borrow and have
3		serviced their loans. Now you also asked
4		about equity; they in a sense were
5		penalised; in fact they kept servicing
6		their loans. So in making our decision
7		you have to take the total picture into
8		consideration.
9	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry just one moment, Mr. Donigal.
10		Wouldn't we be correct in saying that
11		while you were yet Minister, you would
12		have received complaints along the lines
13		being put forward by Mr Donigal?
14	A:	Yes.
15	Q:	You was Minister?
16	A:	Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN:	You would have realised that there was a
18		problem, certainly there was hardship
19		being occasioned.
20	DR. DAVIES:	Chairman, I hear your phrasing but I
21		would prefer that there were problems.
22	CHAIRMAN:	There were problems?
23	A:	Yes.
24	Q:	You don't think that those were causing
25		hardship to people?

1	A:	Well, it is not that I don't think that
2		these were causing hardship to persons.
3	CHAIRMAN:	I ask you as the person. You are the
4		Minister, you are concerned with the
5		financial health since you are doing
6		healing of the economy?
7	A:	Yes.
8	Q:	So you have to be sensitive to that?
9	A:	Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN:	As Minister with the overall
11		responsibility?
12	A:	Yes.
13	Q:	So what I suspect Mr. Donigal wants to
14		get from you is whether then you as
15		Minister, having received these
16		problems, did you give any general
17		directions, did you confer with the
18		experts at FINSAC or wherever as a way
19		of making suggestions as to how this
20		could be solved?
21	A:	Yes. Not on an individual basis but Mr.
22		Chairman, something missing from all of
23		this discussion is that there were
24		hundreds, I would say perhaps, thousands
25		of cases which were resolved amicably

1		and persons have gotten on with their lives.
1		I am not for one moment denying that there are
2		cases outstanding, but it would seem to me and
3		for obvious reasons, those persons are
4		obliged to come and testify before you. But
5		it seems to me we run the risk of having a
6		one-sided view of the intervention of FINSAC.
7		There
8		are persons I think JRF can give the
9		evidence; FINSAC can give the evidence of
10		thousands of cases
		12 which have been
resol	ved or people are	
13		proceeding with.
14	CHAIRMAN:	Maybe I am not understanding. There was
15		a collapse. This wasn't an ordinary
16		situation, there was a collapse in the
17		financial sector. This is an area of
18		more than passing interest to you as
19		Minister?
20	A:	Yes, sir.
21	Q:	So the fact that some people were
22	χ.	actually able to settle early is with
23		respect, of complete disinterest to a
24		
∠4		great many people who remained in the

1	interest. And the question then rises, what
2	did you as Minister do you? Did you give
3	advice; did you call a seminar, did you make
4	a speech? I don't know. So far as we are
5	concerned we are required to investigate
6	circumstances. what did you as Minister do?
7 8 9 1	Continued
0 11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	DR. DAVIES:	And I answered specially, FINSAC was
2		given general policy guidelines in terms
3		of seeking to come to a mutually
4		acceptable arrangement with their
5		clients and this extended where we also
6		dealt with the issue of the home of
7		borrowers up to a certain limit. So
8		there are general guidelines given by a
9		Minister cannot be the person meeting
10		with each client to resolve an issue.
11	CHAIRMAN:	Minister,I don't think you must insult
12		us. obviously you had overall
13		responsibility, sir.
14 15	A: CHAIRMAN:	Exactly, sir. Nobody is expecting you to be taken out
16		of your office and wandering all over
17		the country settling cases, no. But the
18		fact is, that you as Minister are aware
19		of not just isolated but of complaints
20		which seem to fit into, you might even
21		say, one or two categories, which calls
22		for attention. You were aware, weren't
23 24	A:	you? No, I am aware of this Mr. Chairman, and
25		let me indicate that - and I don't know

how many times I am going to say it but 1 I keep saying it, that there are many things which were sent, people wrote to me and I immediately dispatched it to Patrick because 4 he handled even more of the cases than 5 Gladstone, but I am also aware and I must put 6 it on the record, Mr. Chairman, I am also 7 aware of many arrangements which were 8 settled whereby both sides have signed off 9 to an agreement but for whatever reason the 10 debtor was unable to carry through his or her 11 or the company's side of the obligation. That 12 is also an issue which you should take on 13 board. I know specifically of cases 14 ostensibly settled by FINSAC because they had 15 come to an arrangement; lawyers did 16 everything and settled but the debtors 17 didn't carry through their side of the 18 arrangement and it went on to JRF. So it's 19 not that no attempt was made to bring about 20 settlements, because there is no 21 benefit. If by definition your liabilities 22 are multiples of the assets, 2.3

24

1		there is no benefit to hold on to assets
2		which are not worth the liabilities so
3		the quicker you can settle and get out
4		is the better for everybody.
5	COMM. ROSS:	Could you offer us any explanation as to
6		why those loans remained unsettled,
7		remained in that position, as to why
8		were some people able to resolve their
9		matters but others, many others, were
10		not able to?
11	A:	Commissioner Ross, that is an
12		operational question which I am not
13		competent to respond to.
14	Q:	Wouldn't it have helped the process if
15		there were broad policies applied across
16		the board? I mean at the end of the day
17		the debts sold at a a significant
18		discount.
19	A:	Discount against what, Commissioner
20		Ross?
21	Q:	Against the face value of the loans.
22	A:	Yes, but the face value of the loans by
23		definition Commissioner Ross, was almost
24		irrelevant.
25	Q:	Certainly wasn't irrelevant to the

1		
2	A:	debtors.
3		Commissioner Ross, if there was not a
4		problem in that the loans were not being
5		serviced and the assets held by the
6		institutions, the value of the assets could
7		not match the liabilities then there would
8		have been no need for the intervention. It
9		must say something Commissioner Ross, when
10		advertisements are placed internationally
11		in terms of the offer to purchase the bad
12		debts and not one single Jamaican firm bid
13		because they felt that this was not going to
14		be a good deal. So I am not clear where you
		are going with your question, in that should
15		we simple hand back the assets?
16 17		No. I think DEBTOR asked a question about
18	Q:	applying a discount across the board, some
	Ω.	sort of policy response in that regard. You
19		
20		also mentioned that some debtors, debts were
21		able to be resolved but obviously if you deal
22		with 30 or 40 thousand there is going to time
23		issue going to be a time
24		
25		

1		frame, there is going to be the time
2		issue; there is going to be a lot of
3		logistical issues which are going to
4		affect how you resolve that. If there
5		are policy decisions taken that could
6		certainly accelerate the process because
7		it would require the detail negotiation
8		of each individual case.
9	A:	It still would because in the final
10		analysis, Commissioner, agreements are
11		not as I discovered with dealing with
12		many of the persons, the principals,
13		agreements are not that difficult to
14		come by. What is difficult is that both
15		sides honor the agreement. So the notion
16		that a policy decision would resolve the
17		issue, each loan, Commissioner Ross, has
18		to be dealt with on an individual basis.
19	Q:	It would certainly accelerate
20	A:	I am certain that you handle your
21		business on a one by one basis, not on a
22		blanket approach.
23	COMM. ROSS:	Fortunately, I don't have those
24		problems.
25	A:	So Chairman, if I may summarize, FINSAC

1		was given a great deal of flexibility in
2		terms of dealing with each client with the
3		objective of a settlement.
4	CHAIRMAN:	Minister, may I say this; we understand
5		that. We are dealing with a situation where
6		there was a collapse of the sector. You
7		received complaints, let me call them
8		complaints, that is what they were,
9		complaints. Your policy was having
10		appointed an authority who are competent
11		people
12	A:	Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN:	it was their business to resolve that,
14		but the fact is that it wasn't resolved;
15		people continued to complain, a fact of
16		which you are aware.
17	A:	Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN:	So that you could no longer say you are going
19		to send them back to the people, you as
20		Minister would have to take some action or
21		devise some scheme or whatever because it is
22		you who are concerned about the health of the
23		economy if I may say so, the response that
24		well, we appointed a competent board, cannot
25		be

1		adequate, cannot be an answer to the
2		problem and it certainly didn't solve the
3		problem, with due respect.
4	A:	And with due respect Mr. Chairman, the last
5		thing you would wish and something which I
6		had oppose vehemently is for a Minister to
7		be in there solving individual problems,
8		because it would be this same Commission of
9		Enquiry accusing us of ministerial or
10		political interference.
11		Minister, I don't know if I am not
12	CHAIRMAN:	explaining myself clearly but let me
13		endeavour to do so. You created an
14		institution, the purpose of which was to,
15		I won't say solve the problem but create
16		healing?
17		Yes.
18	A:	Because, hey, this is not a simple matter.
19	CHAIRMAN:	Having done so, you nonetheless continued to
20		receive complaints. The question then
21		arises, what do you do? One thing is plainly
22		logical to me, that you can't go back to the
23		same experts to resolve it if they haven't.
24		So then it
25		

1		behoves you as the person in charge to
2		give consideration to methods of aiding
3		and assisting these vast number of
4		persons who are being affected. You are
5		not dealing with a small number of
6		people and therefore the problem might
7		go away.
8	A:	Sir, can you help me? What is the number
9		you think we are dealing with?
10	CHAIRMAN:	I can't pretend to know of the numbers.
11	A:	But Chairman, you did use the words
12		'vast number'.
13	CHAIRMAN:	I did. Well, I tell you what, it's not
14		small.
15A:		Can you help me with a number? Can you
16		help me with a number Chairman?
17	CHAIRMAN:	No, I don't know what documents I must
18		refer to find it. I will get you a
19		figure but you are certainly not dealing
20		with a small number of people. Did you
21		not continue to receive complaints?
22	A:	Decreasing number, because Chairman,
23		many of the initial complaints were
24		resolved and many, FINSAC thought that
25		they had come to an agreement. There

1		are many of the bad loans which were sold to
2		JRF which FINSAC had assumed would not have
3		been going to JRF because they thought that
4		they had been resolved. So it's not that no
5		attempt was being made, but Chairman, I
6		would just looking on the international
7		situation and the selling of bad loans by the
8		State having intervened to companies, is a
9		universal thing, it's happening right now in
10		the US so it's not abnormal that all of these
11		disputes are not resolved in the first
12		instance but are then sold to institutions;
13		it's not an abnormal occurrence.
14		Would it be a proper, despite what you
15	OHA TOMAN .	
16	CHAIRMAN:	
17		have said, that despite the fact, forget
18		about - whatever the numbers - the
19		problems continued, whatever the
20		problems were to be referred to you by
21		these people.
22	A:	I said to that.
23	CHAIRMAN:	After you demitted.
24	A:	Even after I demitted people have asked
25		me.

