

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY



CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

THE WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

**VERBATIM REPORT
OF THE PROCEEDINGS**

Tuesday 26th August, 2014

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

30th Hearing

09:37hrs

26th August, 2014

Commissioners:

Sir. Richard L. Cheltenham, K.A., Q.C., Ph.D – Chairman

Mrs. Jacqueline Samuels-Brown, Q.C.

Mr. Seenath Jairam, S.C.

Secretary to the Commission:

Mrs. Nicola Pierre

Counsel to the Commission:

Mr. Glenn Hanoman

Ms. Latchmie Rahamat

Administrator of the Commission Secretariat

Mr. Hugh A. Denbow

Attorneys for the People's National Congress (PNC):

Mr. Basil Williams

Mr. James Bond - (Absent)

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Attorneys for Working People's Alliance (WPA):

Mr. Christopher Ram

Mr. Moses Bhagwan - (Absent)

Attorneys for the Guyana Trades Union Congress (GTUC):

Mr. Brian Clarke - (Absent)

Mr. Selwyn Pieters - (Absent)

Attorney for Dr. Patricia Rodney, Asha Rodney, Shaka Rodney and Kanini Rodney:

Mr. Andrew Pilgrim, Q.C.

Attorney for Donald Rodney:

Mr. Keith Scotland - (Absent)

Ms. Camille Warner

Attorneys for the Ex-GDF (Guyana Defence Force) Association:

Lt. Col. (Ret'd) Joseph Harmon - (Absent)

Mr. Leslie Sobers - (Absent)

Attorney for Captain Gerald Gouveia:

Mr. Devindra Kissoon - (Absent)

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Witness:

Lt. Col. Sydney James

Officers:

Ms. Pamela Binda	-	Editor
Mr. Kristoffer Sundar	-	Assistant Editor
Ms. Shanta Kumar	-	Transcriptionist
Ms. Tricia Peters	-	Transcriptionist
Ms. Karen Mohamed	-	Transcriptionist
Ms. Diane Gobin	-	Transcriptionist
Mr. Sahadeo Ramdular	-	Transcriptionist
Ms. Omunike Pearce	-	Transcriptionist
Mr. Vickram Ragobeer	-	Audio Technician
Mr. Mahendranauth Sanichar	-	Audio Technician
Mr. Rui Constantine	-	Audio Technician

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Chairman [Sir. Richard L. Cheltenham, K.A., Q.C., Ph.D]: Lt. Col. Sydney James, please take the stand, Sir.

Lt. Col. Sydney James: Good Morning.

Mr. Chairman: Good Morning.

[Lt. Col. James entered the witness box and was sworn in]

Counsel to the Commission [Mr. Glenn Hanoman]: Good Morning. Mr. Chairman, inadvertently yesterday, one from the bundle of vouchers that was received by us, we omitted to tender. I now wish to try and do that.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, please proceed to correct the omission.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you. Could I ask you, Lt. Col. James, to have a look at your original vouchers? There is a voucher there that is dated the 10/08/1979 – we can show you a copy of it – in relation to what appears to be 20 arms.

Mr. Chairman: “In relation to what appears to be 20 marks?”

Mr. Hanoman: 20 arms.

Mr. Chairman: 20 arms.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, please. Have you located that voucher?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Would these arms relate... I noticed this is...

Attorney for the People’s National Congress (PNC) [Mr. Basil Williams]: Mr. Chairman, could he identify the voucher? Does it have a page number? I think he had given us 176, onwards. Does that have a number?

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: Lay the foundation.

Mr. Hanoman: Do you see on that voucher the word “Berettas” written in the big space in the top left-hand corner of the document?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: According to this document, do you see that it was issued to the Ministry of National Development? Do you see that on the document?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I do not know if my fellow participants have managed to locate the document.

Mr. Williams: Is that page 178?

Commissioner [Mr. Seenath Jairam, S.C]: Yes.

Mr. Williams: I think that is how he should proceed. That is what we were given.

Mr. Hanoman: Could you just, very quickly, explain to us what your analysis of this document is?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir. This document relates to the initial voucher dated 10/08/79. I am not certain what your reference is, Sir. This was dated 10/08/79. You would see on this document it has “2/2”; it means that this is page two of two and the first document or voucher would be one of two. There are two documents that accompanied this transaction.

Mr. Hanoman: Do you have the first document that should be attached to that?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

[Commissioners were in discussion]

Lt. Col. James: If I can just explain, Sir...

Mr. Hanoman: Could you explain...? You are saying that that is a two-sheet voucher...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: I was saying, Sir, that the 1/2 voucher lists the amount of weapons and this second voucher lists the sale numbers for the 20 Berettas that are listed on the first voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I please ask the assistance of the Witness to show me which voucher he is looking at as voucher number one of two?

Lt. Col. James: This one here.

[Court Marshall handed Mr. Hanoman the voucher]

Mr. Chairman: Just confirm for us that this is not in evidence already, since yesterday.

Mr. Hanoman: I am instructed that this copy of this particular voucher was not given to us, so we will now try to tender it. Could I ask you to...

Commissioner [Mrs. Jacqueline Samuels-Brown, Q.C.]: Before you proceed, just to clear up my own difficulties, are these documents referred to in the witness statement?

Secretary to the Commission [Mrs. Nicola Pierre]: If I may assist, please, Commissioner. These are vouchers that are not expressly referred to. This would be at the witness statement paragraph 15B. There should be two vouchers in support of the statement made by Lt. Col. James at 15B. What has happened is there are vouchers numbered one of two, and two of two, which shows that there are two vouchers; the first one being the numbers of arms, the second one being serial numbers. Inadvertently, only the second piece was submitted, the one with the serial numbers. Mr. James is now producing the original one of one, which has the number of arms. We would like an opportunity to copy that and then assisting Counsel can ask that it be admitted together with page two of two, which shows the serial numbers.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Am I correct that two of two is already in evidence as SCJ 2B.

Mrs. Pierre: No, please.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Is any of those documents in evidence?

Mrs. Pierre: Neither of the documents is in evidence, nothing that supports 15B.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What is SCJ 2B?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Pierre: SCJ 2B is the document containing the serial numbers of the arms issued under SCJ 2A, so 2A and 2B are one of one and two of two.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, Lt. Col. James, in relation to 15B of your witness statement you have spoken about 20 Berettas 9 mm SMGs. Those guns are reflected in the vouchers that you just looked at...

Lt. Col. James: What is the serial number of the statement, Sir?

Mr. Hanoman: 15B.

Lt. Col. James: I will have to see the original voucher, Sir.

[Court Marshall handed the Witness the voucher]

Mr. Hanoman: So, I am asking you to locate the vouchers that are relative to what you are saying in paragraph 15B in respect to 20 Berettas 9 mm.

Lt. Col. James: These are the two vouchers, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: So, there are two vouchers that you have...

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir. As I explained before, the first one reflects the amount, 20 Berettas, 20 cleaning rods, 60 magazines and 20 slings, and the second voucher lists the serial numbers of the Berettas which were referred to in the first voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could you, very quickly, just analyse for us what is contained in those two forms, the date, and to whom it was issued?

Mr. Williams: Now, I would like to see the one of one. I have seen the two of two but I do not know what the one of one is.

Mr. Hanoman: We, ourselves, have now seen it for the first time. We will make available copies as soon as we are able.

Mr. Williams: You never served us about that, no.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: We did not have it.

Mr. Williams: But I have this one here, two of two.

Mr. Hanoman: So we do not have one of one?

Mr. Williams: No.

Mr. Hanoman: We are going to undertake to serve that within minutes, please, if my friend is willing to be a little patient. Yes, can you just read for us what is contained in one of one and one of two?

Lt. Col. James: Okay, Sir. In the first voucher, dated 10/08/79, this was an issue allegedly to Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development. The issue was allegedly done by W. King and Staff Sergeant Caesar. The authority for issue was "FHQ/Q/COORD/11059879". The first sheet of two sheets lists the items as 20 Berettas 9 mm, 20 cleaning rods, 60 magazines, and 20 slings. There is a signature purported to be of W. Skeete on the first voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That reference number that you referred to would be the reference in relation to a written correspondence.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: There is also what appears to be a date below that?

Lt. Col. James: If there is what, Sir?

Mr. Hanoman: A date. You mentioned something sounding like a date just below that reference number.

Lt. Col. James: Well, in the authority for issue, there is a date 09/08/79, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What does that mean, that that is the date of the correspondence?

Lt. Col. James: That is normal standard procedure for coating references in the military, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: No, what I am asking... That reference there is in relation to a written correspondence...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: ...is the date that of the written correspondence?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: In other words, those guns would have been given on the 10th as a result of a letter dated the 9th, the day before?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Our request is for this two-page voucher to be tendered and admitted, and I do not know if we...

Mr. Chairman: What tag are you proposing to put on it?

Mr. Hanoman: Well, SCJ 2... I was wondering if we could put X?

Mr. Chairman: You want to tag it as X?

Mr. Hanoman: Well, it is an omitted document, and we have a sort of chronological....

Mr. Chairman: Okay, unless you...

Mr. Hanoman: We could put 2B (i) as well...

Mr. Chairman: I am happy to be guided by you. You want the document to be tagged and received in evidence...

Mr. Hanoman: I wish to tag it 2B (i).

Mr. Chairman: Yes, well it is received into evidence and so tagged.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you very much. Lt. Col. James, when you left here yesterday you left with an assignment in mind and I think everyone wants to have a good summary of which guns were given to whom and what percentage of those guns were returned. Have you managed to put together any such report?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: And that report was prepared by you?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you willing to vogue for its accuracy?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Do you wish to refer to that report in answering some on the questions posed yesterday?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir. I did circulate to Counsel...

Mr. Chairman: Is it in a form that could have been circulated...?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, please, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: ...so we may more easily follow it?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, Sir.

Lt. Col. James: May I just see the documents before you circulate it please, Sir? The document that I will be referring to has an initial close to the date, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Show it to the witness, please?

[Court Marshall handed the Witness the document]

Mr. Hanoman: Can you tell us what this document is, please, and what date it was prepared?

09:52hrs

Lt. Col. James: Sir, the document was prepared from yesterday to overnight that is why it has today's date. It basically list as the Commission's Chairman directed the issues of weapons to individuals and you would have seen me separate them, each issue, based on the particular designation on the voucher. You have 17 issues of weapons. The first issue relates to an issue of seven Smith and Wesson Pistols.

Mr. Hanoman: And you have attempted to do it chronically as well with respect to date?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir. This issue was allegedly to a Comrade R. Corbin, Permanent Secretary (P.S) of the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). Based upon my examination of records available at the Guyana Defense Force (GDF), seven Smith and Wesson Pistols were issued, three were returned and four are outstanding. You would see me have a percentage outstanding of 2.6%; this percentage outstanding relates to the outstanding amount which is four.

Mr. Hanoman: You mean the percentage of the entire amount?

Lt. Col. James: No, the percentage of the amount that is outstanding which is 155, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Oh, I see.

Lt. Col. James: It is four over 155 multiply by 100, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Lt. Col. James: If I go to the second issue Sir,...

Mr. Jairam: Lt. Colonel, but in terms of that particular issue, it is more than 50%. If you look at it, you categorise them.

Lt. Col. James: No Sir, I was not doing it based on the amount issued, I was doing the percentage outstanding which is four based on the number of weapons outstanding.

Mr. Jairam: Okay, continue.

Lt. Col. James: Which is 155, Sir. With respect to the second issue, Sir, we had an issue of nine Smith and Wesson Pistols on the 19th May, 1966. One was returned, we have eight outstanding again that correlation was 5.2% and this was allegedly issued to Comrade R. Corbin, National Development. With respect to serial three, Sir, 19576 to serial 12, these were issued to Comrade Skeete based on their vouchers at serial three four HK11LMGs were issued, they were all returned, Sir. At serial 4, 19576 eight G3 Rifles were issued, none were returned. Eight are outstanding. With respect to serial five. Sir, 19576 four GPMG were issued, four are returned and we have none outstanding. With respect to serial six, Sir, 19576...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: You are reading a little rapidly, slow down a little please.

Lt. Col. James: Sorry Sir. With respect to serial six Sir, 19576, 20 Barrette sub-machine guns were issued, 16 were returned.

Mr. Chairman: [*Inaudible*]

Lt. Col. James: Well Sir, it is reflected in the person collecting it.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but the persons outside this thing do not know it is reflected in this column.

Lt. Col. James: Well Sir, I was going across the page starting from Serial to Person Collected.

Mr. Chairman: [*Inaudible*]

Lt. Col. James: Very well, Sir. With respect to serial six, I did say serials three to 12 reflected issued to Comrade Skeete. At serial six, this was an issue to Comrade Skeete on the 19th May, 1976, you have 20 Beretta SMG were issued, 16 were returned leaving an outstanding amount of four, Sir. At serial seven, 19576 six 7.62 self-loading rifles were allegedly issued to Comrade Skeete, none were returned and we have an outstanding amount of six. With respect to serial eight, this is an issue to Comrade Skeete dated 13/10/1976, six 0.22 rifles were allegedly issued; none were returned leaving an outstanding amount of six. With respect to serial nine, this an issue again with Comrade Skeete, on the 13th October, 1976, six 0.30 carbines were allegedly issued, none were returned and we have an outstanding amount of six. With respect to serial 11, date the 13/10/1976, this was again an issue to Comrade Skeete. 15 SLR 7.62 were allegedly issued, none were returned and we have 15 SLR Rifles outstanding. With respect to serial 12, this again relates to an issue allegedly to Comrade Skeete, six G3 rifles were issued, none were returned and we have six outstanding.

Mr. Jairam: ...date?

Lt. Col. James: This is 141076 and that is my correction, there should be a hyphen there.

Mr. Chairman: In the instances of three to 12.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir, based on the amounts which were outstanding which are reflected at serial four, four at serial six, six at serial seven, six at serial eight, six at serial nine, six at serial 10, 15 at serial 11 and six at serial 12. Based on those total, and on the calculation which was done, the outstanding amount for Comrade Skeete with respect to serials three to 12 represents 36.7 % of the total 155 outstanding.

Mr. Chairman: But three to 12, the evidence seem to be that they were issued to Skeete in a personal capacity?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, you did mention yesterday that I should relate the particular voucher...

Mr. Chairman: What I am suggesting is what is here. I was not suggesting that anything wrong, but I just want you to confirm that Comrade Skeete three to 12 as opposed to 13 to 16 he received the weapons on behalf of the Ministry of National Development.

Lt. Col. James: Ministry of National Development, yes that is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: But of course you still have not found the other records which would indicate whether or not the weapons were issued this Comrade Skeete in any official capacity?

Lt. Col. James: No Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What we can say is that there is no record on the vouchers indicated that he received them on behalf of an official organisation.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: If I can continue, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I just want to know Comrade Skeete whether any enquires be made whether he is still around?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: In my earlier testimony based on intelligence sources, he is still around and available.

Mr. Chairman: He is still around?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir.

Mr. Chairman: And stand firm? He can be around and be bed ridden and disabled, that is what I mean when I asked whether he is standing firm.

Lt. Col. James: I understand that to mean he is mobile.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Lt. Col. James: I am not certain, Sir. With respect to serial 13, serials 13 to 16, these relate to alleged issues of weapon to Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development. At serial 13, 10879, 50 model 10, 9 mm pistols were allegedly issued to Comrade Skeete, the Ministry of National Development. 13 were returned leaving a balance of 37. With respect to serial 14, again allegedly and issued to Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development dated 10/8/79. 20 Beretta sub-machine guns were allegedly issued 17 were returned leaving an outstanding amount of three. At serial 15, 10879, 15 M70 assault rifles were allegedly issued to Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development. 14 were returned, leaving a balance of one. At serial 16, again an issue allegedly to Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development dated 10/8/79. Five M72 light machine guns were allegedly issued, four were returned, leaving a balance of one. Again, based on the total for the outstanding amount, more than 27.1% of the weapons which are outstanding were allegedly collected by Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development. At serial 17, this allegedly was an issue of Comrade Skeete for a National Development, the date is 06/07/78 and allegedly 50 Model 10, 9 mm pistols were issued, six were returned leaving balance of 44 and again, this issue represented 28.4% of the total 155 which is currently outstanding based on the issue. If you turn over the document, I have summarised, based on the names and designations from one to five the amount of weapons which were issued allegedly to those individuals. If you would permit me Sir, Comrade R. Corbin, Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister, seven; Comrade R. Corbin, National

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Development, nine; Comrade Skeete, 81; Comrade Skeete, Ministry of National Development, 90; and Comrade Skeete for National Development, 50.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, if you permit me a few observations, if I can direct you...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am very sorry, just before you proceed, following up on the Chairman's question, I am just making sure I have it correct here. I see on the last occasion you were here, you gave evidence in relation to this Comrade Skeete. You had carried out investigations which indicated that was an employee of the Ministry of National Mobilisation. Am I correct?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you. [*Inaudible*] Records here that I am looking at, the transcript says, "National Mobilisation". Is that correct?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, but it is National Development, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: National development

Lt. Col. James: Is that correct.

Mr. Hanoman: If I can direct your attention to the date, the 19th May, 1976.

Lt. Col. James: You are talking about serial seven, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: I did interrupt because following up on the exchange with the fellow Commissioner [*inaudible*] whether you knew the position that he held in the Ministry of National Development?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot ascertain, Sir. I did not make that inquiry.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it correct for me to suggest that on the 19th May, 1976 both Comrade Corbin, National Development and Comrade Skeete collected guns from the Army on that same day?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, based on the records I have in my possession and the investigations I carried out.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: That Corbin and Skeete on the same day collected guns from the Army?

Lt. Col. James: Again Sir, based on the issue vouchers I found at the issuing agency. I would have to say yes. Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, you have mentioned also that a number of the arms or weapons were returned. Is there any record in existence at the moment that can tell you when those guns were returned?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I have a record which indicates that the weapons were returned however it is deficient [*inaudible*].

Mr. Hanoman: So you are unable to say whether they were returned after Burnham came out of power or before?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I am not able to say the exact time they were returned based on the record.

10:07hrs

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And that is the Special Stores Register that you told us about yesterday. Is that the record you are referring to?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Jairam: But what about the AB561?

Lt. Col. James: Well Sir, I did walk with that ledger, but it is deficient of that information.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The Special Stores Register, am I correct that that was the eight-page document that was admitted into evidence yesterday consisting of extracts from that register?

Lt. Col. James: No, Ma'am that is the Special Stores Register.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Yes, the Special Stores Register.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Ma'am.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The Special Stores Register does have a column for dates to be inserted...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...but those dates are not noted as it relates to the return of the weapons.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: The document that you spoke about yesterday, the AB561?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Dates of return are supposed to be recorded in that document as well.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Your research is that no dates were referred to in that document...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: ...with respect to these items?

Lt. Col. James: Well, Sir, those items were not listed in the AB561 as being issued.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I ask that the document that is dated 26th August, 2014, just referred to by this witness concerning the amount of weapons issued, be tendered and marked as an exhibit in this case? The suggestion is that it could be tagged as SCJ 5.

Mr. Chairman: *[Inaudible]*

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, please.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it is received and so tagged.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, just to sum up this document, I noticed you did not work out what was the percentage of guns given and the total percentage – you did not total it up – returned.

Lt. Col. James: Sir...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: We have done some quick calculations...

Lt. Col. James: Sir, the total that was issued was 237. The amount that was returned was 82.

Outstanding are 155 weapons, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: We have done some quick calculations and it is showing that 65.4%.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry Counsel; I did not get the figure outstanding.

Lt. Col. James: The figure outstanding, Sir, is 155 weapons of 237 issued.

Mr. Chairman: Thanks.

Mr. Hanoman: Well I am suggesting to you that 65.4% of the guns that we handed out were not returned. We have done those calculations. Do you not wish to dispute that?

Lt. Col. James: I did not do the calculation as to the total percentage outstanding, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. James I did observe here that it would appear that Comrade Skeete had guns issued to him in his personal capacity on ten occasions. Only on two occasions were there returns. Was that borne out by the...

Lt. Col. James: Based on the information that was available to me, Sir, that is correct.

Mr. Hanoman: May I proceed please, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I did not know whether you were attaching any significance to that or whether...

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, I plan to deal with that issue now please.

Mr. Chairman: I do not know whether the witness is the right person that can help you there, but that struck me as significant.

Mr. Hanoman: Now your research investigations and analysis with regards to these outstanding guns go back as far as 1976, is that correct?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I did not get to make the contrasting point, but I leave it to you to make it. On the occasions when he received the guns on behalf of the Ministry of National Development, on each occasion, an amount was returned as opposed to the occasions when he received them in his personal capacity. Only on two of the ten occasions were there returns. You may or may not regard it of any significance but I thought I should mention it.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Sir. Now, have you during that period, dating back as far as 1976 come across any policy that permits the GDF to give guns to an individual as opposed to an organisation or a unit?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: In your own analysis when dealing with the question of guns being given to Smith, that individual name, you have grouped him under the broad classification of an external organisation. Is it that you have...?

Mr. Chairman: You mentioned Smith, are you referring to...?

Mr. Hanoman: I am sorry, "Skeete". Did I say "Smith"?

Mr. Chairman: We all thought we were not seeing well here.

Mr. Hanoman: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: It caused us great concern.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, in your analysis of these guns being given out to external agencies, you have places "Skeete" and "W. Skeete" or "Comrade Skeete"; you have mentioned him and categorised him as an external agency?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Is that because you are associating Comrade Skeete with the Ministry of National Development?

Lt. Col. James: This was based on other vouchers as reflected from serials 13 to 16 which suggested that he was an employee of the Ministry of National Development, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see. So when you look at the vouchers that have Skeete connected to the Ministry of National Development and you look at the vouchers that have Skeete's name alone, do you notice a similarity of signatures...?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, that is what I was...

Mr. Hanoman: ...in both of those sets of vouchers?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: What inference are you asking us to draw from the similarity of signatures?

Mr. Hanoman: The inference that you have drawn is that whenever guns were issued to Skeete, the individual, that that would have been an issuance to the Ministry of National Development.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir, and...

Mr. Williams: That is erroneous for him to draw that. The document does not say that.

Mr. Hanoman: We are speaking about inferences so I do not know what could be erroneous.

Mr. Chairman: Yes but is it reasonable to draw the inference? A man could be helping himself and he is then working for an organisation and it is the same signature, so when he is helping himself he is giving the same signature as when he is drawing on behalf of the organisation.

Mr. Hanoman: Those inferences might be up to yourself to draw, please, if they are reasonable or not.

Mr. Chairman: I would need your help at the appropriate time but I agree with Mr. Williams that the inference you are drawing does not follow reasonably from the fact...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Very well. I...

Mr. Chairman: ...of what we would experience...

Mr. Hanoman: ...will attempt to develop it.

Mr. Chairman: ...so at the appropriate time we would want to hear you and the inference.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well. Is it also a practice that has been going on since 1976 in the Army that whenever guns are given to an organisation there is some identifiable person that is authorised to sign on behalf of that organization on collecting guns?

Lt. Col. James: As far as I am aware, Sir, in the correspondence that would follow from an organisation requesting weapons from the Guyana Defense Force and here I referred to a Joint Services Organisation, because I am not familiar with issues to other organisations, I think the letter would also dictate who the person is that is so authorised to collect the weapons.

Mr. Hanoman: Let me put it another way...

Mr. Chairman: I am not following the answer you gave, please.

Lt. Col. James: What I am saying, Sir, is that...

Mr. Chairman: What question are you answering? We want to be clear.

Lt. Col. James: What I am saying, Sir, is in the authority which would be provided to the issuing unit for, let us say a Joint Services Organisation, that correspondence would state who is the person so authorised to collect weapons on behalf of the organisation he is collecting weapons for, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: You are dealing with the correspondence which would be provided. I am talking about the correspondence that was provided.

Lt. Col. James: I am saying that correspondence that is provided, Sir...

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: ...based on my own research...

Mr. Chairman: The other one might mean “ought to have been provided” and I want to know what actually happened.

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I cannot say for what would have occurred in 1976...

Mr. Chairman: Yes the period...

Lt. Col. James: ...I am speaking about what I am familiar with, currently, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And it is that officer who is authorised by the correspondence to sign who would inscribe their signature on the Issue and Receipt Voucher as receiving it.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Williams: Could we go that over again, please?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The question was referring to the voucher itself, the second item in this left hand column and the question was whether the person named in the correspondence, or the person who would have been named in the correspondence as the officer authorised to receive the arms, would be the person who would be expected to sign in the section marked “signature” as the person receiving the items and his answer was “yes”. Thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Even within the army framework, if arms were to be given to a Unit, there would be somebody in that Unit that would have the authority to sign for those arms, some individual person, is that correct?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, in the correspondence that would be sent from the Unit to the Chief-of-Staff requesting the issuance of weapons to that unit, it would designate who the officer is or other rank so designated to sign to collect the weapons on behalf of that Unit, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: So the consignee will always be an organisation and there would be an authorized person that could sign on behalf of that consignee, is that correct?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: But, Lieutenant Colonel, I am a little concerned because reviewing the vouchers, the Issue and Receipt Vouchers, and whoever wants to get more particular on this may do so, there are a number of them in relation to which there is no signature. Is it because they relate to the serial numbers, they are the companion vouchers to the ones which are signed, am I correct?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So just to be clear, a lot of these vouchers will have just a general description of the weapons being issued and then they are accompanied by another voucher which has the serial numbers and on the one with the general description of the weapons being issued you would have the signature of the receiving officer?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Alright, I just want it to be clear for the records, thanks.

[Commissioners were in discussion]

Mr. Hanoman: According to your analysis, as contained in that exercise we just went through with regards to Skeete, Corbin and the National Development and guns being given out, do you agree that in some way Skeete was a regular recipient of a considerable amount of arms and ammunition?

Lt. Col. James: Based on the records, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

10:22hrs

Mr. Hanoman: You agree that it therefore is quite possible that he would have become well-known to the persons issuing firearms?

Lt. Col. James: That is also correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Are you suggesting that that was any basis for departing from the strict procedure that every time you get arms, you should stifle?

Mr. Hanoman: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I think you need to make the assumptions very clear. You will get ahead, you are following a point because your questions might have suggested that it was alright since I was a regular coming for arms at times, give me arms before insisting on the signature and the capacity of which [*inaudible*].

Mr. Hanoman: I have brought that out to suggest that because he was so regular, they may not have filled out the forms as comprehensively as they should.

Mr. Chairman: What you are pointing there is a great departure from standards of proper conduct...

Mr. Hanoman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: ...in relation to these matters. You are giving out large of arms and the person collecting the arms are not made to sign for them and in what capacity.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Just to be clear though, he did sign, is just that it does not say that he was collecting on behalf of an institution. Am I correct, Officer?

Lt. Col. James: I would assume so, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Yes, and I think I may have created a misunderstanding in the public's mind, the master voucher is always signed, it is the one that has the particulars where the serial numbers that is accompanied that is not signed. Am I correct?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am just trying to make sure I have not misled.

Mr. Chairman: What I want to know from you, Sir, is whether in reviewing the document you found any irregularities in relation to the weapons issued to Mr. Skeete or to any other organisation; well some he received seemingly in his own capacity, some seemingly with the Ministry of National Development. Were there any irregularities?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir, there were a number of irregularities on some of the vouchers.

Mr. Chairman: That is what I would like you to draw to the attention.

Lt. Col. James: I would have to refer to...

Mr. Chairman: No, feel free, that is why you have it there.

Lt. Col. James: ...I am not certain how Counsel have them listed.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: May I suggest that we go through the Exhibits that were admitted in evidence one by one yesterday, in the order they were admitted, refer to them by Exhibit number and ask the Witness to indicate whether they are any irregularities on those particular vouchers as we go through them.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Ma'am.