1	CHAIRMAN:	At which time you wouldn't have the
2		power to do anything much?
3	A:	I can't convince you about that.
4	CHAIRMAN:	Moral suasion.
5	A:	What I want to get on the record is, as
6		Minister did you do anything?
7	A:	Yes, sir, and I have indicated that.
8	CHAIRMAN:	And what you did was refer it to FINSAC.
9	A:	Well, that's the only institution I had
10		the facility to deal with.
11	CHAIRMAN:	So we are in a circle.
12	A:	Chairman, in the final analysis you have
13		to have individuals dealing with the
14		clients. There is no policy solution
15		unless the policy solution was all debts
16		are forgiven. That is clearly wasn't an
17		option but there is no way that a
18		Minister can dictate a generic solution
19		to all problems, the problems have to
20		be these are legal issues you know,
21		there are things of titles, there are
22		things of assets being held, et cetera;
23		these are things which had to be dealt
24		with on an individual basis.
25	CHAIRMAN:	DEBTOR, we seem to have taken up

```
1
                                                                                  your...
    2
                 DEBTOR:
                                                                                  My last question, Commissioner.
     3
                                                   In settling my debt the closest I have had
                                  come to do that is with JRF. My debt was a
     4
                                  little over 80M, I paid over 86M. At the point
     5
                                  of settling FINSAC I was not able to come to an
     6
    7
                                  agreement. I have made several approaches but
     8
                                  when the debt was sold to JRF, I was able to
                                  sit down with Dennis Joslin. His deal to me
     9
 10
                                  was US$5M, in US dollars, for a debt that was
 11
                                  over $80M, US$5M and that was his settlement.
 12
                                 Now, in the process, and I heard it from your
 13
                                 mouth that the debt that was sold to JRF, did
 14
                                  not include the interest, it was the principal
 15
                                  amount.
 16
                 A:
                                                                                 You heard that from my mouth?
 17
                 0:
                                                                                 I heard that.
 18
                 A:
                                                                                 Where?
 19
                Q: 20
                                                                                 That the debt was sold, the principal
 21
                A:
                                                                                 amount.
 22
                 CHAIRMAN:
                                                                                 No. Mr. Chairman, I.
23
                                                                                 No, I don't think he said it. Where did you
 24
                 Q:
                                                                                 hear that?
25
                                                                                 It's an interview on a radio programme but
                                                                                  the second of th
```

1		the debt that was sold to JRF, was it
2		including the interest, outstanding
3		interest or it was just the principal
4	7.	amount?
5	A:	My understand it had to include the interest
6		because that's how banks live. No bank can
7		live by simply calculating it's assets as
8		the principal.
9	Q:	But JRF as a foreign company were able to buy
10		the debt at cents in the dollar, come here
11		with a small portion, they paid something,
12 13		from what research, that they have actually
		paid 15 cents in the dollar, now they are
14		able to collect interest on principal
15		amounting they got waivers to charge
16		interest at bank rate sometimes in most cases
17		higher than the current bank rate. Now, our
18		opportunity was to sign on a loan in US
19		dollars, convert to US dollars at a discount
20		rate. If you weren't able to keep up with
21		those payments, you would revert back to the
22		original amount of money so there would be
23		no discount, if you miss one payment or two
24		payment you
25		

1		would go right back int	o the original money
2		so your discount that wa	s offered to you, you
3		would lose that. How con	uld you put people at
4		work, myself, took me 2	20 years to build my
5		company from scratch,	worked hard for my
6		business, built my busin	ness up, we were able
		to 8	employ -
sometin	nes on my site I h	ad	
9	200 people	e on my site, 150 peopl	e on my sit working.
10	Since 197	7 I have not been able	to employ one person
11	because I	have no business, '97	rather.
12	I am sure	you must have a consci	ence at
	14	some point. I mean, we	have made several
15	representation	s, I have made several	
16	representation	s to the Minister of Fi	nance, we
17	never get a rea	sponse. Thank you.	
Thank y	you, DEBTOR. Yes,	would you state your na	
18 C	HAIRMAN:	20 MR. SIEVERIGHT: Commissioners, good	Mr. Chairman,
21		morning. I am Delano	Sieveright,
22		Generation 2000.	
23 CI	HAIRMAN:	What is it called?	
24 A	:	Generation 2000, 2-0-	0-0.
25 CI	HAIRMAN:	You are a business con	mpany?

1	A:	No, we are political organization sir.
2	CHAIRMAN:	Oh, I see. Then you know that this is a
3		consideration of a financial melt-down
4		here.
5	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	Yes, I know.
6	CHAIRMAN:	What is your locus standi?
7	A:	We have a wide remit and we have an
8		interest in public affairs.
9	CHAIRMAN:	This is not just a talk shop you know,
10		maybe you have business to do so
11		unless
12	A:	Politics is about public affairs, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN:	It may well be but we are not quite sure
14		that this is a proper forum to ventilate
15		all of that.
16	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	Rest assured, sir
17	CHAIRMAN:	Maybe when you can go on radio stations
18		or TV stations to discuss that.
19	A:	This is a public forum.
20	CHAIRMAN:	No, it's not a public forum in that
21		sense, it's only a public forum within
22		the terms of our Terms of Reference.
23	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	Will you allow me to ask the question
24		sir?

Let me hear what the question is. First

25 CHAIRMAN:

1		of all, we are not quite clear what your
2		standing is and we will see whether Dr.
3		Davies should answer.
4	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	The first question?
5	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
6	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	The first question is, following on the
7		question that Mr. Donnigan re the
8		Jamaica Redevelopment Foundation, put, I
9		want the former Minister to clarify
10		whether it is a fact that the Jamaica
11		Redevelopment Company would have had to
12		seek a special despensation to charge
13		interest rates?
14	CHAIRMAN:	I don't follow your path.
15	DR. DAVIES:	Sorry, I think I know where he is going,
16		sir.
17	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	Let me just complete the question and
18		the former Minister will be able to
19		answer. Is it a fact The Jamaica
20		Redevelopment Foundation, a non-banking
21		entity would have had to seek a special
22		dispensation to charge interest rates
23		above a certain level, and if so, would
24		this special dispensation have had to be
25		granted by you as a former Minister of

1		Finance or the former Governor of the
2		Bank of Jamaica, and in that vain Dr.
3		Davies, upon reflection, do you now
4		regret that having devised a means of
5		limiting or recaping the size of the
6		interest rates by the Jamaica
7		Redevelopment Company was allowed to
8		charge many good Jamaicans so many years
9		later?
10	MR. HYLTON:	Mr. Chairman
11	CHAIRMAN:	Before you. I am trying to understand
12		this powerful question.
13	A:	Multifaceted.
14	CHAIRMAN:	Let me hear you please, Mr. Hylton.
15	MR. HYLTON:	Quite apart Mr. Chairman, from the
15 16	MR. HYLTON:	Quite apart Mr. Chairman, from the observation you made, it seems to me
	MR. HYLTON:	<u>-</u>
16	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me
16 17	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question
16 17 18	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question asked for the interpretation of what
16 17 18 19	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question asked for the interpretation of what the law means. It doesn't seem to be an
16 17 18 19 20	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question asked for the interpretation of what the law means. It doesn't seem to be an appropriate question. The first half of
16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question asked for the interpretation of what the law means. It doesn't seem to be an appropriate question. The first half of the question was: What was the effect
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HYLTON:	observation you made, it seems to me that the first half of that question asked for the interpretation of what the law means. It doesn't seem to be an appropriate question. The first half of the question was: What was the effect of the section, what was the power of a

look at the practices of JRF, the treatment of delinquent borrowers, I suppose there is some link. We won't shut you out. Dr. Davies, can you answer the question? DR. DAVIES: Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early part of the discussions. At the beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting of the	1	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, doubtless, but we are supposed to
suppose there is some link. We won't shut you out. Dr. Davies, can you answer the question? DR. DAVIES: Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early part of the discussions. At the beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	2		look at the practices of JRF, the
shut you out. Dr. Davies, can you answer the question? DR. DAVIES: Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early part of the discussions. At the beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	3		treatment of delinquent borrowers, I
the question? 7 DR. DAVIES: Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early 8 part of the discussions. At the 9 beginning of this session this morning 10 we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin 11 were granted exemptions under the Money 12 Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or 13 new action taken, because these institutions 14 in carrying out their business of collection 15 have been granted this exemption, those 16 three institutions were granted. Consistent 17 with the due deligence and the appraisal of 18 the assets with the companies which had 19 indicated interest in purchasing the bad 20 loan portfolio, their assessment would have 21 been based on the same terms and conditions 22 which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	4		suppose there is some link. We won't
Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early part of the discussions. At the beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	5		shut you out. Dr. Davies, can you answer
part of the discussions. At the beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	6		the question?
beginning of this session this morning we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	7	DR. DAVIES:	Perhaps Mr. Sieveright missed the early
we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin were granted exemptions under the Money Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	8		part of the discussions. At the
Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	9		beginning of this session this morning
Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	10		we indicated that FINSAC, FIS and Refin
new action taken, because these institutions in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	11		were granted exemptions under the Money
in carrying out their business of collection have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	12		Lending Act so it's not a new initiative or
have been granted this exemption, those three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	13		new action taken, because these institutions
three institutions were granted. Consistent with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	14		in carrying out their business of collection
with the due deligence and the appraisal of the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	15		have been granted this exemption, those
the assets with the companies which had indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	16		three institutions were granted. Consistent
indicated interest in purchasing the bad loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	17		with the due deligence and the appraisal of
loan portfolio, their assessment would have been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	18		the assets with the companies which had
been based on the same terms and conditions which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	19		indicated interest in purchasing the bad
which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed, and there is a consistency in the granting	20		loan portfolio, their assessment would have
and there is a consistency in the granting	21		been based on the same terms and conditions
25	22		which FINSAC, FIS and Refin Trust enjoyed,
24 of the	23		and there is a consistency in the granting
	24		of the