Mr. Chairman: That might be a comfortable way of doing it, Sir?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct.

Mr. Hanoman: If we could start with the first two vouchers we have tendered and marked SCJ 2A and SCJ 2B which is dated the 10th August, 1979 and deals with 50 Model M Pistols. That is a two-page...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: ...voucher. Do you notice any irregularities on that two-page voucher?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Personally, the procedures, the Issuing Officers, they should affix their regimental number, the Rank is there and they should also affix their first name. With respect to the ...

Mr. Chairman: The regimental number and what you say?

Lt. Col. James: ...the regimental number and their first names. With respect to the person signing, what you see here is a signature, but what the procedure details is that the person writes his name in cursive letters, so you know for example, what is the correct name. If for example, it was a member of the Guyana Defense Force signing as collecting the weapons, he would have affixed his number, Rank, first name and surname, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Officer, you turned sideways to face us a while ago and we lost, you said if it were an Army Officer, he would have affixed his name, his Rank and you said a third...

Lt. Col. James: His number, regimental number, Rank, first name and surname, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: And regimental number?

Lt. Col. James: That is the first one I called, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Yes, I was not asking you to face us, I was just telling you when you turned your face away from the microphone, we lost some of it.

Lt. Col. James: Very well, Ma'am. Similarly, the person, the weapons were allegedly issued to instead of Comrade Skeete, it should have his full name, whether it was Wilfred Skeete or whatever is his name. On these particular two vouchers, there is the Authority for Issue which, based on my experience, seemed to have been a Correspondence that was referred to. So other than those discrepancies members of the Commission, I would say these vouchers...

Mr. Hanoman: No, under Authority for Issue, is it correct for them to just list the reference number of the Correspondence or there were supposed to have a name there as well?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir because if we were to, let us say this was around 1979, we or the investigation or the Investigator should be able to retrieve this document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: [*Inaudible*]

Mr. Hanoman: To have this Correspondence reference on this date there would have been the regular way of doing it in 1979?

Lt. Col. James: I would assume so because that is the way it is currently done presently, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see. Just to be clear; is it also correct that these Issuing and Receipt vouchers are prepared in triplicate forms?

Lt. Col. James: That is also the procedure, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: On the original form would bear the signature of the Consignor or which would be the GDF?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, it is prepared in triplicate so if you sign on the original copy, the signature is reflected on the duplicate and triplicate copy, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I am looking at the...there is a note at the bottom of these Issuing Receipt vouchers that states that on original and triplicate forms the stamp and signatures will be those of the consignor and on the duplicate forms, those of the consignee. In other words, these forms that bears the signature of the persons to whom the guns were issued, this would be the duplicate forms that we have here.

Lt. Col. James: No, well, Sir, in my investigation I did check to see if those were duplicate forms, however, based on the markings at the back of the Issue vouchers it seems to have been written singularly and not in triplicate, Sir. There is no evidence that carbon was used in the preparation of those Issued vouchers, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: My understanding is that there is no evidence that the forms were made out in triplicate?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What I wanted to point to, the fact that the forms that we have, purported to have the signatures of the consignees or the recipient of these weapons. If there were ever three forms existing, what we would have here is the duplicate one as opposed to the original and triplicate one.

Lt. Col. James: The original and the triplicate one also, Sir because the Consignee would collect the original Issue voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: The signature of the person authorised by the GDF to sign these forms would be on the original and the triplicate?

Lt. Col. James: The duplicate and the triplicate, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: If you look at the bottom of the form, they say “on the original and triplicate forms, the stamp and signature will be those of the consignor”. That is the person in the GDF, right?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That is the original and the triplicate and on the duplicate form it must be those of the consignee, the person receiving the weapons which in this case is Skeete?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: As a matter of fact, in relation to all the vouchers that you have submitted to us, it purports to have the signature of the recipient of the weapons?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Do you mean the consignee?

Mr. Hanoman: Or the consignee?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well and you have been unable to locate the original or triplicate relevant to these duplicates?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: As I did indicate earlier, Sir, based on my examination of the vouchers, it did not seem to have produced duplicate forms. There is no evidence of any carbon being used, if you look at the back of all the vouchers, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Cannot these duplicate and triplicate forms be prepared without carbon?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: You are talking about the triplicate...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...you are saying there is not triplicate...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...as far as your examination show...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...but there were duplicates. There were duplicates?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot say, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What do you have there, the original?

Lt. Col. James: I have what I considered to be original for all the transactions, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: You do not know if there was either a first or second copy for these?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: You do not know, there maybe, but you do not know?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I see, thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it not possible, sorry, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: [*Inaudible*]

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: I am trying to pursue it, Sir. Is it not possible for somebody to have...can you not have an original duplicate and an original triplicate? In order words, when you are preparing these three forms you write on each of the three forms as opposed to using a carbon to produce these three forms. Is that not possible as well?

Lt. Col. James: It is possible, Sir, but the Issue vouchers are normally prepared in triplicate, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: When you say prepared, you mean by using a carbon?

Lt. Col. James: It is like a book, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Do they have different colours?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir, you have white, green and yellow, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: The green vouchers, is it in that order, so the green vouchers is related to duplicates?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What you have in your possession, are green vouchers?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, but what I was saying, Sir, I examined the back of all of the Issue vouchers and there was no indication that they were duplicate.

Mr. Hanoman: What you are seeing on the green voucher, is original handwriting as opposed to what appears to be a carbon copy of the handwriting?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry; may I just have the opportunity to look at any of the vouchers that have been put in evidence?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

[Court Marshall handed over the Witness's copy of vouchers to Mrs. Samuels-Brown].

Mr. Hanoman: These vouchers that you have, they do not run in any sequential order or numbering?

Lt. Col. James: It should run in sequence from the first to the last Issue voucher in the booklet, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: No, what I mean, when you have a book of vouchers with these triplicates inside of it, are these vouchers assigned in any chronological numbering system?

Lt. Col. James: It should be used chronologically, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: No, like voucher number one to voucher number 500, do you understand?

Lt. Col. James: I do not think I understand your question.

Mr. Hanoman: Is there a written record on the voucher itself that can tell us, in order words, for you to see if some have been pulled out and so on, from a book?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, on the front cover of the voucher, it is normally a cover and it lists the vouchers that are inside the booklet, let us say one to 10...

Mr. Hanoman: I see.

Lt. Col. James: ...or whatever number to the last voucher inside the Issue voucher book, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Those would not appear on those green duplicate copies, those numbers?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I am not certain what would have occurred in 1979, but the current voucher system has the numbers of all three of the, original, duplicate and the triplicate, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You did not find the book of vouchers that those vouchers would have been torn out from?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, all I found was these vouchers in the file, Sir. I did not find any book or so, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: If you look carefully there, you are not seeing that some of them are green and some white and often the white relates to the green?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: That is not evidence then at least it was prepared in duplicate, you are with me? If I had a transaction on a particular date and it is now reflected here in the documents you have found a green copy and a white copy, is that not an indication that at least it was prepared in duplicate?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, based on, if you look at the individual voucher, it seemed to have been, I would say, a haphazard preparation on those vouchers. White copies used, green copies used, etcetera, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: When the white and the green relate to the same transaction, at least more than one copy was prepared provided?

Lt. Col. James: I would have to say, yes.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Just to get it clear, from what I am seeing here from the originals you have given to us, the green copies that we have all have original pen writing on them. There are two white copies, one for the 18th, I think it is the 5th or 8th, 1976 and one for the 19th of the 5th, 1976. Those are the two white vouchers and the writing on them is clearly on the one for the 18th is by a carbon copy and the one under the one for the 19th is original pen writing. Since you are going to take back these documents with you to the records of the Army, I just wanted it to be on record...

10:37hrs

Lt. Col. James: Very well, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...that generally we have green vouchers which have original pen writing on them, there are two white vouchers one for the 18th May, 1976, and that has carbonised writing on it, and another white voucher for the 19th May, 1976, which has original pen writing on it. I just wanted that to be on the record. There are other white vouchers to the

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

back and if the Counsel wants to explore and make sure that we know which of the Exhibits are white and which are original or white with carbon or green with original or carbon writing he may do so.

Mr. Hanoman: Before we were legitimately side tracked, we were in the process of going through each voucher to look for irregularities, could I ask you to continue that exercise, please?

Lt. Col. James: Are you...

Mr. Chairman: I thought that your language was unfortunate.

Mr. Hanoman: Well, "side tracked", by itself, sounds so bad so it was a "relevant side track".

Mr. Chairman: That too was unfortunate. *[Laughter]*

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead, please.

Lt. Col. James: Are you finished with the first two vouchers, Sir, the description I gave you?

Mr. Hanoman: I think you just dealt with the first two-page voucher so if we could move on to the second... This would be (i) SCJ 2B...

Mr. Chairman: I do not think, Counsel, that you appreciated what was happening. The Witness did make a statement that he found no evidence that the forms were made in duplicate or triplicate. It would suggest that there was some serious irregularity in the manner in which it was recorded, the issuance of the arms. In truth and in fact, there were some instances where we found two documents, a white and a green, relating to the same transaction, so it is an amendment to the earlier view that was expressed by the Witness so it is important, but you thought that it was side tracking. Anyhow, get ahead.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What I was suggesting, Counsel, is that perhaps you should examine the originals and I was pointing out that some documents have original writing, some have carbonized writing, some are green and some are white and since we have them in evidence and since we will not have those originals, it may be useful for you to identify by virtue of the exhibit

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

numbers, which are green and in original, which are white and which are in carbonized writing and vice versa. That was just a suggestion I was making.

Mr. Hanoman: I will, of course, be guided very fully by those suggestions. Perhaps with the first two-page voucher that you have looked at, you can also tell us if that voucher is green and has original writing on it.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, he could simply adapt what Madame Commissioner is saying.

Mr. Chairman: Unfortunately, I do not think that they were paying attention, but let us get ahead.

Mr. Williams: No, what Madame Commissioner was saying is that she has noted that there are originals and green, in two whites you have one original pen writing, that is on the 19th, the 18th has carbon, so I do not think that he is disputing that because those things are there; he just has to adopt it. He has to address on it when the time comes, but it does not change... For him to now go back through him to ask if that is true or not, it would not make sense.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: There are some others at the back, some white ones at the back, perhaps he could proceed as he was before and during the break take an opportunity to look at them so that he can examine the witnesses in an expeditious way on it.

Mr. Chairman: Counsel, I think you have gotten wise suggestions from two sources. Very well...

Mr. Hanoman: Which two sources, please, Sir? Because I am being asked to do it in block from one source and from the Commissioners I have been asked to do it individually in this way so I am not sure what you are referring to, please, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Okay, all I am saying is that it does not change what the witness is saying, that the vouchers he examined were done haphazardly.

Mr. Chairman: You get ahead, Counsel.

Mr. Hanoman: The first...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: It may be wise to consult your own colleagues from time to time too. Get ahead.

Mr. Hanoman: The first two page voucher that you looked at, is it green in colour and has original writing on it?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is there any evidence that any carbon copy was made from that voucher?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could we look at the voucher now that we have now tagged as SCJ 2B(i) which comprises one of two and two of two, two sheets?

Mr. Jairam: We have not been provided with the one as yet.

Lt. Col. James: If I may give my analysis of the next two vouchers...

Mr. Hanoman: First of all, is it green in colour?

Lt. Col. James: It is green in colour.

Mr. Hanoman: Does it have original writing on it?

Lt. Col. James: Both of them have "pen handwriting" on them.

Mr. Hanoman: They have what?

Lt. Col. James: "Pen handwriting".

Mr. Hanoman: Original? Is it original?

Lt. Col. James: It seems to be original, Sir, even though there is some evidence of pencil writing on the first voucher, in the Corner.

Mr. Hanoman: And the pencil writing is in relation to what?

Lt. Col. James: I am not certain, Sir. This does not seem related to the transaction on the two vouchers.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, do you notice any irregularities on that...?

Lt. Col. James: Again, Sir, as I described the first two vouchers, the authority for issue seems to have been a correspondence which should be standard in this kind of transaction. The weapons were allegedly issued to Comrade Skeete of Ministry of National Development and I did say earlier, that the procedure is the first name and surname of the person receiving the weapon should be on the voucher. I did say, also, that the person receiving the weapon should reflect their regimental numbers, their rank, their first name and surname. This is deficient...

Mr. Hanoman: And those are absent.

Lt. Col. James: This is deficient with respect to just the rank and the surname for both W One King and Staff Sergeant Caesar, Sir. Again, with respect...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Sorry, the rank is there but not the regimental number?

Lt. Col. James: The regimental number is not there and...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: ...the first name, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And the first name.

Lt. Col. James: With respect to the signature I, again, did say that, notwithstanding the signature, there should be cursive writing to indicate the first name and surname of the person collecting the weapons. Those characteristics are similar for the second part of the voucher, sheet two of two, Sir. This is with respect to the voucher dated 10th August, 1979, for 20 9 mm Beretta pistols, 20 cleaning rods, 60 magazines and 20 slings, allegedly issued to Comrade Skeete, Ministry of National Development by W1 King and Staff Sergeant Caesar, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: The next voucher that I am asking you to look at is dated 10th August, 1979, and we have it marked as SCJ 2C and refers to 15 M70 assault rifles, et cetera.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: Counsel, do you want to explore, at the appropriate moment, the implications of these departures from what would be regarded as the proper...?

Mr. Hanoman: Very well, Sir.

Lt. Col. James: I would say that it is a breach of the logistic standing operating procedures because the analysis I gave you or the information that is deficient on the issue vouchers, should have been on the issue vouchers.

Mr. Chairman: Apart from that, is there any broader implication in the sense that when Skeete received and seemingly signed in his individual capacity, is there any evidence that the Party got or the Ministry got the guns as opposed to Skeete himself doing what he liked with them? Perhaps he is not the right person to answer that but...

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, did I hear correctly? Did you ask him whether the Party got...?

Mr. Chairman: No, I withdrew that and I said it was the Ministry.