1		exemptions. I could just add in passing
2		that an exemption was granted in 2008 by
3		the present Minister of Finance.
4	CHAIRMAN:	It's a delightful tit-bit.
5	MR. HYLTON:	I think Mr. Chairman, that the witness
6		thought it was relevant to the general
7		issue that you are looking into.
8	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, and absolutely, that is natural but
9		it's a tit-bit nonetheless. Anything
10		further you wish to ask?
11	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	Just two more slightly difficult ones,
12		it won't take much time.
13	CHAIRMAN:	Well, so long as you don't make them too
14		convoluted and take long.
15	MR. SIEVERIGHT:	They won't be long, I promise you.
16		Okay. The next point, can you attribute
17		Dr. Davies, that the financial sector
18		collapse was in part due to bad
19		management, and in fact on many
20		occasions you stated that it was
21		essentially fraud in some entities. Now
22		does this apply to the National
23		Commercial Bank, one, and why did you
24		not take the same draconian actions
25		against the directors/managers of the

1		National Commercial Bank as you did with
2		Century National and Eagle Commercial?
3		I am not clear what the question, the
4	A:	draconian measures which you made
5		reference to.
6		There was a differential in treatment, was
7	CHAIRMAN:	there not?
8		In terms of?
9	A:	The treatment of the other institutions,
10	CHAIRMAN:	some were shut downe and some were not, NCB
11		was not shut down.
12		Well, NCB was not shut down because of the
13	A:	size is the 'too big to fail' syndrome,
14		Chairman, and within the context of keeping
15		
16		the banking system operational it would not
17		have been possible if NCB had been shut
18		down, but there was a replacement of the
19		Board, a new Board was established and after
20		that the principals were removed overtime.
21		You are aware that Eagle Commercial, Eagle
22	CHAIRMAN:	Commercial as a bank was not an insolvent
23		bank, you are not aware of that?
24		
25		
20		

1	A:	Well, I don't sir, the Eagle group
2		has to be taken together because that
3		was one of the examples of where the
4		group structure was utilized.
5	CHAIRMAN:	Why? If you are healing, why?
6	A:	What was that?
7	CHAIRMAN:	You want stability and you want healing,
8		why?
9	A:	I am not following you, Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN:	Your responsibility as Minister
11	is to maintain	a stable financial institution?
12	A:	Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN:	So far as Eagle Bank was concerned, the
14		commercial bank that was not insolvent
15		institution.
16	A:	Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN:	NCB was and you you have said the reason
18		why you have allowed it to continue was
19		because it was too big to fail.
20	A:	But I have also said sir, that in the
21		case of Eagle we are not simply looking
22		at the Eagle Commercial bank which was
23		the smallest entities within the group.
24		If you look at the building society and
25		look at other aspects which were all

1	handled as one, so the commercial bank on
2	its own was just a small percentage of that
3	total group of companies and I would urge
4	you to utilize your not inconsiderable
5	powers, to bring other people to testify.
6	Dr. Bonnick would be able to who handled the
7	negotiations with Dr Chen-Yung personally
8	would be able to amplify.
9	Continued
11 1	
2 13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	COMM. ROSS:	I am not really following the too big to
2		fail argument. Depositors in all the
3		financial institutions were protected,
4		so the depositors of NCB were treated no
5		differently from depositors of any of
6		the other institutions that required
7		intervention. I think the real question
8		is why were the shareholders and
9		officers of that institution treated
10		differently from the shareholders and
11		officers of institutions that failed.
12	A:	Well, as I indicated the decision was
13		taken that NCB was needed to keep a
14		banking system going and the decision
15		therefore was meant to keep NCB intact
16		even as we proceeded with the overall
17		transformation of the sector that was
18		the diffence. I suspect a second
19		difference is that NCB the full
20		extent of the problems in NCB came
21		towards the end once decision for full
22		intervention had been taken.
23	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
24	MR. SEIVERIGHT:	Last question.
25	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, please.

1	MR. SEIVERIGHT:	Thank you. Dr. Davies, I have heard you
2		say that the Bank of Nova Scotia and
3		other international banks remained
4		solvent during the crisis and as such
5		the other entities failed that was due
6		to bad management. Isn't the difference
7		between those entities that failed and
8		those that survived a function of the
9		strength of their parent companies? And
10		I put it to you sir, that it is
11		misleading if not somewhat dishonest to
12		say that the Bank of Nova Scotia and
13		others were not adversely affected by
14		your high interest rate policy.
15	A:	Chairman, I am have difficulty with
16		these these questions. I would submit
17		that he gave a speech in the form,
18 19	MR. HYLTON:	posing as question. And also Chairman, given the comments
20 21	CHAIRMAN:	youu have made sir That was dealt with by the Bank of
22		Jamaica.
23	MR. HYLTON:	In terms of going of going forward, sir
24		I am wondering if you could give us a
25		new direction.

1	CHAIRMAN:	As to what?
2	MR. HYLTON:	On the question of the appropriateness
3		in the forum that we are in as you
4		pointed our sir, this is not a trial for
5		accusation.
6	CHAIRMAN:	That's incorrect, we are quite aware of
7		it. Anything more you want Mr.?
8	MR. SEIVERIGHT:	There is no response to that question?
9	CHAIRMAN:	No, there is no response.
10	MR. SEIVERIGHT:	Okay. So that will be on record?
11	CHAIRMAN:	But you have spoken and they are taking
12		it down.
13	MR. HYLTON:	I understand sir, you commented that
14		that was inappropriate, and that has
15		also been recorded.
16	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Yes, sir, please state your name?
17	JOHNDOE:	Chairman, Commissioners, Ladies and
18		Gentlemen, pleasant morning. I am
19		JOHNDOE, graduate student at the
20		UWI, Mona and the grandson of an
21		entrepreneur who like JOHNDOE
22		was displaced during the FINSAC era.
23		Dr. Davies
24	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry, sir, you represent yourself?
25	JOHNDOE:	Well, my grandfather who is now

1		deceased, pretty much. Dr. Davies why
2		were NCB and Workers Bank preference
3		and minority shareholders treated so
4		differently from all the other entities'
5		shareholders in that they got some
6		payments/compensation for their shares?
7	A:	The response I have dealt with NCB in
8		terms of the critical role which NCB
9		played within the overall banking
10		system. I am not able to there is a
11		legal issue with regard to Workers Bank
12		and I think I would have to be briefed
13		as to there was a legal advice in
14		that regard. I will have to be briefed
15		in that regard.
16	Q	Just to follow on former Minister, you
17		stated that your objective was to
18		protect depositors so why more or less
19		was this select approach with respect to
20		the shareholders NCB as I mentioned
21		and Workers Bank, why wasn't this
22		uniform?
23	A:	Well I think I answered the first
24		question which indicated why.
25	Q	Dr. Davies you are in the media these

1		days ranting about credibility and
2		coherence and so on. I want to put it
3		to you, I want to ask, what was the
4		credible, coherent exit strategy in the
5		notorious FINSAC dispensation from a
6		fiscal perspective in respect of the 33%
7		that was added to the total stock of
8		debt as a result of the absorption of
9		that \$140B? What was the credible,
10		coherent and strategic exit strategy
11		from a fiscal perspective?
12	A:	From a fiscal perspective I was very
13		clear at all stages during the
14		intervention in that the decision to
15		intervene and to protect savers, holder
16		of insurance policies and pension fund
17		given the differential between the value
18		of the assets and the liabilities would
19		be the cost to the budget and the cost
20		to the taxpayers so it was never ever
21		hidden that that would be there. What
22		are the benefits? The benefits is that the
23		country did not erupt. Persons conveniently
24		assumed that the fact the matter was
		resolved with a huge fiscal

1		cost but there was no riot, and there was
2		no bloodshed that this would have
3		happened regardless. I can't rewrite
4		the situation and say let us run an
5		experiment, but it's certainly not an
6		experiment which the administration was
7		willing to take of the total collapse of
8		the financial system.
9	Q	And I appreciate the need for some
10		degree of stability, but Dr. Davies, how
11		did you chart a recovery and of course
12		restoration of some degree of
13		macroeconomic thereafter notwithstanding
14		the need for mitigating riots and
15	A:	Let me respond that the debt to GDP
16		ratio was reduced from a 144% to 105%.
17		Let me respond that inflation for seven
18		consecutive years was below 10%. Let me
19		respond that we built up NIR of 2.5B.
20 21	CHAIRMAN:	Let me respond. Please allow him to respond.
22	A:	Let me respond. Let me respond by
23 24		indicating rating agencies gave Jamaica unprecedented levels and said we are
25		fighting above our weight. Let me

1		respond that since then there have been six
2		downgrades from that rating. Let me respond
3		by indicating that Jamaica did not have a
4		balance of payments problem and had no need
5		to borrow from the IMF. Let me respond that
6		even now as we are speaking the debt to GDP
7		ratio is climbing, the total debt has
8		increased by a third in two years and we do
9		not know what the future holds because of
10		the macroeconomic.
11	CHAIDMAN.	Just allow Dr. Davies to complete his
12 13	CHAIRMAN:	answer and then you can
	0	Dr. Davis Mr. Chairman may I be
14	Q	protected at this point? Mr. Chairman may
15		I be protected at this point?
16		
17		
18		
19		Dr. Davies why was the Minister of
20		Finance response to the Bank of
21		Jamaica's report regarding the
		insolvency of some
22	CHAIRMAN:	One moment please. This is not a
23		marketplace. We would like to conduct this
24		proceeding in a civilised manner. Please
25		
		allow the witness to ask his

1		questions uninterruptedly. if you want to
2		have your private seminar would you please
3		retire from this room. Allow the witness to
4		ask questionsallow the questioner to ask
5		questions and allow Dr. Davies to respond. We
6		need neither applause nor any kind of other
7		running commentary.
		Y
es?		
9	JOHNDOE:	1 appreciate that degree of protection,
10		Mr. Chairman.
11	Q	Dr. Davies what was the Ministry of
12		Finance's response to the Bank of
13		Jamaica's report regarding the
14		insolvency of some financial entities so
15		late in coming?
16	A:	I forget the gentleman's name.
17	Q	JOHNDOE, Dr. Davies.
18	A:	Chairman, I spent a long day yesterday
19		answering the same question.
21		20 Q Listen to the
22		follow up Dr. Davies. In some instances,
		sir, The Ministry of Finance intervened
after	billions o	dollars were passed through the Bank of
24		Jamaica to these institutions. In some

1		Century, your decision to take control
2		was in excess of fifteen months after
3		you were informed of the entities
4		distress or the challenges more or less.
5		Dr. Davies, almost a year and a half
6		later, why was this response so late in
7		coming, former Minister?
8	A:	JOHNDOE as I
9	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry, one moment please. We won't
10		allow repetition otherwise we will never
11		end. This matter was dealt with
12		yesterday, I don't think anything
13		further can be had from it.
14	Q	Very well. I yield to your advice, Mr.
15		Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN:	Thank you.
17	Q	Dr. Davies how much was advanced to
18		Workers Bank after the collapse of
19		Century and when did you become aware of
20		Workers Bank's financial challenges, was
21		it before the collapse of Century and if
22		so, how long before?
23	A:	Mr. Chairman I am being asked to have
24		recollections of things which occurred
25		almost

1	CHAIRMAN:	I don't think he says he is not able to
2		remember. Have you got the
3		statistics on you because if you do, you can
4		put them to the Minister?
5	Q	Dr. Davies Well the Minister should at
6	0	least have, former Minister
7	CHAIRMAN:	Dr. Davies, have you got the statistics
8		because if you do, it's very easy. Mr.
9	A:	Chairman, I'll move to another question.
10	CHATDMAN.	Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN:	12 JOHNDOE: Dr. Davies what
svst	emic safeguards or	
13		policy prescriptions were put in place
14		to leverage the operations of financial
15		institutions? For example, the fallout
16		in the United States there are policy
17		prescriptions with respect to
18		executive, remuneration to executives.
19		Did you take any such steps, Minister?
20	A:	Several, JOHNDOE.
21	Q	Very well.
22	A:	I don't how much time we have.
23	Q	Nuff, nuff time?
24 25	A:	I don't think you make the judgment on this.

1	Q	My apologies, sir.
2	A:	There were a host of steps taken and
3		JOHNDOE I am sorry you missed yesterday
4		because I also indicated that do not
5		take the stability which has prevailed
6		here for granted. One, we have
7		virtually abolished or precluded the
8		possibility of executive Chairmen.
9		There is a common thread running through
10		several other problem institutions where
11		the CEO reported to himself as the
12		Chairman of the Board and it brought
13		with it several unfortunate
14		developments. What came to the board and
15		we found that out from board members,
16		was that which the Chairman who was the
17		CEO determined. We have also put in
18		place a regulation, a requirement that
19		the external auditor on seeing anything
20		untoward has to bring that to the
21		attention of the regulators. That's a
22		very critical factor. We have also
23		drastically improved the capital ratios
24		required for deposit taking
25		institutions. We have also tightened the

1		fit and proper criteria. We have
2		increased the sharing of information
3		between the two regulatory institutions.
4		There is a host of things which as a
5		graduate student I will direct you where
6		to go and read to find.
7	Q	I appreciate that, Dr. Davies.
8		Dr. Davies you are in the media quite
9		often referring to hindsight being
10		twenty-twenty vision. In hindsight, Dr.
11		Davies do you regret your management of
12		the crisis and if so, what particular
13		aspects do you regret, Dr. Davies?
14	A:	Chairman can you help me here, sir ?
15	CHAIRMAN:	That question need not be answered. That
16		question was answered yesterday.
17		What's the next question?
18	Q	Dr. Davies, did the International
19		Monetary Fund give advise/policy
20		prescriptions with respect to the
21		collapse of the financial institutions?
22	A:	Advice, yes and that was also discussed
23		to a great length yesterday.
24	Q	Dr. Davies, in much the same way that you
25		invited me to that thing you should have

1		invited me yesterday.
2	CHAIRMAN:	This is all very pleasant but let us get
3		on.
4	JOHNDOE:	What advice did the Fund give?
5	CHAIRMAN:	Let us not get back into Roman history.
6	JOHNDOE:	Very well. So I would be advised to
7		consult the
8	CHAIRMAN:	The transcript.
9	JOHNDOE:	Yesterday's transcript?
10	CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
11	JOHNDOE:	Very well.
12	CHAIRMAN:	You can have it from the Secretariat or
13		the press.
14	CHAIRMAN:	Absolutely. thank you very much for your
15		cooperation, former Minister.
16	DEBTOR:	Good morning, my name is DEBTOR, I
17		am from DEBTORCOMPANY. Dr. Davies I
18		listened to you yesterday about the
19		situation - what about the collapse of
20		the banks. You spoke under.
21	CHAIRMAN:	Parle lentment s'il vous plait.
22	Q	I am speaking too fast?
23	CHAIRMAN:	Speak slowly, please.
24	DEBTOR:	Now you spoke about the poor practice
25		that went on in the commercial banks

1		until you had to order some forensic
2		experts to come in and check the banks'
3		activities. Did you say yesterday that
4		you ordered some forensic audit of the
5		banks?
6	A:	Yes. I am getting a little help from the
7		Chairman.
8	A:	My question is Doctor, the forensic
9		experts what did you say your report
10		tell you exactly, whether the banks that
11		they were doing, because you said
12		yesterday that the banks were also
13		increasing the interest rates of the
14		borrowers to cover some of the loss they
15		were making?
16	A:	With all respect, Mr. DEBTOR, I said no
17		such thing yesterday.
18	A:	Okay, I'll check the record.
19	CHAIRMAN:	No, no. When was that?
20	DEBTOR:	He said the banks were investing in
21		farming, they were investing in real
22		estate.
23	CHAIRMAN:	He said that.
24	DEBTOR:	At that time they were paying out high
25		wages. Now, having said so, having

1		admitted that the commercial banks did
2		not treat the public right, what did you
3		do for the borrowers? The borrowers
4		were the ones who were paying the high
5		interest rates, their assets were taken,
6		their assets were sold. What action did
7		you take to protect the borrowers?
8	A:	To protect the borrowers?
9	Q	Yes, sir.
10	A:	At what stage, Mr. DEBTOR?
11	Q	When you find out that the banks were
12		going on with corrupt practice?
13	A:	When we intervened it was action on behalf
14	77.	of the whole society, on behalf of the
15		
		system. But DEBTOR, FINSAC entered into no
16		loan agreement with any borrower. These were
17		all private arrangements between
18		institutions and borrowers, so I find it
19		there are rules governing banking in terms
20		of the legal arrangements, but I am not clear
21		what is the question expecting of a
22		government in terms of intervening between
23		a client and a bank.
24		My question is, yesterday you
25	Q	

1		deliberately at length explained, the
2		commercial banks they were involved in
3		corrupt practices to the point that you
4		said there had a criminal investigation
5		done?
6	CHAIRMAN:	May I just interpose, Mr. DEBTOR. Are
7		you trying, are you seeking to get from
8		Dr. Davies a response to the question;
9		assistance was given to the depositors
10		because they got their money back? What
11		assistance if any was given to
12		borrowers?
13	Q	Or what protection from the banks?
14	CHAIRMAN:	I think that is what he is trying to
15		say.
16	A:	Chairman, I am more comfortable with
17		assistance than with protection.
18	CHAIRMAN:	Well, go ahead.
19	A:	Well, I don't know whether he is
20		interested in the assistance as opposed
21		to protection.
22	CHAIRMAN:	Well I rephrased it to him and he didn't
23		dissent.
24	A:	As I indicated whilst there is the
25		Chairman says a vast number to be

1		quantified, but there are several
2		persons like yourself who were
3		dissatisfied with the treatment from
4		FINSAC. There are several persons who
5		had their loans totally restructured and
6		reductions in terms of the interests. I
7		know of a fact to be sure. It obviously
8		did not cover a 100% and by virtue of
9		the remaining dissatisfaction but there
10		are hundreds, and I would daresay
11		thousands of borrowers who have had
12		their loans restructured and have
13		settled totally or in a payment
14		arrangement which is to their
15		satisfaction.
16	CHAIRMAN:	Some were assisted and some were not?
17	A:	Well, sir, as I indicated to you
18		Chairman, I don't know of a blanket way
19		to do it because each of these
20		arrangements are individual
21		arrangements.
22	Q	Mr. Minister I am not asking if FINSAC
23		should or should not consider a refund, my
24		question is regarding the commercial banks,
		the forensic audit you

1		have done. Do you have a copy of it
2		that tells you what the banks were doing
3		illegally as you mentioned yesterday, I
4		recall quite well, you mentioned that
5		the banks were not doing well so they
6		had to increase, to climb interest rates
7		in order for them to cover for the loss.
8		That is your statement.
9	A:	But Mr. DEBTOR, you were here all day
10		yesterday and we indicated that both
11		actions, legal actions have been taken
12		against some of the principals, some of
13		the institutions partly informed by the
14		forensic audit. And let me just indicate
15		that to date we have been successful,
16		and I say we as a country but FINSAC,
17		FIS have been successful in every single
18		legal action taken.
19	A:	But as a borrower my business end up
20		taken away, put in receivership by NCB,
21		then taken to FINSAC, FINSAC sold it to
22		NIBJ which is one government institution
23		selling to another government
24		institution, underpriced, so I am left
25		with nothing how does that make

1		sense? Meanwhile you accepted that
2		commercial banks were going on with
3		corrupt practice. They were criminal in
4		what they were doing. What did you do
5		to protect the borrower, nothing. Why
6		didn't you tell them that interest rates
7		were too high they were jacking
8		interest rates, killing us. What did
9		you do? You just stood by blaming us,
10		that we did not do our business well.
11	A:	DEBTOR I don't want to discuss your
12		personal case, I know because NIBJ
13		later became one of the institutions
14		under my aegis and I know of serious
15		attempts being made to come to some
16		agreement which would allow your
17		business to be revitalized. So I don't
18		think it is be appropriate for you to
19		bring one side to it. If you were going
20		to bring NIBJ into it I think the
21		relevant authority should be here to
22		defend themselves.
23	A:	I'll leave NIBJ out for the time being.
24		What I want to understand is question,
25		why you did not do when you saw that