Mr. Williams: Oh, I thought I heard you say whether the Party got...

Mr. Chairman: I did say that I am correcting that. *[Laughter]* There is nothing wrong with your ears, Mr. Williams, nothing at all. What are the implications? You see, the evidence is not important in terms of the departures; it is the impact and implications that we are concerned about. You often do it at superficial levels. We want to know what the practical implications are. He may or may not be able to help us but it is worth asking.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: But you may do it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Hanoman: At the end, yes. I think that you are looking at the form that deals with the M70 Assault Rifles.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is that a green form?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Does it have original penmanship on it?

Lt. Col. James: It has original pen writing on it and there is no evidence that a duplicate was prepared, Sir, based on an examination of the back of the voucher. This voucher is dated 10th August, 1979, and purportedly details the issue to a Comrade Skeete from the Ministry of National Development by W One King and Staff Sergeant Caesar.

On this voucher there is an authority for issue FHQ-COORD-1105, dated 9th August, 1979, which suggests that there was an authority for the issue of these weapons and accessories, Sir. Again, as I would detail to the Commission, similar discrepancies... The person the weapons are issued to is deficient of his first name and the issuing officers, W1 King and Staff Sergeant Caesar, the voucher is deficient of their regimental numbers and first names and, again, the signature for the person collecting the weapon, notwithstanding the signature, it is a requirement for him to write his name legibly, Sir. This is not on this voucher, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: Lt. Col., may I ask you, the reason why you are focusing on the absence of the regimental number, is it because when one joins the Army a unique number is assigned to that person and that is how you distinguish the “Kings”? You may have many “Kings” and many be Warrant Officer 1 and Staff Sergeant Caesar, so by the omission of the regimental number you see it as a very key omission?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: I think I am finished with this voucher, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I was going to make the point later on but the notation did mention that there should be a stamp and from my examination of the documents, tell me if I am correct, but so far...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...there is no stamp, even with the notes...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am. All the vouchers I have gone through; the three vouchers are deficient of the unit stamp and in this instance it would be the Issuing Unit or the Unit responsible for the arms and ammunitions, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Just for the record, I think the requirement for a stamp to be placed on the vouchers deals with the original and triplicate vouchers which has to bear the stamp of the consignor, is that correct?

Lt. Col. James: This stamp relates to the issuing unit, Sir. It says, Standard Unit Stamp.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Some copies should have the consignor's stamp and some copy should have the consignee's stamp. Is that what is noted at the bottom, officer?

Lt. Col. James: Well, I understand what is written at the bottom...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: No, just what is written at the bottom, I am dealing with.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: In practice, it normally is the Issuing Unit because if I can give an explanation, a unit coming to collect arms would not walk with their unit stamp.

Mr. Williams: What is that? A Unit coming to collect would not walk with the stamp?

Lt. Col. James: Well, it is not stamps that you put on, let us say, a postage document. It is a stamp...

Mr. Williams: ... the seal, a rubber stamp.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, that is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: And you are saying that the receiver or the consignee would not walk with such a stamp?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, because the unit stamp is peculiar to the Commanding Officer, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The stamp is peculiar to the Commanding Officer?

10:52hrs

Lt. Col. James: The Commanding Officer of that particular unit; for example....

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So really, you are talking about the practice when the issue is internal, because if you are issuing it to an external body and they should have a stamp; are you saying that their practice too would be that they would not come with their stamp from Ministry of National Development?

Lt. Col. James: Not that I know of. I do not want to use “Ministry of National Development” but for example the Guyana’s Police Force, they would not come with a Guyana’s Police Force’s stamp.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Yes, but...

Lt. Col. James: The stamp that is affixed is the issuing unit, Ma’am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Williams: I do not know if I could come in, Mr. Chairman, at this point. I think it is a good point raised by Madame Commissioner. I do not think this Coroner could speak for the Ministry. This form says that the receiver/consignee must have a stamp. If it was the Ministry, the Ministry must have had a stamp. You could speak, because you said you are restricting your views to the joint services. You are not really familiar with arms to external agencies.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: But you have given your specific references to the joint services, not in external agencies. So, I could understand why you are saying that.

Mr. Hanoman: Just in an effort to try to clear that up, it is your experience that presently as well as before you became –because your research has dated as far back as 1976, and you have looked

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

at many, many vouchers - is it correct that whomever receives weapons, whomever is the consignees of these weapons, is it not the practice for them not to stamp, but just to sign?

Lt. Col. James: As far as I am aware, Sir, the stamp is affixed by the issuing unit on the vouchers.

Mr. Hanoman: By the issuing. The person receiving whether externally or within the GDF, it is not normal for them to put a stamp?

Lt. Col. James: I have not seen that in my research, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Mr. Jairam: Lt. Col., let us go back to the foot note. It says, "Original and triplicate forms, the stamp and signature will be those of the consignor" let us pause there. As I understand that note, the original and the triplicate will be signed by the GDF.

Lt. Col. James: Well, it says stamp and signature, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: And signature, right.

Lt. Col. James: I suspect a signature might suffice.

Mr. Chairman: *[Inaudible]*

Mr. Jairam: You see, to take it to the store, it is an authentication. So they would want to see a stamp, an official document. Not something of somebody just scribbling. It continues, "on the duplicate forms, those of the consignee." It seems to suggest that this form contemplates if you are giving to an external entity; it has to be an entity with a stamp, not an individual. An individual generally does not have a stamp. Those are instances where we see Comrade Skeete alone, without a notation of the Ministry. That would appear to be contrary to what that form contemplates.

Lt. Col. James: I take your point, Sir. As I have said, based on my research I have never seen the stamps of external organisations or units. I have seen the stamp of the issuing unit, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: So when you issue to police, they do not put on a stamp?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Well, Sir, as I did indicate to you; based again on my own experiences, the stamp at a unit lines are normally peculiar to the Commanding Officer of that unit. He would not normally be engaged in a transaction like this, if I can give an explanation, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Let me introduce a little humour here. Say for example Mr. Pilgrim was receiving one of the weapons; he may affix his personal stamp. There are some individuals who do have personal stamps, but that is just introducing some humour to the proceedings.

Mr. Williams: *[Inaudible]*

[Laughter]

Lt. Col. James: That is a good one.

Mr. Jairam: Mr. Williams will have one, I imagine, on his own proclamation.

Attorney for Dr. Patricia Rodney, Asha Rodney, Shaka Rodney and Kanini Rodney [Mr. Andrew Pilgrim, Q.C.]: My weapons are not firearms... *[Inaudible]*

Mr. Hanoman: I think we have just looked at the form that deals with the M70, am I correct?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: M70... one of one, please.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: *[Inaudible]*

Mr. Hanoman: I think we were just looking at SCJ 2C.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, just the point I was making earlier; all the forms are standard that we have. All of the observations made by the witness would apply to them. He has already given us several illustrations. I do not think it makes a difference. What purpose does it serve for us to go through the entire thing again?

Mr. Hanoman: Well, we might be wasting some time here. There are just eight forms...

Mr. Williams: We can apply the principles to...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Please.

Mr. Williams: I am saying we already have the illustrations for what you need; which are what he calls irregularities. They would have applied to all the forms that would have already been tendered as Exhibits.

Mr. Chairman: I would prefer though that I have a representative illustration of every year, rather than all.

Mr. Williams: Yes, that is what I am saying, but you go through every document...

Mr. Chairman: But if you have representation of every year, you do not have to go through all.

Mr. Hanoman: We are halfway through the exercise, Sir. These last four, they have some differences that are worth identifying. There are white copies and carbon copies in the last four...

Mr. Chairman: We are guided by you, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: But if they were standard for every year... they are not standard.

Mr. Hanoman: I wish to refer the witness to SCJ 2D, dated the 10th August, 1979. It deals with five M72 light machine guns.

Lt. Col. James: Again, Sir, this is a green form, with pen handwriting, there does not seem to be an indication that there was a carbon based on an examination at the back of the voucher. The characteristics I would have previously described with respect to the omission of the persons, the weapons were allegedly issued to, his first name is deficient. Again, the two issuing officers, their regimental numbers and first names are deficient. This form has an authority for issue, FHQQCOORD105 dated 9.8.79, and there is a signature purported to be W. Skeete. Again, there is a discrepancy with respect to the signature alone being on the document, without the person's name being annotated so that you can have an idea of exactly who the weapons were issued to. It

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

lists the five LMGs, and based on the procedures, their serial numbers were recorded along with their accessories which were issued through this transaction, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: So, they are the same irregularities on that form. Could I direct your attention to exhibit SCJ 2E which we have been calling a long form? What colour is that form, in your....1

Lt. Col. James: This form is white, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: This is the original that you have?

Lt. Col. James: As I did indicate to you, Sir, the original of logistic forms used are normally white, duplicated in green, and yellow, Sir. This particular issue voucher is dated the 09th....

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: [*Inaudible*]

Lt. Col. James: it is white. There is no indication of any duplicate being used. It is dated the 19th May, 1976, with an issue again to Comrade Skeete. As I said, there are some deficiencies with respect to just addressing the person, weapons and accessories being issued to by just their surname. There should be the insertion of their first name, and if possible, the organisation they represent. On this form, there is no authority for issue. This form is also deficient of who would have issued the weapons. There is a signature which purports to be a Wilfred Skeete. Again, there is a deficiency, because this should be written out in cursive...

Mr. Hanoman: No, but let us pause on that for a moment. This is the first of all the forms that has the full first name in the signature. That as Wilfred Skeete; it appears to be Wilfred Skeete in the signature.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But the other signatures are all...

Lt. Col. James: W. Skeete.

Mr. Hanoman: W. Skeete.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir. This issue purports to be for four HK11 LMGs, eight G3 rifles, four GKMGs, 20 Berettas SMG guns, and 15 SLR 7.62 rifles, along with a number of accessories,

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Sir. Again, I said this form is deficient of the authority for the issue of these weapons and accessories, and is also deficient of who would have issued these weapons...

Mr. Hanoman: Now, this...

Lt. Col. James: ...and accessories, and no stamps, no standard unit code.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, I believe that this is the only singular voucher that has no authority for issue.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: This form is the only long form, as well, compared to the others?

Lt. Col. James: I would not say this is unusual. We normally have long forms if we are issuing items that cannot be contained on the short forms, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I do notice in 1976 that you did not have short forms...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman:and this form is 1976, and it is long; but that is normal?

Lt. Col. James: That is normal. We have the short issue vouchers, and also the long issue vouchers, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You have mentioned a lot of irregularities in the previous forms, but the fact that there is no authority in the issuance of these arms; how would you rate that?

Lt. Col. James: Well, this is a serious irregularity, Sir. It is a breach of the logistic Standing operating procedures (SOPs) as it relates to issuance and accountability for weapons that might have been issued, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What you mean is that the section marked "authority for issue" is totally blank and devoid of any endorsement at all. Is that what you meant when you said there is no authority for issue?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Jairam: Neither does it contain the name of the officer preparing or issuing these arms.

Lt. Col. James: I did state that in my analysis, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could we now move to the exhibit number SCJ 2F, which deals with smith and Wesson pistols, on the 18th May, 1976? It appears to me that that too is written on white vouchers.

Mr. Chairman: I wanted to spend some more time on that significant irregularity, where there was no authority. That column was blank, there was no signature of the Officer, the name of the officer issuing; and what was the number of the firearms issuing? That was a serious irregularity of the number of firearms?

Mr. Hanoman: Could I ask you to look at that long form you just spoke about? Can you to indicate to us the quantity and quality of the firearms on that form?

Lt. Col. James: If I might start with the first item...

Mr. Hanoman: And we are dealing with the form where the authority to issue is blank, which you said you considered to be a serious irregularity. Apparently nobody signed, or no name is stated giving these guns out.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir. With respect to the issue, the items reflect –I will say combat rifles, for HK11 light machine guns...

Mr. Hanoman: Let us stop a little bit there! These HK11 light machine guns are the guns that you described as those guns that are normally found on a tripod?

Lt. Col. James: In this instance, it was not a tripod, it was a bipod.

Mr. Hanoman: A bipod.

Lt. Col. James: A bipod, my correction.

Mr. Hanoman: So, they are big guns...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Not necessarily big, but it is a high calibre weapon.

Mr. Hanoman: High calibre weapon.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: And the purpose of the bipod is to swivel the gun, if you are shooting at a target, to mow down several persons?

Lt. Col. James: Not necessarily, Sir. It is just to give it a longer range. It is just to give it a longer range.

Mr. Hanoman: A longer range.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Okay, and the other weapons...

Lt. Col. James: The other issue relates to eight G3 rifles. Again, Sir, it is a combat rifle, similar to the AK47, or M70 rifles, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: G3, similar to the AK47.

Lt. Col. James: As I mentioned in my evidence yesterday, the difference with the G3 rifle is that the AK47 or M70 rifle would use ammunition 7.62X39 short whilst the G3 Rifle would use 7.62x51 which is a larger caliber ammunition Sir. I did mention that yesterday. With respect to the 20 Beretta sub-machine guns...

11:07hrs

Mr. Jairam: I think you left out one, says four.

Lt. Col. James: No, I started with the four HK11 light machine guns.

Mr. Jairam: No, then you went to eight and then there is another four after eight. What is that?

Mr. Hanoman: G1033GPMG.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Oh, I now got you, Sir. This is the four General Purpose Machine Guns it is a heavier gun than the HK11 and this again can be mounted on a bipod or a tripod, Sir. Again, it is to give it greater elevation so that you can fire for longer distances, Sir. This particular weapon is belted and it uses the 7.62x51 mm ammunition, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What do you mean by belted?

Lt. Col. James: It is belted. The ammunition or rounds are in belt and that is how you feed it as suppose for example one of the other rifles the rounds are in magazines, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: In other words, this gun is capable of firing...

Lt. Col. James: It is firing faster, it can fire rabbit fire, in fact all the weapons can fire rabbit fire, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: No, but with this belting system there will be a constant feed of ammunition.

Lt. Col. James: Once ammunitions are on the belt, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That belt can hold about how many rounds?