I		forensic report and you saw the banks
2		were involved with increasing interest
3		rates to cover their loss, why didn't
4		you do that and say listen that is wrong
5		you are destroying the borrowers welfare
6		and their future, so you didn't do
7		anything to protect the borrowers
8		whatever?
9	A:	DEBTOR let me separate the issue of
10		those who were involved in criminal
11		practices, et cetera from the issue of your
12		privatea government cannot be involved in
13		each arrangement between client and
14		creditor. I didn't know when you went to NCB.
15		I had nothing to do, nor did FINSAC have
16		anything to do with
17		such an arrangement.
18		neither the past administration or the
19		present to be in a situation where they would
20		be intervening in each negotiation between
21		borrower and creditor.
22		
23		
24		

1	Q	I am not talking about my specific case
2		I am talking about in general,
3		situation?
4	CHAIRMAN:	Just one moment. I don't know if you
5		are getting the drift of what Mr.
6		DEBTOR is seeking to put. Undoubtedly
7		he is using his experience but you are
8		aware that his experience is not
9		singular.
10	A:	No, it isn't.
11	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. So that there were many situations
12		precisely like his. You are aware from what
13		he is saying that there were some banks that
14		were in breach, I suspect of the Banking Act
15		I suppose, and that it may well be that some
16		of the managers of the bank were involved in
17		questionable I use the word questionable
18		to be neutral, l don't know if there were
19		criminal activities. So that was systematic
20		and he was concerned to find that knowing
21		that what did you do to protect borrowers,
22		not suggesting himself, well he is not really
23		concerned about himself to all
24		

1		perspective.
2	A:	Well, Chairman, as I indicated, legal
3		proceedings were, had been initiated
4		perhaps not all which should have been
5		done haave been but we have been
6		successful. As regards the borrowers,
7		DEBTOR, Mr. Chairman although you
8		made reference to those whose situations
9		have not been resolved but I do not
10		believe that it is appropriate for us to
11		ignore the large number of those who
12		have been resolved and in terms of
13		and what we did, interest was written
14		down in many instances and you can get
15		specifics from FINSAC. The terms were
16		rearranged within the capability of the
17		institution or the individual to
18		service.
19	CHAIRMAN:	I am sorry, Dr. Davies, I think
20		somewhere we read about the ninety and
21		nine, but it is the one. So as
22		Minister, with respect, would you not be
23		concerned with you have been concerned
24		with the one as well.
25	A:	I am, Mr. Chairman, I am.

1CH	AIRMAN:	Although I am saying one I am saying a
2		large group of people.
3	A:	But Mr. Chairman, even as we seek to
4		look at the one there is always three
5		sides to the story you know.
6	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry to interrupt you, Mr. DEBTOR.
7	Q	My next question to Mr. Davies, FINSAC
8		was your responsibility as the Minister
9		of Finance.
10	CHAIRMAN:	I am not sure we heard that.
11	Q	What I am saying you admitted that
12		FINSAC reports to the Minister of
13		Finance you are the board that runs
14		FINSAC?
15	A:	Yes.
16	Q	I am talking about now my case. In my
17		case the receiver was operating the
18		receiver was run the business just like
19		personal business is charging the
20		company US\$100,000 a month
21	MR. HYLTON:	Mr. Chairman?
22	CHAIRMAN:	That question should be directed to
23		FINSAC, DEBTOR. Don't trouble the
24		Minister with such things.
25	MR. HYLTON:	I think for us, Mr. Chairman, it would

1		be useful for us to be aware that this
2		matter is before the court as I
3		understand it. The speaker is going into
4		it. This is a matter that you should be
5		aware of.
6	CHAIRMAN:	I don't see how that stops us from
7		hearing it.
8	MR. HYLTON:	I just thought you should know.
9	BY CHAIRMAN:	Okay, thank you.
10	Q	My next question has to do with the
11		activities of the commercial banks.
12		The commercial banks were
13	CHAIRMAN:	Excuse me, Mr. DEBTOR is this your
14		final question?
15	Q	That is my final question.
16	CHAIRMAN:	I don't want to press you. Okay. Very
17		well.
18	Q	Mr. Davies said NCB was too big to go
19		down. Was DEBTORCOMPANY too big to go
20		down also? We employ 1,000 people, we
21		pay million of dollars for them every
22		week also. All those people they have
23		lost their jobs, they have lost their
24		livelihoods, some of them have end up to
25		be criminals in Spanish Town. What

1	happens to them? Is any consideration given
2	to the workers, the people? Is that the
3	best? You said NCB was too big to do down.
4	So DEBTORCOMPANY, it could go down. Why?
5	explain to me because you were well aware of
6	the high interest rates. You take your
7	working capital out, all your cash is drawn
8	completely from your business.
9	Continued
11 1	
2 13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	DEBTOR:	You are the Minister of Finance, you
2		know fully how a business is run, not
3		with a high interest rate, but it had to
4		happen, the livelihood of people,
5		causing problems in the family, when
6		workers work over twenty-five years
7		coming to run the shifts at night,
8		leaving their children at home, you did
9		nothing up to today.
10	А	Mr. DEBTOR, I am very very aware of
11		the
12	DEBTOR:	No, no, the workers, you know, I am not
13		talking about me, John DEBTOR, the
14		workers who work at DEBTORCOMPANY.
15	А	Mr. DEBTOR, I am very much aware of the
16		DEBTORCOMPANY case and precisely, it's
17		a manufacturing entity and it's
18		employment, the numbers of persons
19		employed etcetera, but Mr. DEBTOR, I am
20		certain you don't want us to one of
21		the difficulties NIBJ was faced with in
22		trying to work out a solution with Mr.
23		DEBTOR, with DEBTORCOMPANY was you
24		want me to go into the detail?
25	DEBTOR:	You spoke about the NIBJ, you are not

1		discussing NIBJ?
2	A	I am sorry you have raised it though
3		because
4	DEBTOR:	You answered and the Chairman accepted
5		that you don't want to go there, what
6		happens, when it suits you, you want to
7		go there and when it doesn't suit you,
8		it doesn't suit.
9	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry you want an answer to that?
10	DEBTOR:	My position is regarding why, as you
11		said NCB was too big to go down, why you
12		allowed DEBTORCOMPANY to go down?
13	CHAIRMAN:	Stop there one minute, answer that
14		please.
15	A	Mr. DEBTOR, I didn't allow
16		DEBTORCOMPANY to go under,
17		DEBTORCOMPANY was in problem before FINSAC
18		was created, that is a fact. We sought to try
19		to save it because of its importance which
20		you have outlined, but Mr. DEBTOR you also
21		know as a fact that NIBJ attempted to come
22		up with a solution and ran into the
23		difficulty of a family feud, and there was
24		no way you know who to talk to, who would agree
		and

1		who to talk to and you don't want me to
2		talk.
3	DEBTOR:	Since you mentioned me, allow me to
4		answer it
5	CHAIRMAN:	Tell you what, let us take a break and
6		calm down, and we will return to you Mr.
7		DEBTOR after this break. Before we break
8		however, may I suggest to persons who may
9		follow Mr. DEBTOR, to formulate your
10		questions in writing and hand them
		into the secretariat.
12		minute adjournment. Thank you.
13		B R E A K
14	CHAIRMAN:	May we resume. Dr. Davies, you are still
15		on oath.
16	A	Yes, sir.
17	CHAIRMAN:	Mr. DEBTOR, before you begin, I had
18		suggested to persons in the audience who
19		might be minded to ask questions to put
20		them in writing and give them to the
21		Secretary. I hope that is being done.
22		Silence means consent. Yes, DEBTOR.
23	DEBTOR:	My question is very short. As you
24		spoke, you mentioned that NCB was too
25		big to fail, are you aware, that the

1		company employed twelve hundred people,
2		the largest thermo-plastic company in
3		the Caribbean?
4	CHAIRMAN:	DEBTOR, I don't think you need to
5		go through the question at length, but
6		succinctly, what you are asking
7		Dr. Davies, I think most of it, there
8		was a policy of too big to fail, to whom
9		did it apply?
10	А	Mr. Chairman, are you certain that is
11		DEBTOR's question.
12	CHAIRMAN:	That is what he is asking.
13	A	Let me indicate, Chairman, that the
14		DEBTORCOMPANY situation, all the
15		attributes to which Mr. DEBTOR
16		referred, were recognized and one of the
17		attempts at dealing with it was to hand
18		it to NIBJ to work with the principals.
19		You may wish to get the NIBJ to testify,
20		but my understanding was that it was
21		extremely difficult to work with the
22		diverse members of the DEBTOR family in
23		that there was no common position from
24		them in going forward and that
25		represented a major problem, so it was

1		not a financial problem, it was a question
2		of how would this entity be run even if it
3		-
4	CHAIRMAN:	were saved.
5		You understand the response Mr. DEBTOR?
6		Although there was a policy, too big to fail,
7		insofar as your particular situation was
8		concerned, family problems, it exacerbated
9		the problem and made it difficult to
		resolve. You can
10 11	DEBTOR:	ask the next question if you wish. DEBTORCOMPANY is a limited liability
12		company, stand up alone, and my father's
13		choice specified in law who is
14		responsible, if you choose to
15		acknowledge other people outside of
16 17	CHAIRMAN:	that, I cannot help you. So what is the question. You have to
18		pose a question.
19	Q	I posed a question, I said why
20		DEBTORCOMPANY was not considered among
21		those companies too big to fail.
22		Mr. Davies' response was, the reason is
23		because there was a family feud. My
24		answer to Mr. Davies is this,
25		DEBTORCOMPANY is a limited liability

1		company who stands alone now.
2	CHAIRMAN:	Listen, I don't want to make your task
3		difficult, but how we operate, our
4		procedure is you ask the questions, and
5		he answers, the evidence that we get
6		comes from him, you see, he either
7		accepts what you are saying or doesn't,
8		so what is the question you are asking
9		him.
10	DEBTOR:	My question is now, since that is the
11		criterion that he uses to make that
12		decision, did he investigate to find out
13		what is the real status of
14		DEBTORCOMPANY.
15	CHAIRMAN:	I thought he answered. Your problem was
16		a family feud.
17	DEBTOR:	There is no basis for him to say that
18		because DEBTORCOMPANY is a limited
19		liability company. My father at his
20		death left a legal document which shows
21		the ownership of DEBTORCOMPANY, if
22		DEBTOR resigns it shows where all
23		the other members of the family fall.
24	CHAIRMAN:	Are you saying so far as Dr. Davies is
25		concerned, NIBJ or whoever, they should

1		be concerned with the directors of the
2 3	DEBTOR:	company? That's right.
4	CHAIRMAN:	He said feud or no feud, there were
5		directors of the company and that is the
6		body that controls the company, not
7		family making noise outside.
8	А	Well, Chairman, this goes back to my
9		original position, in the sense that
10		each of these problems had their own set
11		of problems. My report from NIBJ, they
12		could not make any progress because of
13		the difficult position, it was not
14		something I was going to say.
15	CHAIRMAN:	Okay, that's your answer, that's the
16		answer Mr. DEBTOR. I don't think you
17		can take it any further as far as the
18		Minister is concerned. It must be that
19		NIBJ has to be summoned. We will give
20		instructions that they be requested,
21		invited to come. When they do, we will
22		tell you, and you can attend and put
23		those questions to them as you think you
24		should.
25	DEBTOR:	Thank you very much. Thank you very

1 much Mr. Davies. 2 CHAIRMAN: Are there any other persons? 3 DEBTOR: DEBTOR. CHAIRMAN: 4 Your name please. DEBTOR: 5 DEBTOR. 6 CHAIRMAN: I thought -- before you begin, I thought 7 I spoke quite clearly. DEBTOR: I gave a copy to Mr. DePeralto? 9 CHAIRMAN: Perhaps he is getting it typed. When 10 you gave it to him? In the break. 11 DEBTOR: 12 CHAIRMAN: Anyway go ahead. 13 DEBTOR: Dr. Davies, my first question is... 14 CHAIRMAN: And your name you said? 15 DEBTOR: DEBTOR. 16 CHAIRMAN: And you are from? 17 DEBTOR: My first question is... We need to know your standing? You are 18 CHAIRMAN: 19 an innocent bystander, are you a victim? I am a victim of the FINSAC situation. 20 DEBTOR: 21 CHAIRMAN: You were FINSAC'd as I gather is the new 22 word coined. Very well, tell us how you 23 were FINSAC'd? 24 DEBTOR: I ..

Go ahead, just ask the question.

25

CHAIRMAN:

1	DEBTOR:	First I would like to ask where in the
2		world can a business survive on a one
3		hundred percent interest rate, that is
4		the first question I would like to ask.
5	CHAIRMAN:	Well I don't know. You know that is a
6		tendentious question, that is argument,
7		questions for Mr. Davies.
8	DEBTOR:	In 1996 I was charged in excess of one
9		hundred percent on a loan, that is why I
10		want to ask the question.
11	CHAIRMAN:	Let me ask it for you, is there any
12		country in the world that has a regime
13		of how many percent?
14	DEBTOR:	One hundred percent or more. Can a
15		business survive?
16	A	Mr. Chairman, I can't guide you, sir,
17		but is this penalty interest, is this
18		interest rate being negotiated sir, I
19		am having a difficulty, he comes and
20		says - where in the name how can that
21		be related to his person, was this an
22		interest rate negotiated?
23	CHAIRMAN:	Dr. Davies, you know the facts of life,
24		the man is asking a question which I
25		suspect you would appreciate precisely

1		what he is asking you about.
2	A	It would be unless you were involved
3		in very profitable or perhaps illegal
4		activities it would be difficult to
5		survive.
6	CHAIRMAN:	That is the answer, what is the next
7		question?
8	DEBTOR:	When the banks were charging in excess
9		of one hundred percent interest,
10		couldn't you do something to stop them
11		from charging so much?
12	A	No, the financial
13	CHAIRMAN:	The answer is no, what is the next
14		question.
15	DEBTOR:	For example, when a business goes under
16		at that interest rate, could you blame
17		an investor for trying at that interest
18		rate?
19	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry I don't think we heard the
20		question.
21	DEBTOR:	I am saying in excess of one hundred
22		percent interest on a loan, if a
23		business goes under, can you blame the
24		investor?
25	А	No.

1	DEBTOR:	Now the next question is
2	CHAIRMAN:	You know sorry, I mean that is the
3		question being posed but, you know, what
4		the answer is.
5	DEBTOR:	Now, when the business goes under and
6		for example, they repossess the assets
7		of the business and it is sold, first I
8		would say the amount of money that was
9		paid towards the account is more than
10		the initial loan, the person is in
11		arrears, you repossess the assets and it
12		is sold and because of that high
13		interest, after all is put together,
14		money is still outstanding on the loan.
15		Now, how can the investor get money at
16		this stage to go and pay back because
17		there is no business there, there is no
18		asset there, for example whether it's a
19		factory, truck, a bus, it's gone, how
20		can they get some cash to pay?
21	A	Mr. Chairman
22	CHAIRMAN:	That is why you were Minister of
23		Finance.
24	А	Well, Mr. Chairman, as Minister of
25		Finance, I would like some more

1		information before I could start answering
2		this question, I don't know what he borrowed
2		this question, I don't know what he porrowed
3		for, I don't know what his assets were, these
4		questions in vacuo pose a problem for me.
		I am asking a common sense question?
9	A	What business were you?
10	DEBTOR:	The point is the asset was sold.
11	CHAIRMAN:	Did you agree to the loan?
12		Agree to the loan but not to
13		One moment please, questions are not from
14		the other side, what was the question you
15		wanted to ask Mr. Davies. What do you do? The
16		Minister needs some background information
17	DEBTOR: 18	in order to respond, says he.
19		I used to operate a truck that was bought
20		free and clear, and just to borrow some
21		money to buy an engine, go to America and
22		
23		buy the engine and gear box and because of
24		the ongoing
		situation, some work to start, by the time
25		it start it lock down, you work, contractors
		don't pay you or a man crash the truck and
		it keeps spiraling.

1	CHAIRMAN:	It shows that you could not afford it.
2	DEBTOR:	But based on what was paid covered the
3		amount that was initially borrowed but
4		because you are in arrears you start
5		paying 75%, 100%, one hundred and odd
6		percent, I am only saying, they take the
7		thing, they sell it, because of the high
8		interest rate, you have some amount of
9		money left, you don't have no asset to
10		work with, how can you get money to pay
11		that high interest rate, because it is
12		just the interest that is there now.
13	CHAIRMAN:	That is your problem.
14	DEBTOR:	Now, I would just like to ask my last
15		point, just to show a situation, one
16		more question. A loan of \$000,000, they
17		were charging 60% on it. Interest came
18		up and they put the interest on that
19		\$000,000 to make five hundred and odd
20		thousand. They charged me 60% on that
21		because
22	CHAIRMAN:	Who is they?
23	DEBTOR:	The bank, they call that your new
24		principal. Okay. Now more interest
25		accrue on that, come up to \$000,000 and

1		they start charging me 45% on that $\$000,000$.
		Now, the other \$000,000 on it is interest and
2		you are paying 60%, so you are paying 120%
3		there. The interest on that 120% which is
4		\$272,000 that is interest, they are going to
5		charge you 45% on that again, that is about
6		250, 300%. Can a
7		person in that situation
9		come out of that spiral and to date
10		interest is being charged?
11 12	A CHAIRMAN:	Well, I don't think so. Idon't want you to go away feeling that
13		you have not given expression to what
14		you have in the back of your mind,
15		because we feel that the Minister's
16		business is to be concerned with these
17		matters. Unless he is unaware of them,
18		we can't devise instruction, to devise
19		methods to deal with them. First of
20		all, on your behalf, you were not
21		unaware of the sort of situation that
22		DEBTOR speaks about, were you?
23	A	No, I wasn't Chairman, as I indicated, I
24		won't say all, but several of these
25		matters people wrote to me. As a matter

1		of fact, one of my special assistants,
2		that was his main task, to liaise with
3		FINSAC, to send on the complaints, but
4		one of the things which I am saying,
5		that I learnt, that invariably you got
6		part of the story and then there was
7		so people would write to me as if there
8		had been no interaction with FINSAC and
9		I discovered that there were other
10		issues, etcetera, so it was not that I
11		am unaware of them and I know of some
12		which have been resolved. In his case
13		Mr. Chairman, I represent a
14		constituency of poor hard working class
15 16	CHAIRMAN:	people so I am aware But were they FINSAC'd?
17	A	Well they were never privileged to have
18		been able to walk through those doors of
19		those institutions.
20	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, so that is why we are concerned.
21	A	But I am aware of persons faced with the
22		issue of cashflow and the difficulty
23		whenever something unexpected occurs.
24	CHAIRMAN:	What we want to get over is that his
25		example is not atypical, this repeats

1		itself.
2	А	But there have been many which have been
3		resolved; I do not know why his wasn't
4		involved, I don't know which institution
5		he started with, I don't know at what
6 7	DEBTOR:	stage his loan The institution is NCB.
8	CHAIRMAN:	Very well. Anything further. You were
9		responding Mr. Davies.
10	A	He was referring I don't know at what
11		stage his loan came to FINSAC, FIS, I
12		don't know any of that, nor do I know if
13		he wrote to me, if he didn't write to me
14		Mr. Chairman, I don't know, I would not
15		be aware of it.
16 17	CHAIRMAN:	I don't know if the concern so much is with
18		his particulars because you are not
		determining anybody's issues, we are
19		looking at the thing generally, and I think
20		you have to accept that what he has spoken
21		about is representative of the situations
22		that are tied to a great many people. I was
23		trying to get some figures before lunch, but
24		I don't quite figure what he is talking
25		about, I am

1		not clear what it all means.
2	A	I would urge you, using your powers,
3		sir, to also seek from FINSAC the
4		numbers which were resolved.
5	COMM. ROSS:	Dr. Davies, as a matter of policy, could
6		you explain to us why it was necessary
7		to continue accruing interest on the
8		loans once they came into the possession
9		of FINSAC or JRF?
10	A	In case of FINSAC, they just took the
11		systems over, it would have been a
12		policy to they had the flexibility to
13		write down on the interest but it was
14		operational, so I don't think anybody
15		ever was required to pay the full amount
16		in terms of the settlements.
17	COMM. ROSS:	I am still trying to understand, if one
18		of the so called institutions, the
19		banks, were relieved of those loans, it
20		was no longer on their books and
21		presumably they were given an equivalent
22		amount of cash advance, the loans then
23		came into FINSAC and they were passed to
24		JRF, I am just wondering why if the
25		resolution of the debt was an objective,

1		why continue accruing interest at very
2		high rates of interest, forty, fifty,
3		sixty percent?
4	А	I don't know what the rates of interest
5		were, I do not believe if any of the
6		settlements took those interest rates,
7		literally took those interest rates in
8		toto in any of the settlements, any of
9		the offered settlements, but as a matter
10		of policy, FINSAC had flexibility to
11		negotiate down these rates; but again,
12		Commissioner Ross, I do not believe that
13		at the policy level one can
14		micro-manage, there has to be some
15		flexibility given to officers. It's not
16		that the officers were told that unless
17		all the interest is paid up there is no
18		negotiation, they were given that
19		flexibility.
20	CHAIRMAN:	It was your understanding, was it, that
21		the for these institutions by which I
22		mean FINSAC and whatever, JRF, had
23		acquired the loans, that the interest
24		continued to accrue, that is your
25		understanding?