Lt. Col. James: May be more than 200 rounds, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: May be more than 200 rounds?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I think there is a reference there to some Beretta as well, 20?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir, I was talking about 20 Beretta sub-machine guns that is a smaller weapon, it is used for close quarter type combat and it uses 9 mm standard rounds, something similar to a 9 mm pistol. The SLR7.62 is the combat rifle, something similar to the AK47 or M70 rifle, it uses 7.62x51 mm ammunition Sir. There is a number of accessories listed, cleaning kit, pamphlets for both the G3, HK11 and GPMG listed on this voucher, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: You regard that as a serious [*inaudible*] of weapon?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Well I would say these are generally combat rifles maybe with the exception of the sub-machine gun all the rest are combat rifles, rifles that you may use in a real combating environment, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But these amount of arms would be sufficient for instance to equip an army based on one of our borders?

Lt. Col. James: Base on the number, may be you would have to have some more combat rifles Sir because as I did indicate a berretta would not be considered a combat riffle.

Mr. Williams: Perhaps the Counsel could, I do not know, it might be too late for a Cadet Officer Course, go and do a little Sergeant Course, Sir, in the Army. I do not see how relevant this examination in this connection.

Mr. Chairman: For my purpose it is [*inaudible*].

Mr. Hanoman: May I now move on to the other form please? I am asking the witness now to look at the exhibit that is numbered SCJ 2F and it is dated the 18th May, 1976 and refers to Smith and Wesson Pistols.

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What colour is that form?

Lt. Col. James: This form is white Sir. The hand writing seems to be duplicate and not in original pen.

Mr. Hanoman: So you are saying that there is evidence that that is a carbon copy of another document?

Lt. Col. James: Well it seems to be a duplicate or a triplicate of an original document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But the colour of that document is white?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But you have told us that the white document should be the original?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Can you give us an explanation as to how carbon writing may have appeared on that white voucher that is supposed to be an original?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot give an explanation, Sir. I cannot give an explanation because this is contrary to the Logistics Standing Operating Procedures I would have alluded to earlier in my evidence.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, is this a fresh document or is this a document that has an exhibit.

Mr. Hanoman: It is an Exhibit.

Mr. Williams: Which Exhibit is this?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: 2F.

Mr. Williams: 2F? 18th May? And that is white in there?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Do you notice any irregularity on that document?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir, if I might start it is dated the 18th May, 1976, there is no unit stamp and the issue purports to be by the Force Quarter Master department which is a departure from the procedure which suggests that a reference should be inserted here, a reference related to the authority for the issuance of the weapons and accessories listed in this voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But just before you leave that the Quarter Master department is a unit that would normally issue guns?

Lt. Col. James: If I can say in the logistics stream or the logistic unit normally has someone designated as the Quarter Master in those days. It is different now, but someone would be designated as the Quarter Master and I would say not the Quarter Master department.

Mr. Hanoman: But in 1976 would the Quarter Master or somebody in that department would that person be in a position to issue guns?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No Sir, as I did say in this part the person issuing the weapons would be annotated here by their number, first name and surname, and if it was more than one individual, those particulars in this part, Sir. If I might go on, Authority for Issue, it had the Commander and again as I reflect in my analysis of the previous vouchers, what should be here is the authority, it should be the reference for the approval of this particular issue and that is not reflected in this voucher. If I might continue, it is allegedly purported issued to a Comrade R. Corbin Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister, I did mention in this part that we should we reflect the person's first and surname and organisation if that is on the authority to issue. Again, there is a signature which purports to be Corbin and again, as I did mention before, what should be included here is the persons' first and surname in cursive writing so that you can make an identification as to who the items were issued to.

Mr. Hanoman: In this form you have, it is issued to Comrade R. Corbin and there are some letters under the name, are you permitted to abbreviate the organisation to which he belongs?

Lt. Col. James: You can list the organisation, do you know why?

Mr. Hanoman: But abbreviations are permitted as well?

Lt. Col. James: It is permitted in this part, you can you that in. As I did say Sir, based on the absence of the issuing personnel and also the Authority to Issue on this particular voucher, this seems to be a significant departure from the established Logistics Standing Operating Procedures, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Because this falls in the same sort of categories as the last form almost, there is no proper authority for issuing guns, according to you, this one is not blank, but the name Commander there is not sufficient to establish, it is not appropriate.

Lt. Col. James: An individual cannot authorise, he would have to have the authority which is the document which is the approval based on the process I would have described yesterday, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: This particular voucher deal with seven smith and Wesson pistols purportedly to be issued to Comrade R. Corbin?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now there is a notation to the top left corner of that document, it appears to be 404, does that has any meaning to you? Record in 404.

Lt. Col. James: Well Sir, record in 404 in those days, I think, referred to what we consider to be AB561 now. It is an official document that is held at the Logistic or Issuing Unit.

Mr. Hanoman: That is the ledger that you have brought today?

Lt. Col. James: Well the AB561 that is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Did you find anything helpful in that ledger in reference to this voucher?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I found no issues of weapons in the ledger that I brought with respect to any of the vouchers that I have identified during my evidence, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Let me interject before you move on. The box for authority to issue that has inscribed in it Commander, we know there is no name there but who would have been the Commander then?

Lt. Col. James: Madam, I will have to do some research to see who the Commander of the Guyana Defense Force was in 1976 I do not want to speculate...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So it would have been reflect to who the Commander is...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am, but notwithstanding being reflected in the Authority for Issuing, we will have to have a document, a formal letter.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: No, I understand that you have been required to go through that several times so I understand what you are saying. I just want to ascertain what the phrase "Commander" here to mean.

Lt. Col. James: Well the Commander is an appointment, I would say for the second highest officer in the Guyana Defense Force at that the time, the highest would have been the Chief-of-Staff.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you very much.

Mr. Jairam: May I ask you Lt. Col. In your research going back to 1976 and apart from the paramilitary organisations such as my fellow Commissioners leaving out those, the Police, the National Service, the Prison Service and so on, have you found in your researches the Army issuing weapons to any other external agency in addition to the three identified, Comrade Skeete or Comrade Skeete on behalf of the Ministry of National Development or this R. Corbin P.S, OPM have you found any other person or entity apart from Prison, Police and so on.

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir. It is reflected in my Commission statement.

Mr. Jairam: Could you remind me of which paragraph? Is it Paragraph 15?

Lt. Col. James: Paragraph 15 Sir, at...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Guymine...

Mr. Jairam: I saw those, Guymine, Customs, Customs Anti-Narcotics Unit (CANU) and so on.

Lt. Col. James: L, M, N, O, PQ, R, S, X, Y, Z, A(a).

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: X, Y, Z are the Constabulary.

Lt. Col. James: Well that was the security for the bauxite company.

Mr. Jairam: These are the external agencies?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: Thank you.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: At that time the bauxite company was Government owned?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So when you see Mazda Mining and Guymine your understanding is that these were [inaudible] department.

Lt. Col. James: Guymine was the bauxite company madam.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And you said Guymine constabulary would have been the security section of the bauxite company?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What about Mazda Mining?

Lt. Col. James: Mazda Mining is a privately owned company, Ma'am, at that time.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Was a privately owned company?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I see, thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: We have now come to the last voucher which has been marked as SCJ 2H, I believe.

11:22hrs

Mr. Hanoman: No, I think we are actually on G. I am sorry we should be looking at Exhibit SCJ 2G which deals with nine Smith and Wesson 9 mm pistols and is dated 19th May, 1976.

Lt. Col. James: Okay, Sir, if I can do an analysis of this form. It is written on the white form in pen, it does not seem to have been duplicated based on examination of the back of the form. This purports to be an issue to Comrade R. Corbin of the National Development. It purportedly was issued by the Force's Quartermaster, Stores. As I did mention, Sir, the information that should be contained in this part of the voucher should relate to the actual person or persons issuing by their regimental number, rank, first and surname. Again, there is no standard unit stamp. The signature purports to be a Corbin, however, the first and surname should have been affixed here. I just want to make a note of something, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: You would notice it is marked sheet one of three, which suggests that there should have been two other sheets, two other vouchers attached to this voucher. I have not seen those attached. The authority for issue as written on the voucher is on instruction from GSO1-Coord-SAFQM. As I did mention, this voucher seems to suggest that whoever prepared it was given an instruction from the then GSO 1, who is General Staff Officer 1, which would relate to the most senior coordinating staff then in Force Headquarters, but again, as I did mention in my analysis of the previous voucher, what should be written here is the written and formal authority and the reference for that document should be entered into this part of the correspondence, and this issue purports to be for nine Smith and Wesson 9 mm pistols, 18 magazines and seven cleaning rods and brushes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, given the fact that this is one, it has been recorded as being one of three sheets...

Lt. Col. James: One of three.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it possible that those other two sheets contain an issue of other arms?

Lt. Col. James: I...

Mr. Hanoman: Because the serial numbers for the nine arms are fully captured on the first sheet so there is no need to use additional paper for the serial numbers for these nine Smith and Wesson pistols. The fact that there are two other sheets, does that suggest to you that there may have been other arms that were given out to Comrade R. Corbin?

Lt. Col. James: I would say, Sir...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Perhaps you should direct the Witness to the last writing on the page that may assist.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: It says “last item”, however, this is part of the procedure when you prepare a voucher. After the last entry you would draw a line and write “last entry”. Based on my examination of this voucher, it suggests that there were two other vouchers attached to this; however, I am not in a position to say...

Mr. Hanoman: Let us just clarify that. Even though there are three sheets, would you still write “last item” on the first sheet and then continue writing on the second and third sheet?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct because, for example, in that space you can write in something, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: I see. So last item does not mean that there is no other information...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: ...on that page. I think I suggested to you that the other two pages may have issued other arms to Corbin. Do you see that as a possibility?

Mr. Williams: How could he answer that? That is like asking him to show me the corner where the fellow passed and I would make a suit.

Mr. Hanoman: We are dealing with forms and vouchers that deal with the issuance of guns. We are seeing one of three sheets issued to Corbin, obviously the other sheets must relate to the issue of guns. I do not see that that is an improbable inference. Is the witness allowed to answer my question, please?

Lt. Col. James: I am not certain, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Do you think he could help with the speculation.

Mr. Hanoman: He is not certain, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: He is right, he cannot be certain. Do you think you will soon be at an end otherwise it would be a convenient time now or we will go pass to have our mid-morning break?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: There are four other vouchers in this bundle that I hope to have the witness look at. Do you wish for us to proceed until that is finished?

Mr. Chairman: It is 11.30 hrs. He has been on the stand for two hours

Mr. Hanoman: Very well, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Consistent with our practice we will have a half an hour mid-morning break...

Mr. Hanoman: As it pleases you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: ...unless you need more for him to go through them.

Lt. Col. James: I am in good shape, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, we will now break at this time for half an hour.

Hearing suspended at 11:29hrs

Hearing resumed at 12:15hrs

Mr. Chairman: "Lieutenant Colonel James..."

Lt. Col. James: Sir?

Mr. Chairman: "...continues his evidence after the mid-morning break, 12.15 hrs." That is my notation, Sir.

Lt. Col. James: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Sir. Commission Counsel.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Over to you, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Lt. Col. James, the last voucher that we dealt with was SCJ 2G. I now wish to refer you to a voucher that is dated 6th July, 1978, and it deals with 50 Browning pistols that appear to have been given to Comrade Skeete for National Development. Do you have that voucher before you?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Can you...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry, what is the Exhibit Number?

Mr. Hanoman: This Exhibit Number is SCJ 2H.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: if I might give an analysis of this voucher, Sir. It is on the green Issuing Receipt Voucher. Again, I have given evidence before which seem to suggest that it may not have been an original voucher, however, an examination of it seem to suggest that there were no duplicates and this is the absolute...

Mr. Hanoman: It is a green...

Lt. Col. James: It is a green voucher, an examination of which suggests that it was not a duplicate voucher and this is based on the absence of any carbon deposits at the back. It is dated 6th July, 1978.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry I did not hear what you said on whether it was original or a carbonised copy.

Lt. Col. James: Ma'am, I was saying that based on an examination of the back of the voucher, there is no evidence of any carbon deposits which suggests that it was written singularly.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And it is in original pen writing?

Lt. Col. James: It is in original pen writing, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Lt. Col. James: The voucher is dated 6th July, 1978. In the issue column, "Staff Sergeant Caesar" is reflected, Sir, from the Ordinance Stores. I did mention that this is a deviation from the established logistic procedures which state that the Issuing Officer or other rank should list

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

their regimental number, their Rank and their full name. The regimental number and the first name of this individual are not recorded on the voucher, Sir. That is a departure. It does not have a unit stamp on it, Sir. It purports to be issued to a Comrade Skeete for National Development. I did mention, Sir, in my earlier evidence, that the authority for issue should generally be an official letter which should have a reference number. This voucher seem to have a reference number quoted by, I would say, two authorities, Sir. Firstly, the COC Ordinance Stores – in the military this would relate to the officer commanding the Ordinance Stores, part of which would be the issuance of arms, ammunition and ration – and the reference, it is mentioned in the Authority for Issue seems to be reference Q/1105FHQ-COORD-1105, dated 6th July, 1978. Again Sir, the signature, even though it is not in the designated block, seems to be W. Skeete and I did refer in my earlier evidence to suggest that the recipient should be written again, first name and surname and this writing should be recognizable and the issuing voucher for this particular transaction purports to be the issue of 50 Model 10 9 mm Browning pistols and the serial numbers for those 50 pistols are illustrated on the voucher.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you saying to us that the proper unit to have issued these weapons in 1978 was the Ordinance Stores?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, it is always the Ordinance Store.

Mr. Hanoman: Always the Ordinance Store.

Lt. Col. James: Always the Logistic Unit. As I did mention in my earlier evidence the name has changed over time. It used to be the Ordinance Battalion but over time it has changed now to the Five Service and Support Battalion, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: May I please see the original for this document, Exhibit 2H?