1	A	No, no, what S am saying they would have
2		taken the systems which would have these
3		loans, but Chairman, if you at the same
4		time, if you and I went into any of
5		those institutions at the same time and
6		I became a bad debtor but you maintained
7		your servicing, your interest would have
8		continued to accrue. I don't believe
9		that statement can be that puzzling.
10	CHAIRMAN:	Well it puzzles me.
11	Q	No, no, what I am saying Chairman,
12		Commissioner Ross is asking a question
13		which would suggest is a unique
14		situation, and what I am saying you and
15		I walked in a bank the same day,
16		borrowed the same amount at the same
17		interest rate, you service your debt , I
18		didn't, mine is sold to FINSAC
19	CHAIRMAN:	I follow that.
20	Q	Yes, but I am saying that your interest
21		clock would not have ceased running?
22	COMM. ROSS:	What is the objective of taking the
23		loans from out of the banks, what was
24		the objective of that?
25	А	To leave the banks with an acceptable

1		level of good performing loans which are
2		assets.
3	COMM. ROSS:	And having done so, what was the
4		expectation of what would happen to the
5		bad loans?
6	A	The expectation is to maximize
7		collection from the bad loans, that is
8		why you take the best bid.
9	COMM. ROSS:	And the expectation is that it would be
10		very unlikely to collect?
11	А	By definition, Commissioner Ross, that
12		is what is meant by the bad loans.
13	COMM. ROSS:	So, therefore, there would have to a
14		differentiation between performing and
15		non-performing loans.
16	А	And there was.
17	COMM. ROSS:	That is what we would expect.
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	COMM ROSS:	The question was asked, were there some
2		larger policies that would have
3		facilitated that process taking place
4		in a more expeditous manner?
5	CHAIRMAN:	I am sorry Dr. Davies, if I seem
6		somewhat dim. But we have a financial
7		problem, there is a melt down, the
8		solution is to take out the non-
9		performing loans, I think they call them
10		in America, "toxic" debt. So we leave
11		the bank presumably to continue let
12		me say, going it's merry way and then
13		you give these uncollectible loans to an
14		organization then these bad debts
15		continue to increase it would seem
16		exponentially because of the interest
17		rates, I understand.
18		Speaking as Minister of Finance, how is
19		the financial sector being able to
20		remain stable or do I misunderstand what
21		has been said?
22	А	Chairman, Commissioner Ross, asked
23		whether the interest clock was kept in
24		gear and I am saying that the operation
25		would have taken in systems, covering

	bad loans et cetera. My information is
	that they dealt with each debtor on a
	case by case basis and clearly you wish
	to maximise returns. But virtually I do
	not know of any situation; I could be
	wrong, where what was demanded as the
	settlement was the full amount but the
	negotiations would begin there. So I do
	not know; I don't know believe it would
	be useful to make a big issue of whether
	or not the interest clock is running
	because the situation is that at the
	same time, at the same time, in healing
	the institution the government has taken
	on debt on which itself is paying
	interest.
CHAIRMAN:	Yes.
A	So I am just indicating that there needs
	to be a comparison of the one with
	other. But nobody by definition expects
	to recoup the principal plus all your
	interest. If you are saying well, there
	should be a policy decision which said
	once you took the loan then you would
	eliminate interest, that something we

1		could discuss, but I can tell you, I can
2		assure that wouldn't have made that much
3		difference because most of the damage
4		had been done by definition the
5		damage had been done before FINSAC took
6		the loans or else it would never have
7		reached FINSAC.
8	COMM BOGLE:	Dr. Davies, by your own, almost your own
9		statement implied here, FINSAC took over
10		debt because the debtor could not pay?
11	А	Right.
12	COMM BOGLE:	So rolling interest is a futile
13		exercise? Why send a statement or tell
14		the person that well, we took over one
15		million dollars but now you owe five
16		million when in truth and fact the one
17		million, the person couldn't pay in the
18		first instance. So what was the aim of
19		an added repaymehnt? It was a futile
20		exercise.
21	А	Commissioner, I think we are arguing
22		about what is a none issue. Because
23		it
24	CHAIRMAN:	I am sorry Dr. Davies. If the
25		Commissioner asks the question I don't

1		think it is appropriate to tell him
2		that.
3	3 A	Commissioner, what I am saying is that
4	Į.	the resolution of the issue where the
5		issues were resolved the FINSAC
6		officers; the loan officers; the case
7	1	officers and it could have to go the
8	3	more difficult it is up the line. They
Ş)	had leeway to negotiate settlements and
10		in certain instances they would take
11		these settlements to the Board I am
12		informed. So the running of the
13	3	interest clock it's in a sense neither
14	Į.	here nor there. If you are saying that
15	5	they could have stopped it, I am willing
1 6 1 7		to consider that. I still do not believe that the running
18	3	of the interest clock was immaterial or
19)	not important because of the fact that
20)	when that person who owed a million
21		dollars and FINSAC took over a million
22		dollars and that person calls FINSAC and
23	3	says, "how much do I owe?" FINSAC says,
24	Į.	"Four million dollars". That sends that
25		entrepreneur in a tail spin. "If I

1		couldn't pay the million what am I going
2		to do?" He phones FINSAC, FINSAC says,
3		"Well you have to come up with 'x'
4		percent of this five million".
5	A	With all due respect Commissioner, I
6		don't know if that's the way they would
7		do it. People would go in and discuss
8		their case. And they were asked, what
9		can you offer?
10	Q	With due respect Dr. Davies, there were
11		cases where the persons got information
12		that their debt had moved from 'x' to
13		'y'. For them to start negotiation they
14		had to pay 'x' to 'y' minus a small
15		amount which means that they were still
16		now required to pay much more than what
17		it was before. And this is why I am
18		saying that if the person couldn't pay
19		the one million dollars; it is now five
20		and FINSAC is saying well, the minimum I
21		can take is two million. Yes, they have
22		dropped off but then if the person
23		couldn't pay one, person paying two
24		million it's a futile exercise.
25	A	Commissioner, I hear you, I was never

1		involved in the day to day if FINSAC
2		were here to testify you could direct
3		the questions to them.
4	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry, with respect Dr. Davies; granted
5		that you were not involved, and we are
6		well aware that you could not possibly
7		be involved in the day to day
8		activities, we ask the question because
9		you were aware; you said that; the
10		problems that people were facing and
11		what my colleague Mr. Bogle, has spoken
12		to here, is symtomatic of what was
13		known. The question is, what is your
14		response to the thinking that people are
15		being put in a situation from which
16		there is no light, there can be no light
17		at the end of the tunnel. So what
18		what's the purpose of it all; to kill
19		people? Because that can only be the
20		object.
21	А	But Chairman with all due respect, as I
22		said before I am aware obviously that
23		there are and were cases which were not
24		resolved but there were at the same,
25		cases operating on the same guidelines

1		which were resolved. So I do not know if
2	COMM BOGLE:	I can say anymore. Dr. Davies, you said you do not know
4		what else to say and what I would say
5		at the end of all that, it shows lack of
6		policy direction, lack of direction from
7		the Ministry. The Ministry set up
8		FINSAC without giving it enough or
9		reasonable policy or guideline whereby
10		rehabilitation and healing of the
11		borrowers should be important because we
12		heal and we work towards the healing of
13		the financial institutions but I don't
14		know think that we did enough to work
15		towards the healing of the borrowers
16		that were
17	Α	I accept your point sir, I accept the
18 19	DEBTOR:	view. Yes, Mr. Chairman one last question. One
20		last question and just let me repeat so
21		that he could remember. The 000 loan
22		that they put on another 000 I
23		capitalise it and then the 000,000 on that
24		they are charging me 45% interest on that
		000,000. Is that a legal

1		situation?
2	CHAIRMAN:	Well, you better ask the lawyer that. I
3		don't know if the Minister, sorry,
4		Dr. Davies can answer that.
5	DEBTOR:	I thought that he had set the policy so
6		that they couldn't charge like 300%
7		interest on a loan; the right thing
8		would be legal to put in well, within
9		the policy to charge 300% interest on a
10		loan?
11	DR. DAVIES:	You are talking about presently?
12	Q	No, I am talking about this loan.
13	A	I am not clear how you got to 300%.
14	Q	Okay.
15	A	No, no, I know. Is it that you are
16		looking at your original principal and
17		you are looking at the interest now?
18	Q	It's just a rough thing I am checking.
19	A	No, no, I am ask just asking for
20		clarification, sir.
21	Q	On the original loan.
22	А	So you are taking the original
23		principal?
24	Q	Yes. Roughly 300% on it at this stage.
25		Is that a policy decision, if that's

	the right word, I don't know the right
	word. Okay, a 100%, you couldn't do
	anything about it? If they are charging
	300% on the same loan you couldn't do
	anything about something like that?
A	DEBTOR, I understand your case well
	but that's not really how the
	calculation should go.
Q	So, what you are saying, they have made
	a wrong calculation?
A	No, no, the way you are calculating your
	interest rate it cannot be that your
	original principal is what you referred
	to at all stages.
Q	Well, I have the figures right in front
	of me here. The original principal is
	000,000. There was interest and you are
	in arrears.
A	DEBTOR, I accept that the number
	which you have now obviously you could
	not service that. I am just saying as a
	matter of course, what they did was to
	capitalise interest and they have a new
	principal but if you have retained your
	old principal and you have calculated
	Q A