Mr. Hanoman: Madam Commissioner is asking to see the original.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

[Court Marshal took the original document to the Madame Commissioner]

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

[Commissioners were in discussion]

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: There are some pencil markings on that document. You did not make them, did you, to the left?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: You made your own note.

Lt. Col. James: Well, if I can go line by line, there are some pencil marks, for example, in the first line, the fourth issue of an M10 pistol and I referred to serial number 684411. That is the fourth entry on the first line, Ma'am, I am just giving some examples on the voucher

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So they are your own little notes?

Lt. Col. James: Ma'am?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am asking you if the pencil writing...

Lt. Col. James: The pencil wiring, yes, Ma'am. The pencil writing, for example, the first line...

Mr. Pilgrim: She is asking if those are your own notes.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The first question is: Did you make them, the pencil marks?

Lt. Col. James: No, Ma'am. I never made any annotations on any of the vouchers, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Alright, the only one I am really interested in is the pencil writing in the box marked "Standard Unit Code number".

Lt. Col. James: Yes Madam, as I did...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Can you read it because I cannot decipher it, that pencil writing. If you cannot it is okay. I was just curious.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

12.23hrs

Lt. Col. James: It seems to suggest something with “ordinance” and I would say it seems to be “sport stores” or the last writing.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Okay, it is so unclear and so inexact, I would not take it any further. Thank you.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I now refer you to the voucher that is date the 13th October, 1976, that deals with three types of rifles, six each, purportedly given to Comrade Skeete and I am looking at Exhibit number SCJ 2I?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir, if I can give my analysis of this voucher, it is a white voucher; it does not seem to have had duplicate or triplicate. There is no indication at the back of the voucher, Sir. I just want to bring this to the attention of the Commission of Inquiry: If you look on the right-hand side where “receipt voucher number” is you will see a number. It seems to have been 2896, Sir. This is what should be reflected on vouchers, a serial number, even though this one is scratched out. I just wanted to bring this to the attention of the Commission and Commissioners. This voucher is dated the 13th August, 1976, and there is an entry purported to be issued by the Force Quarter Master, Stores. As I did indicate in my earlier analysis, this is a significant departure from the expected norm as what should be included in this box is the issuing person or persons by regimental number, rank, first and surnames so this entry in the “issued by” is a departure from the logistics Standing Operating Procedures. Secondly, if you look further to the right, you would see “issued to Comrade Skeete”. I did allude to the requirements for the individuals first and surnames and also any official designations to the organization or unit they represent who are collecting the weapons. If we come further to the left under the Standard Unit Stamp, nothing is reflected there. In the signature block, there is a signature that purports to be W. Skeete. Again, I would have alluded to the requirement for the individual, notwithstanding his signature, also his or her first and surname to be included in that part of the voucher. The Authority for Issue is the SAFQM. I suspect this is an appointment or designation for an individual, however, as I did allude earlier, what is required to be in this box is the authority through which the weapons were to be issued and this is in the form of an official document and

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

the file reference for that number and date should be included in this part and this issue purports to be for three types of weapons, 6.22 Rifles, 6.30 Carbines and 6.303 Rifles with the serial numbers annotated on the voucher.

Mr. Hanoman: In 1976, did the Quarter Master Stores have authority to issue guns to anybody?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, as I did mention before, the weapons would be under the control of the Logistics Unit and as part of that apparatus over the years there have been many changes and the Quarter Master Stores is the area where weapons, ammunition, ration and other equipment are centralised. It is this Unit that has issuing authority or collection of issuing authority for such items, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Which Unit, the Quarter Master Stores?

Lt. Col. James: No, not the Quarter Master Stores, this would refer to the Ordinance Stores but as part of the structure of that Unit they would have what we called then a Quarter Master Stores.

Mr. Chairman: I was just wondering, Counsel, whether we could arrive at a formula which prevents the Witness from having to repeat this kind of standing criticism by saying for example, and I apply the standing criticism here, “wish to add X or Y comment” otherwise he is going back over the same thing. We do not have a lot more but it seems...

Mr. Hanoman: I will try to move it along.

Mr. Chairman: “...the criticisms apply but I want to add the following comment...”

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Good.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I direct your attention to a voucher dated the same date, 13th October, 1976, dealing with 15 SLR 7.62, I believe it is, rifles and the Exhibit Number of that is SCJ/2J?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry, before you on, did you say whether it was pen or carbonised writing on that first...

Lt. Col. James: I did say, Ma'am, that this was in pen and...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: ...in pen, thank you.

Lt. Col. James: With respect to the voucher you just alluded to, Sir, the analysis I just presented, apply to this second voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: To this document as well?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: [*Inaudible*] it is white, green, pen or pencil.

Lt. Col. James: It is in pencil.

Mr. Hanoman: The colour?

Lt. Col. James: It is in, well, it seems...

Mr. Hanoman: No, not the colour of the pencil, the colour of the form.

Lt. Col. James: The form is white...

Mr. Hanoman: Yes...

Lt. Col. James: ...and again there is no evidence that this was a duplicate...

Mr. Hanoman: ...and this is written in pencil?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, this is written in pen, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Pen.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: The last voucher everybody would be happy to hear, I am looking at a voucher dated the 14th October, 1976 that deal with six G3 Rifles. Have you found that voucher?

Lt. Col. James: Yes.

Mr. Hanoman: It is Exhibit SCJ 2K.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir, I just want to address some anomalies I have seen on this voucher, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Please, do.

Lt. Col. James: The first date seems to have been written over. I just want to bring to the attention of the Commission that if this was a... Well the procedure is that once there is an entry like this, whoever is the person preparing the document should affix their signature to this alteration, that is the first thing I wish to say. It is a white voucher and, again, it does not seem to have been duplicated, Sir, based on an examination of the back. What I just want to bring out in this voucher, it has some of the similar characteristics that I had alluded to, the absence of the first and surnames of the persons it was issued to, the absence of the person who would have issued these six rifles; it refers to the Force Quarter Master Stores which is a store, and it does not refer to the individuals and on this voucher, Sir, the Authority for Issue, as written, suggested that it was an instruction by the GSO 1, this is a General Staff Officer 1 Coordinating, and also the SAFQM. Again, what should be written here is the reference for the authority which is a document and a reference for the issuance for these six G3 rifles and the remarks I alluded to earlier with respect to the signature and the need for the first and surnames of the individuals who would have collected these six rifles is not included in this voucher, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: First of all, with regard to all of the vouchers you have just examined, there seemed to be two names appearing, "King" and "Caesar", in some of the vouchers. Have you in your investigation been able to pin-point who those two persons are?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I did address this in my first appearance with the Prosecution Team. I did allude to both individuals, both principals being alive and I also gave the home addresses, telephone numbers where those two individuals could be located, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: This information on this form was sufficient for you to be able to identify who the exact person would have been at the time?

Lt. Col. James: Based on the information, I have found on a majority of the forms, Sir, that is correct.

Mr. Hanoman: Very well. In some of the forms, five of them to be precise, the reference number of the document is mentioned. What I wish to ask you is if, in looking at those letters

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

and numbers, they have any meaning to you; if these letters stand for anything and if the numbers stand for anything.

Lt. Col. James: If I might say, Sir, in the Military, we have a unique filing system. The filing system then would relate to the Unit and you would see for example...

Mr. Hanoman: Could we look at a number. Let us look at the first voucher. I am looking at Exhibit SCJ 2A, the very first voucher, there is a mention of a reference number there.

Lt. Col. James: Sir, are you speaking of a voucher dated 10/8/1979, Sir?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, dealing with 50 Model 10 pistols.

Lt. Col. James: Okay, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Right.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What is the Exhibit Number?

Mr. Hanoman: I mentioned it already, please, SCJ 2A. The "FHQ", could you tell us if that stands for anything?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir, it stands for at that time, Force Headquarters, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, and then the other one ...

Lt. Col. James: The "Q" stands for "Quartering" and the "COORD" suggest that it may have originated from the Office of the, I would say, "GSO1-COORD", there was such an appointment at that time, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: What does "COORD" means?

Lt. Col. James: Coordinating.

Mr. Hanoman: Coordinating.

Lt. Col. James: Coordinating.

Mr. Hanoman: It has nothing to do with Ordinance?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, because that person would also coordinate operations so it would be Operations Quartering, etcetera, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: The number 1105?

Lt. Col. James: That I think is a reference number, Sir. We have a file indexing system and the 1105 would direct you to the specific item being referenced. For example, if there was a request, let us say this was a request, it would be 1624 – I am just giving you an example out of my head – so 1105 was laid to a specific file reference because there is a file index.

Mr. Hanoman: It would be only one particular written correspondence that would have that number, 1105, a precise document?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, it would relate to some particular item, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Let me ask it a different way.

Lt. Col. James: The date would relate to the date when that particular document was prepared, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You would not expect that a document generated on a different date to have those same numbers, 1105?

Lt. Col. James: It can have the same numbers, Sir. As I did indicate to you, for example, if it is a request, 1624 is request, so every time you are writing a letter with respect to request it would have Issuing Unit or the Unit that is writing; they would have their own peculiar designation, for example, if it was DHQ, it would have “DHQ”. We do not use “Q” and “COORD” now but just to give you an example, it would have designation of the Unit, “DHQ”. I would have to say now we used Unit numbers, every Unit now has a number so, for example, the FHQ, you would not see. Let us say it is Defense Headquarters now, it might be 201, so if I wanted to reference a document, let us say a request, it would be 201/1624 and I would write the date on the document so if I wanted to reference that it would be 201/1624 dated that particular day so if I have several correspondences it would have the Unit Number, the particular item or particular document or the particular matter I am addressing and the date, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Okay.

Lt. Col. James: I just wanted to continue, Sir...

Mr. Hanoman: Go ahead.

12:38hrs

Lt. Col. James: So, based on this here, you can have several documents that might have this same, I would say, reference, if they were prepared on the same day, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: If they were prepared the same day?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: For instance, let me refer you to SCJ 2H, which in your file would relate to 50 Browning pistols Model 10 and is dated 6th July, 1978, you see that?

Lt. Col. James: 6th July, 1978 ...

Mr. Hanoman: You see that?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You see the reference number of the correspondence to be 1105?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: And this is on 6th July, now, look at any other reference number that is mentioned and you will see, the same numbers appearing all the time.

Lt. Col. James: As I was telling you, Sir, 1105 might be peculiar to let us say, weapon issues. I cannot say out of my head because this is since 1976, but it would relate to whatever is the transaction that is being done, there is a file index, so for example, if 1105 is issuance of weapons, you will see 1105 reflected on all the references as relates to issuance of weapons.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: So you are saying that if you were to look at this reference number and you had to go and find it, you could very well be looking at thousands of documents with exactly the same marking?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, what would be peculiar would be the date, sir. You can find the ... you might prepare several of the same documents but the date is what would guide you as to the particular document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: It does not appear to be an anomaly to you that although one is dated 6th July with that same reference number and another one is dated 9th August of the same year to have exactly the same ... that does not appear to be an anomaly?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, because as I used the example ...

Mr. Hanoman: I understand. I just wanted to raise it.

Lt. Col. James: Okay, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: I am glad you did, Counsel, because it is something that I wanted to ask.

Mr. Hanoman: I am sorry to have taken away that. I do not know if you have covered it already but could you tell us, who and I am looking at Exhibit SCJ 2F which deals with ... that is the long form ... that has the date 18th May, 1976 on it. Were you able to say who was the Commander at that time?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, as I did mention ...

Mr. Hanoman: You did mention it?

Lt. Col. James: I said that I have to do research as I do not wish to be inaccurate.

Mr. Hanoman: Okay, I was just making sure that we had covered that. In relation to the following voucher, which is SCJG are you able to tell us in 1976 who was GSO1 COORD?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, again, I will have to do research to identify who was in that appointment at that particular date.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Could it have been the ... let me ask you another thing. A lot of guns according to these vouchers, were given out, did you make checks for corresponding ammunition vouchers in relation to matching the guns that were given out?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, as I did allude to in my evidence, yesterday, one issue of I think it was 175 rounds, 9mm standard ammunition, which was on one of the issuing receipt vouchers, that is the only indication I had that any ammunition was issued.

Mr. Hanoman: Were you able to verify whether that ammunition had been used or expended or returned?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I cannot say for that issue in 1976, what I can say now is that if we would have an issue of ammunition at this current time, there are procedures with respect to accounting for the ammunition, whether it was expended or returned, I cannot answer for 1976.

Mr. Hanoman: Just for the sake of everyone listening, we are dealing with 175 rounds of 9mm ammunition allegedly issued to Comrade R. Corbin.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That you are unable to account for.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: In order to assist the Commission, you have supplied to us, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and you have spoken about ...

Mr. Jairam: Before you ...

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Mr. Jairam: May I ask you Lt. Col., what some of these vouchers issuance, receipts, I see magazines ...

Lt. Col. James: Well, Sir, I did mention accessories.

Mr. Jairam: Yes, but I want to find out, would the magazines be blank or would they contain ...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, ammunition is issued separately.

Mr. Jairam: Separate?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: Okay, I just wanted to be sure.

Mr. Hanoman: You spoke about logistics standing orders, can you explain to us what that is?

Lt. Col. James: Okay, Sir. For every single unit or sub-unit in the Guyana Defense Force, there are what we call Standard Operating Procedures based on how that particular unit functions, with respect to the Logistic Standing Operating Procedures, that relates to the Standing Operating Procedures for the now 5 Service and Support Battalion, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Similar Standing Orders were in existence between 1976 and 1980?

Lt. Col. James: I would assume so, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But have you never seen and examined Standing Orders that were in existence then?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir. I would have seen the current Standing Orders, I do not know whether it was from 1976 but I know it as current. Every single unit or sub-unit at the Guyana Defense Force are required to have their own Standing Operating procedures based on how they are organized.

Mr. Hanoman: But you are not aware of any radical changes in the system? Or in the Standing Orders from 1976 to now?

Lt. Col. James: I would say, no Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it correct that specifically these Logistic Standing Orders also relate to the forms currently in use in relation to arms and ammunition, so as well as the practice of issuing these arms and ammunitions.

Lt. Col. James: I would say they are standard and they are current, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Do you have the Standing Orders with you?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Can you look at a copy that we have to see that is the same copy that you provided us with and what obtains right now at the GDF?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry, this document that has been circulated to Counsel?

Mr. Hanoman: I do verily believe so.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Just to make it clear that there is transparency in how we proceed, I think it needs to be recorded that Counsel received it in advance and we perhaps could assist Counsel by directing them to where they could find it.

Mr. Hanoman: Apparently, this was given along with the statement from Lt. Col. Patrick West and Kyte and it may be attached to those statements.

Mr. Jairam: I see that there is the label “Restricted” on the documents. Do you have any national security concerns about it?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, not with this particular document.

Mr. Chairman: I take it, Mr. Williams, that if you did not have the document you would have cried out. I was saying that if you did not have a copy of the document ...

Mr. Williams: No, I have.

Mr. Chairman: ... you would have cried out.

Mr. Williams: Yes, I have a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Mr. Williams: I am just apprehensive about what it is going to be used for now, very copious.
[Laughter]

Mr. Chairman: We will see. Just give him a little time and we will see.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: There is an appendix to these rules, I believe, if I could direct you to Annex A.

Mr. Jairam: That is page 156?

Mr. Hanoman: My own is numbered 103 with the word 'Restricted' underneath it. That is the numbering of the SOP itself.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Of the document.

Mr. Hanoman: Of the document, itself, not ... could I direct your attention to form No.DFQ3005 which deals with issues and receipt voucher and they have existing form AF1033, you see that entry?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Explain to us what that is, first of all.

Lt. Col. James: Well, Sir, you would have seen the old form which does not have that nomenclature and ...

Mr. Hanoman: Okay, this deals with the same ...

Lt. Col. James: It is the same format; it has now been renamed or renumbered over a period of time.

Mr. Hanoman: So, it has been ...

Lt. Col. James: All the forms that were in use from the existence of the Guyana Defense Force to now, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: So, that form is now DFQ3005?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: And it replaced AF1033?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: And the forms that you are looking at in those vouchers, those are AF1033?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir, these would have been AFG1033.

Mr. Hanoman: Oh and that number is written on the form, itself?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is there a procedure in this Standard Operating Procedure document that speaks to the write off or loss of stores? I am looking at 128, I am not sure if it has to do with arms and ammunition, but 128 which can be found at page 37 of the same document.

12:53hrs

Lt. Col. James: Page 38, Sir?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes.

Lt. Col. James: yes, Sir. Page 38, part 12 “write off of stores.”

Mr. Hanoman: Yes. At number 128, what is recorded here is the “write off or deficiency of stores, due to fraud or negligence, or other causes shall acquire the authority of the defence board.” Would this include stores such as arms?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, you do not write off arms.

Mr. Hanoman: I just wanted to make sure.

Lt. Col. James: The procedure with respect to loss -let us say loss of weapons- or if you want to destroy unserviceable weapons. There are procedures, Sir. It has to be boarded by the audit, and inspection department. There has to be verification by several sections of the Military, for example, the audit and inspection department, the G2 Branch, the external auditor, etcetera, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: As the current Head of the G2 Branch, can you say whether the GDF is still looking for these weapons that have not been returned?

Lt. Col. James: I would have to say no, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Can you explain why you are not looking for them?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: As far as I am aware, no instructions have been given with respect to operations to recover those weapons which were purportedly issued, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: During your research, you realised that guns have been given to the Ministry of National Development. Did you research when that Ministry ceased to exist?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Do you have any information about where the Ministry was, in those days?

Lt. Col. James: I am not certain if it was the Ministry that was in Camp Street, but I know that was destroyed by fire. I am not certain, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: What about the question of when they ceased to receive arms? Do you not think that might be more relevant? If he can help us, when they ceased to receive arms.

Mr. Hanoman: According to your research, Col. James, when was the last time the Army gave weapons to that Ministry?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: According to his report? Research!

Mr. Hanoman: Perhaps I could direct you. There are some vouchers dated the 10th August, 1979. Several issues were made to Comrade Skeete, Ministry of National Development. Do you see that?

Lt. Col. James: That seems to have been the last period or last set of issues purportedly, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you aware –I know you have been following these proceedings- that the evidence is that that Ministry building was destroyed by fire the month before that, in July 1979?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You are not aware of that?

Lt. Col. James: I was not following that. No Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I was trying to find this in a timely way, and I am sorry to have to go back to this. In answer to Counsel to the Commission, you said that as far as you are aware the efforts for the recovery of these weapons are no longer being made.

Lt. Col. James: I would not say that, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What was your evidence? I know I may have...

Lt. Col. James: My evidence was that a number of weapons which were purportedly issued were not returned to the Guyana Defence Force. In the report that I submitted to the Chief-of-Staff in August, of 2008, I was awaiting a direction as to how I should proceed with this matter, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: And you have gotten no such directions?

Lt. Col. James: I have gotten no such directions.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: In your report which has been tabled to this commission, in paragraph nine; it is recorded "a detailed crosscheck of weapons issued to external agencies, those returned, and now in the force's inventory, is ongoing?" does your evidence today differ from what I just read?

Lt. Col. James: Ma'am, when I said that in my report, we were crosschecking to see based on the force.... There was a force reconciliation exercise that was done in that same year, and I had to do a detailed crosscheck, to detail, and identify which weapons were issued, and which weapons were returned. If those weapons were returned, verification by actually seeing the weapon and checking the serial number, Ma'am, and that exercise was done.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So that is now complete?

Lt. Col. James: It was done and completed, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: This report is dated the 08th of the first... oh, well the 11th of the first, 2008. Is this a 2008 report, or a...

Lt. Col. James: That is correct.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: So, in 2008 it was ongoing, but today when you are giving evidence, you can say it is no longer ongoing?

Lt. Col. James: It is no longer ongoing, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you that is what I was trying to find. Thanks.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you aware of the GDF contacting any Skeete or any Corbin about these missing weapons?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Would anyone be of interest to you, Counsel?

Mr. Hanoman: Both of them would be of extreme interest. We would be happy to speak to Mr. Skeete, and Mr. Corbin to show them these vouchers and their signatures.

Mr. Williams: Oh, you know them? You know Corbin and Skeete?

Mr. Hanoman: Are you speaking to me?

Mr. Williams: Yes, I am speaking to you, Counsel. I am responding to you. I am asking you. You said you would want to see Corbin, and you are asking him about Corbin too, if GDF contacted him. Do you know who you are talking about, that is what I am saying.

Mr. Hanoman: I asked him if the army contacted any "Corbins" or any "Skeetes", in order to find the missing weapons.

Mr. Williams: You are now saying that.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you representing Corbin?

Mr. Williams: I do not know who Corbin is, that is why I am asking you, if you know who Corbin is. Mr. Chairman, I heard –and there might be some liable actions- some Robert Corbin on the news last night, purporting to say that this Commission had received a document in relation to Robert Corbin. I suppose Robert Corbin will deal with that.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: Fortunately, that man [*inaudible*] to have any legs, will not appear before this tribunal.

Mr. Williams: No, but just to clarify the records, there is no document before this commission with any name of Robert Corbin.

Mr. Hanoman: I am happy my Friend has mentioned that because we have seen documents from Parliament that states that a Robert Corbin was the Parliamentary Secretary at the Office of the Prime Minister, at the appropriate time. Those parliamentary records –and I believe we will endeavour to get them, and lay them over.....

Mr. Williams: The Counsel, Sir, presaging a lot. Perhaps if he has the courage he could say who he thinks Robert Corbin is. Perhaps he could also clarify whether on the 18th May, somebody at the OPM, as a P.S –whatever that meant- and the next day, they are at the Ministry of National Development. When the time comes I will deal with that.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I was thinking that Mr. Williams' agenda might not be the Commission, so you proceed.

Mr. Hanoman: I think Mr. Williams might be better able to clarify that, because he is a member of that party.

Mr. Chairman: I think you need to proceed with your agenda, not with....

Mr. Hanoman: Yes Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The Witness did give very clear evidence on the previous occasion he was here that he cannot identify the particular Corbin. There were extensive examination on this point, between pages 82, and 86 of the record, you will see it.

Mr. Hanoman: I did omit to ask you; in your endeavours to assist the Commission, did you make checks to find out whether there were any records of explosives being given to external agencies, between 1978 and 1980?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir. I did not make those checks, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: But you are capable of doing those checks...

Lt. Col. James: If directed to by the Commission.

Mr. Hanoman: ...if directed to do so? Is it also not correct that on one of the vouchers, a grenade launcher is mentioned?

Lt. Col. James: With the Commission's permission, I will check the vouchers, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: if you have a particular voucher, please identify it for him

Mr. Hanoman: I am being assisted to find that now, please, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: SCJ 2C.

Mr. Hanoman: SCJ 2C deals with 15 M70 rifles, and it is dated the 10th August, 1979. Do you see that 15 grenade launches is also mentioned on the same voucher?

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could you explain to us what this grenade launcher is capable of doing?

Lt. Col. James: Well, Sir, it is an accessory that can be added to the front of the M70 rifle, which would permits a hand grenade to be launched, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it made for a specific explosive device or various explosive devices can be....

Lt. Col. James: Sir, it only relates to a grenade and the use of an M70 rifle, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But what type of grenade?

Lt. Col. James: I said a hand grenade, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, you have not checked to see if any grenades were issued to any external agencies?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: But the voucher on which this grenade launcher is mentioned purports to have been issued to a Comrade Skeete of the Ministry of National Development.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: And this is on the 10th August, 1979.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: This would be a few months before Walter Rodney was killed, six months, maybe. Do you agree that this would be about six months before?

Mr. Jairam: No, more than. Dr. Rodney was killed June, 1980.

Mr. Hanoman: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. About eight months before Rodney was killed this grenade launcher was issued purportedly to comrade Skeete, of the Ministry of National Development. Do you agree with that, according to this form?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Okay. You have given us two other documents, besides the SOP.... Could I ask that the SOP submitted by the Witness be tendered as SCJ 6 perhaps we can refer to it as the Logistics SOP please. [*Inaudible*] Could the Commission bear with me for a few minutes, I am trying to find the other documents.

13:08hrs

Mr. Hanoman: Now, you gave extracts from something, two other documents which one of them starts Section Three - Security for Documents - could you recall sharing that with the Commission?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, I am the author of that document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You are the author of the document.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Can you explain to us what this document is?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Well firstly Sir, it is an extract of the Guyana Defense Force Security Standing Operating Procedures and the extract you would refer to...

Mr. Hanoman: It starts at section three.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, it relates to security of document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Would you agree that they also relate, well including the classification of documents, how they are to be stored, how they are to be destroyed and so on?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now there are several missing documents we have heard about in this inquiry. First of all, I will ask you if can help us with how these documents might have been classified, for instance the personal file of William Gregory Smith, that would have been classified as what type of document?

Lt. Col. James: That is a Confidential document, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That would have been a Confidential document.

Lt. Col. James: Yes Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: According to your procedures, that document was to be stored under lock and key?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: That document also to be stored, I think there should be an armed guard also guarding that place in which the document was stored?

Lt. Col. James: Not necessarily, the building has a number of security measures, physical security measures like security cameras and alarms, etcetera and the building is also secured from unauthorised entry.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, if such a document was to be deliberately destroyed, the procedure is for a certificate... What is the procedure if the Army was to deliberately destroy such a document?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: I do not about such a scenario because there are procedures with respect to destruction of document and the scenario you outlined; we do not destroy personal files, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: So there is no policy in the GDF for personal files to be destroyed?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, what is the procedure if a personal file is missing?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, if I might start first personnel files comes under the authority of the General staff officer the G1, he is responsible for personnel matters, he would have appeared before this Commission and that person is Lieutenant Colonel West. The custodian of the personal files in the Guyana Defense Force is the general Personnel Department and once they would have recognised all the discrepancies, they would submit a formal report to the G2 branch for investigation of the circumstances under which it cannot be accounted for, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Well as the G2 branch man, are you aware of any correspondence that deals with locating that missing file?

Mr. Chairman: I was wondering whether if there is a difference between personal files and personnel files in this context.

Mr. Williams: [*Inaudible*] dealing with the Intelligence Committee only they could give you the difference between a personal file and a personnel file.

Mr. Chairman: Take for example, Gregory Smith, he would have a personal file and a personnel file it would not be the same?

Mr. Williams: He would have a file being a member of the organisation, but for the Intelligence Committee, I suppose a personal file is a file that they documented [*inaudible*].

Mr. Hanoman: How do you refer to that file that I am speaking about?

Lt. Col. James: It is a personal file, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Personnel?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: P-E-R-S-O-N-A-L.

Mr. Hanoman: Personal.

Lt. Col. James: With respect to your question Sir I did receive from the GPD – the General Personal Department two correspondences which suggested that personal files could not be located Sir, and I did conduct investigations.

Mr. Hanoman: No, let us be a little clear. We are speaking about the personal file of William Gregory Smith?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: So you are saying that... What is the date of the correspondence you are referring to?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, this correspondence is dated the 13th June, 2014.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Did you not say two correspondences?

Lt. Col. James: Well this was with respect to 4141 W. Smith and I also did receive another correspondence with respect to 1731 Pivate L-E-O-N M-O-L-E-N-O, Ma'am, personal file.

Mr. Hanoman: So this is the first time that the GDF is acknowledging that the personal file of William Gregory Smith could not be found?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, this is the first time I would have received a correspondence with respect to this personal file not being accounted for.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I am sorry, the second correspondence?

Lt. Col. James: The second correspondence, Ma'am, relates to, this is the regimental number 1731, Private Leon Moleno, and this correspondence would have been the 25th July, 2014 Madam.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Is that correspondence high security, is it something that we would...

Lt. Col. James: No, Ma'am it is restricted and you cannot see it.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Would you be willing to that with us?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, it is restricted, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I arrange for those documents to be photocopied for the benefit of everybody and hopefully I can tender it?