1		everything else on that basis, I am just
2		telling that their method of
3		calculation, the way they analyse it is
4		different from yours.
5	CHAIRMAN:	That is so DEBTOR, I don't think he
6		quantify that; that is so.
7	DEBTOR:	Thanks.
8	DEBTOR:	Commissioner
9	CHAIRMAN:	Just one moment, please. Your name is?
10	А	DEBTOR. What I want to ask
11		Dr. Davies is
12	CHAIRMAN:	Just before you ask Miss?
13	А	DEBTOR.
14	А	Would you indicate your
15	А	Yes, my husband had a construction
16		company and
17	CHAIRMAN:	You are what is now called a "FINSACED"
18		person?
19	А	A FINSAC victim.
20	CHAIRMAN:	Victim.
21	A	Our account was passed over to FINSAC.
22		What I want to find out from Dr. Davies
23		is what is his definition of a
24		non-performing loan to begin with?
25	А	It's a legal thing. I think it's a loan

1		on which no had payments have been made
2		in three months, I would have to check.
3		They have changed the definition and
4		title I would have to refresh myself on
5		that.
6	А	Okay. My commonsense tells me that a
7		non-performing loan is a loan that's not
8		being paid on. My husband had a
9		construction company. The amounts to the
10		bank were being paid monthly from work
11		in progress. His account was FINSACed.
12	А	By my mistake?
13	Q	You tell me.
14	А	How can I tell you that?
15	Q	We were never called in, given any
16		option to make any negotiation. The
17		first document that we received after
18		the loan was passed over was from
19		Jamaica Redevelopment offering to turn
20		this enormous sum into a US dollar loan;
21		for us to sign an agreement which we
22		never did because it never spell sense.
23		It was a bucket that you could never get
24		out of. As far as I am concerned that
25		was not a non-performing loan. Here are

1		the documents.
2	A	Well
3	Q	Monthly payments were being made.
4	А	Well, I have no knowledge of this but it
5		is well I believe this is a very
6		strange occurrence.
7	Q	It seems strange to me as well.
8		Probably someone had an agenda you
9		think?
10	А	Well, I don't know who. It was turned
11		over from the bank to FINSAC?
12	Q	Yes. It was turned over from the bank.
13	Q	Which bank was that?
14	Q	It was originally with Mutual Security
15		then went to NCB.
16	A	And at each stage the same error was
17		made that you were servicing a loan but
18		it was classified as non-performing?
19	Q	As non-performing. Well, it was handed
20		over; we are assuming, it was classified
21		as non-performing; we were bad debtors.
22	A	It's something which
23	CHAIRMAN:	That is a serious complaint but I am
24		not certain we can put that question to
25		the Minister. We may have to deal with

I		did you say FINSAC? You are certain
2		it is FINSAC?
3	Q	Yes it was the Minister's policy why it
4		was taken from the bank to be given to
5		FINSAC.
6	A	No, with all due respect Chairman, only
7		non-performing loans could be I
8		cannot accept that, sir. How that could
9		that be seen as our policy that
10		performing loans would be transferred to
11		FINSAC?
12	A	We have the documents to prove that.
13	A	Well, if
14	CHAIRMAN:	One second, Minister. This argument is
15		going to get us nowhere. The policy of
16		the fiscal policy or whatever it was
17		relates to non-performing loans. If a
18		mistake is made by the bank I don't
19		think you can attribute that to the
20		Minister and you need to probe a
21		different source, if I may say so. I
22		don't think the questions are being put
23		to the correct he can't give you the
24		answer to satisfy you.
25	Q	Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN:	Because he doesn't know anything about
2		it.
3	Q	Well, let's say the bank
4	CHAIRMAN:	Just one moment, please.
5	COMM ROSS:	Dr. Davies, was any notification given
6		to debtors whose loans were being
7		transferred? Was there any process for
8		that?
9	A	I don't know.
10	DEBTOR:	Not in our case. We were never given any
11		notices from no organization. We were
12		never offered any opportunity to come in
13		to make any
14	CHAIRMAN:	So far as we are aware there didn't seem
15		to be any I don't want to say
16		requirement, but it certainly wasn't
17		done, people weren't told. They woke up
18		one morning got a letter saying you are
19		now a FINSAC character?
20	Q	That's correct.
21	CHAIRMAN:	I don't know if you can attribute that
22		to the Minister though.
23	Q	It's his Policies.
24		(LAUGHTER)
25	CHAIRMAN:	Well, maybe you should identify the

1		policy that you suggest caused it.
2	А	Negligence to begin with.
3	CHAIRMAN:	Minister, when you are Minister you are
4		negligent. Go ahead.
5		(LAUGHTER)
6	Q	I just wanted to point out the fact sir,
7	2	that we don't why it went to FINSAC
8		either but even when the we borrowed
9		ten million dollars; 52 million dollars
		,
10		was repaid, our house was sold for
11		twenty million that's seventy-two
12		million and we are still told we owe
13		eighty-five million.
14	CHAIRMAN:	Yes, those are the facts?
15	Q	Those are the facts, sir.
16	CHAIRMAN:	I am not being difficult. What is the
17		question you want Dr. Davies to answer?
18	Q	How could we survive, what are we to use
19		to pay the eighty-five million dollars
20		that we still owe? Where is it to come
21		from? We can barely eat. This is not
22		endemic to me it is 40,000 business
23		people. Those that were able to
24		negotiate and be cleared, I don't know;
25		I don't know who they are, I don't know

1		of any.
2	CHAIRMAN:	39 thousand for 25 accounts. I don't know
3		but that seems to be the number. The figure
4		we have here is 39 thousand loans were
5		involved. These are the loans; 39 thousand
6		loans were involved. Involved in what, sir?
7	MR. HYLTON: 8	What does that figure represent?
9	CHAIRMAN:	Represent the loans. Accounts they say.
10	MR. HYLTON:	Accounts?
11	CHAIRMAN:	That were transferred.
12	MR. HYLTON:	To FINSAC?
13	CHAIRMAN:	To JRF.
14	MR. HYLTON:	Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN:	Those are the loans.
16	DEBTOR:	Okay, sir.
17	COMM BOGLE:	Which would essentially mean that these
18		accounts were the ones that were not
19		negotiated and agreed under FINSAC because
20		those that were agreed under FINSAC would
21		surely not have been transferred to JRF?
22		Yes. And we were never given an opportunity
23	Q	to come in and negotiate anything at no
24		time. You know, it's not
25		

1		a question, it's a matter of fact.
2	CHAIRMAN:	DEBTOR?
3	Q	Yes, sir.
4	CHAIRMAN:	As presently advised I suspect that
5		those questions may be better put to the
6		JRF people.
7	Q	Okay. I just thought Dr. Davies would
8		have had answers to my questions to
9		FINSAC.
10	CHAIRMAN:	No, I think it's appropriate that if he
11		didn't know before he now knows
12		precisely what it is the policies
1 2		- 5 5 1
13		effected.
13	Q	Yes.
	Q CHAIRMAN:	
14		Yes.
14 15	CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Are there any more questions?
14 15 16	CHAIRMAN: Q	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine.
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN: Q CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine. Have we got any other persons who had
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN: Q CHAIRMAN: DEBTOR:	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine. Have we got any other persons who had Good morning.
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN: Q CHAIRMAN: DEBTOR: CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine. Have we got any other persons who had Good morning. Good morning.
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN: Q CHAIRMAN: DEBTOR: CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine. Have we got any other persons who had Good morning. Good morning. Sorry, are you more comfortable sitting
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN: Q CHAIRMAN: DEBTOR: CHAIRMAN:	Yes. Are there any more questions? No, that is fine. Have we got any other persons who had Good morning. Good morning. Sorry, are you more comfortable sitting because you look pretty uncomfortable to

25 CHAIRMAN: What would you like to say?

1	Q	Yesterday Mr. Davies said there was a
2	CHAIRMAN:	Sorry, you are?
3	Q	Yes. I am a victim of FINSAC.
4	CHAIRMAN:	Of FINSAC?
5	Q	Yes. Dr. Davies said there was a special
6		avenue for people who have residential
7		property and I would like to know if
8		there was any avenue for somebody like
9		me who took out a loan with the bank of
10		\$000,000, it reached to 11 million
11		dollars and my house was sold for
12		\$000,000. I met into an accident and all
13		those information was reported to both
14		the bank and FINSAC and all the groups
15		and yet they sold my house and put me
16		and my family on the street with my
17		little baby grand-daughter who was two
18		months old and everything that I earned
19		was gone. Right now I am living on the
20		bottom of the scale. What provision was
21		made for somebody like me?
22	А	Chairman, it has been said explicitly,
23		and this was given a great deal of
24		publicity; it was discussed in
25		Parliament, it was discussed with the

1		Opposition, the period had extended
2		whereby the housing unit in which the
3		debtor resides would be treated
4		separately so I am kind of surprised
5		that that would have occurred. But this
6		was given a great deal of publicity; it
7		was discussed in the House; it was
8		discussed with the Opposition. I recall
9		distinctly the Opposition asking for
10		extension of the period. If I am not
11		mistaken when the loans were sold, even
12		for those who had requested that, when
13		their loans were sold to JRF they
14		extended that period for six months so
15		this one is puzzling to me.
16	CHAIRMAN:	So it appears to me Mr. Willis, you may
17		have to await the presence of FINSAC
18		people. Mr. Patrick Hylton, whoever
19		comes along. When was your house sold
20		by the way?
21		2005, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN:	I see.
23	DEBTOR:	And I also pay back more than \$1.5M on
24		that account before my house was sold.
25	COMM ROSS:	Dr. Davies, you mentioned that there was

1		a six-month period under JRF where that
2		moratorium had taken place, correct?
3	А	I think that was part-negotiated, that
4		special provision would be granted to
5		residential units in which the debtor
6		resides, it's not someone who is bought.
7	Q	So after July 2002 that provision really
8		was no longer in existence or being
9		honoured?
10	А	I don't know what JRF's Policy was after
11		that period but we offered an
12		opportunity such that the person could
13		pull that out of the collateral.
14	Q	We have a memo here which actually
15		states that the moratorium would exist
16		only until July 2002.
17	А	Yes.
18	COMM ROSS:	So then after that and it appears that
19		DEBTOR'S house was sold after that so
20		it wouldn't have been covered by the
21		moratorium within that period? I guess
22		he wouldn't access it within that
23		period.
24	A	Well,I guess but I don't know from what
25		DEBTOR, said whether he sought to