Mr. Chairman: What is the relevance of Moleno whose personal file cannot be accounted for?

Mr. Jairam: Leon Moleno, what is the relevance of him?

Mr. Hanoman: I have never heard that name, Sir. I have not seen the document. What is the name you mentioned?

Lt. Col. James: The second name, Sir?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes.

Lt. Col. James: Leon Moleno, Sir. The first one was 4141 William Smith and the second name, Sir, is Leon Moleno, Sir. The first one was 4141 W. Smith and the second one was I think it is 1731 Leon Moleno, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Is it your understanding that those are the only two personal files that have gone missing in the Army?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, those were the only two correspondence that were sent to me from the, I would say the General Personnel Department indicating that those two personal files could not be located. I have not received another one, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure now of the context in which Moleno's name appear and I am not sure in what context we have heard of him? We know of Gregory Smith, but not Moleno.

Mr. Hanoman: Are you suggesting to us as I asked earlier whether when all the checks were made that these were the only two files missing, that is why you only receives those two names?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir, those two are reports that were made to the G2 branch which required an investigation as to why the personal file could not be located or its whereabouts, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: But that name means anything to you the Leon.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: M-O-L-E-N-O.

Mr. Hanoman: Moleno.

Lt. Col. James: Not necessarily, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Commission Counsel, could you advise us as to the context in which his name appears.

Mr. Hanoman: Well we have never requested that information.

Lt. Col. James: No Sir, I brought the documents because I anticipated that you would ask whether we had conducted investigation with respect to missing personal files and those were the only two correspondences I have received which would have facilitated an investigation by the G2 branch, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: But we must not be side-tracked because this whole disclosure arose by my giving an illustration about Gregory Smith's personal file, for example would be AL and then this information about Gregory Smith and Moleno came out.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: But we must not pursue that that was...

Mr. Hanoman: Very well.

Mr. Chairman: By accident that that came out.

Mr. Jairam: But the fact that you have a regimental number 4141 Smith, means that someone carrying that number was enlisted in the Army?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: But the person's personnel file is missing?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: We have heard that before.

Mr. Hanoman: But as you stand there you are only aware of two personal file in the whole army that is missing?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: William Gregory Smith and Leon Moleno?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, that correspondence was handed to you to investigate?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Did you find those files?

Lt. Col. James: No Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Did you come to any conclusion about how they became missing?

Lt. Col. James: The investigation is still ongoing, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: But if a file were to be removed from its secure location by an authorised person, somebody would be required to sign in an official record?

Lt. Col. James: There is normally access to personal files by individuals who have been security vetted. I am not saying it is not possible. It could be possible but as far as I am aware, there are a number of controls which prohibits ease of access to personal files, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Now, if for instance the Head of the Army, the Chief-of-Staff, walk into that secure location and request a file, a note would have to be made somewhere?

Lt. Col. James: Request for any personal file had to be documented and approved, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Where?

Lt. Col. James: Regardless of the Rank of the person requesting the personnel file, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Okay, where that record has to be made?

Lt. Col. James: It depends on the rank of the individual whose personal file is requested. If it is an Officer, there are certain categories, for example if it is a Captain, a major and above has to collect the personal file and the approval for the collection of that personnel file has to be made by the Chief-of-Staff, the Deputy Chief-of-Staff or the Colonel Administration in Cohort train. Even if it is an ordinary rank's personnel file, Sir, those three designated persons have to approve in writing on a form that is normally prepared, and records for personal files, issuance of personal files and returns of personal files are documented, Sir.

13:23hrs

Mr. Hanoman: Have you done an exhaustive search of all those documents already or you have not completed that?

Lt. Col. James: I have done exhaustive searches, but prior to the General Personnel Department being where it is currently located, it was located in an area which was prone to flooding and I am aware that during the 2005 flood, not only personnel files by a number of other documents stored at ground level were some severely damaged, some barely damaged by the flood that would have occurred, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: The protocol that you outlined there relates to how it ought properly to happen.

Lt. Col. James: Could you please repeat your question, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: The protocol that you outline there with respect to accessing files is how it ought properly to take place.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: But when you get deviations from the norm, where you do not know precisely what took place then you have deviations from the norm. That is the exciting part of life you see when you deviate from the norm. That is not meant for you to answer that.

Lt. Col. James: Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I ask that that extract with pages number one to 12, just being referred to on the security of documents be tendered and admitted into evidence.

Mr. Chairman: You have a tag for it?

Mr. Hanoman: SCJ 7 please.

Mr. Chairman: The document is now so received and marked, as indicated SCJ 7.

Mr. Hanoman: You have also shared with us two pages which deal with the orders for investigators. It starts at 3.3. Can you tell us what that document is about?

Lt. Col. James: Well basically Sir, this is unit standing orders that are peculiar to the G2 branch and it addresses all categories of G2 branch personnel including investigators, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Alright. Now, if I could direct you to the number 3.3-3 which speaks to “No officer warrant, I believe that should be officer, senior or junior non-commissioned officer-soldier is to be handed over to the Guyana Police Force unless authorized by the SO1G2. Do you see that?”

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: A Sergeant in the Army would be any of those categories of persons?

Lt. Col. James: A Sergeant would be a Senior Non-Commissioned Officer, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: He would be a Senior Non-Commissioned Officer?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sergeant and Staff Sergeant, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: So according to the procedures in existence now, a sergeant in the army could not be handed over to the police force unless authorised by you?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Did this provision exist in 1980?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot say, Sir. I know it was an order given by the former Chief-of-Staff where Admiral Gary Best during his tenure as Chief-of-Staff, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: Could I ask you to look at 3.4-1 on the very last page and direct your attention to sub=letter c. Written there you see liaising with the HQ CID for the exchange of Crime Information?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: What does that mean?

Mr. Hanoman: Explain to us what does that mean please?

Lt. Col. James: During my tenure, we have had increased collaboration with both the Criminal Investigations Department (CID) Headquarters, Special Branch and CANU and this is with respect to crime and narcotic activity. There are a number of formalised meetings, attended by myself, the Head of Special Branch, the Crime Chief and the Head of CANU. We have scheduled meetings and what you see reflected in the unit orders is liaison between the G2 branch and CID Headquarters with respect to crime information. For example, on a daily basis we would receive the police report from the Guyana Police Force which would indicate different categories of crime, where they would have occurred between A to G division, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: You were in the G2 branch or the Intelligence Unit since 1980?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Now, traditionally is it correct for me to suggest that it is the G2 branch that has always had the responsibility of sharing crime information with the Police?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Hanoman: If it pleases the Commission, I wish to tender this two page document. The tag in mind is SCJ 8.

Mr. Chairman: The two page report has been tagged SCJ 8.

Mr. Hanoman: The standing orders, the security of documents and the order for investigators just referred to were altogether at the back of one of those Army statements Kite or West and in that order.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, we are looking at the standing orders here, Logistics Standing Orders of the Guyana Defense Force that is the document we are looking at?

Mr. Hanoman: Those two last documents referred to should be attached to the end of that. I do not know if you have it?

Mr. Chairman: Did you not mention standing orders as the Army security document

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, there are Security Standing Orders which is a fairly thick document and then after that we dealt with a separate 12 page document which speaks to security of documents and this last document is a two page document that speaks to what obtains in the G2 branch...

Lt. Col. James: G2 branch.

Mr. Hanoman: ...With regards to investigations.

Lt. Col. James: Yes.

Mr. Jairam: They are the last two pages?

Mr. Hanoman: It should be the last two pages. It should be attached to the statement of Lieutenant Coronel West. I think it was distributed since July.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: This goes back Mr. Williams; we are advised it is a document distributed since July.

Mr. Williams: No, we found it.

Mr. Chairman: You found it, yes, good, thanks.

Mr. Hanoman: You also mentioned today that you are in receipt of a letter dated the 13th June, 2014 which is the death anniversary of Dr. Walter Rodney, information that William Smith's personnel file was missing. I wish to ask for this letter to be tendered as well. Copies have been made and distributed and the tag that I have in mind is SCJ 9.

Mr. Jairam: Well the letter does not say William, it says 4141 W...

Mr. Hanoman: I am very sorry, 4141 which is perhaps more precise than William

Mr. Chairman: Cannot be accounted for.

Mr. Hanoman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I think you probably interpret that as missing but the precise language of the letter was it cannot be accounted for. I think it is one and the same.

Mr. Jairam: What tag did we give it?

Mr. Chairman: But I am anxious to receive it into evidence and give it a tag.

Mr. Hanoman: SCJ 9 please.

Mr. Chairman: Yes but I am not seeing the document.

Mr. Hanoman: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: We have to see it before it would certainly be applicate.

Mr. Hanoman: I have no further questions, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: 13th June, 2014. What tag they are putting on it?

Mr. Jairam: SCJ 9.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: SCJ 9. Thanks.

Mr. Pilgrim: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: You are at the crease?

Mr. Pilgrim: I had hoped to be, but I just wanted to be clear for the benefit of everyone that still has to question that we will have the benefit of the Lieutenant Colonel tomorrow to continue because I doubt that the four parties present with an interest would likely finish in the next 25 minutes. So I just wanted to be clear that if I start now, I can continue tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman: Please guide us Commission...

Mr. Williams: I thought I was starting.

Mr. Pilgrim: I must have misinterpreted your position yesterday that you were not going to start.

Mr. Williams: No. *[Laughter]*

Mr. Pilgrim: Yesterday when we discussed it I understood I was...

Mr. Williams: I could bat to close of play.

Mr. Chairman: Today?

Mr. Williams: Yes. Whatever happens, I do not know if the witness is coming tomorrow. But it is two full days up to now.

Mr. Hanoman: The Witness has...

Mr. Chairman: You boys are *[inaudible]*

Mr. Williams: I am happy that I am being jostled to open the batting. I am happy, it is not normal.

Mr. Chairman: We are not to waste any time here so please proceed.

Mr. Williams: I could start.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Hanoman: Just for the sake of the record, the Witness has indicated to us that he is willing to be with us for as long as it takes which includes tomorrow.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: That is the official position? He is coming tomorrow?

Mr. Hanoman: Yes, please.

Mr. Williams: Okay, let me start today, I will not be long.

Mr. Pilgrim: We have heard that before.

Mr. Chairman: All that is relative.

Mr. Williams: I would just like to refer you to, let me get a couple of the forms, let us take a form with Skeete, SCJTWOH, might I respectfully refer you to that. It is dated the 6th July, 1978. This issue and receipt voucher.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: What date is it?

Mr. Williams: The date is 6th July, 1978.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Williams: I am going to use this as an illustrative way, all of the forms that we have dealt with. Now, Coronel the question of handing over of guns in the army, you would agree with me is a very serious exercise?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Very serious.

Mr. Chairman: You are talking to external sources.

Mr. Williams: Yes, not even external, internal too but more so external. And so there must be a strict regime applicable to such an exercise in the Army, very strict regime applicable for

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

handing over of guns, transferring guns to other persons, other units, external agencies, you agree with that?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: And so it would mean then that their procedures must be strictly followed?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: And the practice is that in the army, those procedures are strictly followed?

Lt. Col. James: As far as I am aware, Sir.

13:38hrs

Mr. Williams: Yes, now when you look at the documents I referred you to, and it runs throughout all the documents, there is no Issue Voucher Number. Do you agree with that?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: That number is important for tracking of the weapons?

Lt. Col. James: That is also correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Also, you do not Receipt Voucher Numbers either?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: That is equally important for tracking of the transaction?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Therefore, those are two irregularities?

Lt. Col. James: I did allude to those in my analysis, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I guess the answer is "I repeat, yes".

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Of course...

Mr. Chairman: Are there irregularities so much or deficiencies there or both?

Lt. Col. James: I would say both, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to interrupt you; I just want to know...

Mr. Williams: No, Sir, by all means.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that an irregularity would arise if there was a requirement and it was ignored but as I understand these things were not on the form so the form was deficient, but I might be wrong, correct me if I...

Mr. Chairman: There is provision for an Issue Voucher Number and a Receipt Voucher Number but those sections were not filled out.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Very well, thank you.

Mr. Williams: You would expect that the persons within the Army dealing with handing over of guns would be very familiar with such forms...

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Williams: ...and of the need to have the Issue voucher number and also to protect themselves, the Receipt voucher number.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: In addition to the other irregularities that have ran throughout all the forms that you have pointed out previously, you get the impression that whoever may have filled out these forms, could not have been the proper person appointed to do so in the Army?

Lt. Col. James: I do not agree with you, Sir.

Mr. Williams: What do you not agree with?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: I did indicate that the Principals, allegedly, who would have issued these weapons are around and they can clarify whether these were genuine issues or not, Sir.

Mr. Williams: No, that is not what I am putting to you. I am saying to you the fact that all these forms are attended by irregularities, it is not unreasonable to say that they might not have been filled up by the proper person to do so.

Mr. Hanoman: I am sorry to interject but my friend has just used a host of negatives in the sentence, about four or five, so I do not know if it is fair to the Witness.

Mr. Williams: Perhaps Counsel could explain what it means, Sir, the four/five negatives he is talking about.

Mr. Hanoman: I cannot explain that, that is why I wanted to ask the question without it.

Mr. Chairman: Is it a linguistic objection you are taking?

Mr. Hanoman: It is because there is about four or five negatives trunked together in the sentence.

Mr. Chairman: I am not terribly worried about that. I am worry about whether the Witness understands but if you think that it is likely to be misleading...

Mr. Hanoman: Very well. I would just like for the Witness to know that he can ask Counsel to explain the question if he does not understand.

Lt. Col. James: He knows that. He is a professional Witness of 34 years standing. He does not want you to tell him that. He is a leader. If he does not understand he would say so.

Mr. Hanoman: I think the point is taken, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Have you not observed him over the last many days?

Mr. Hanoman: I have not been asking that sort of question, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, let us proceed.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Lieutenant Colonel, is it unreasonable to suggest that?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot answer...

Mr. Chairman: Put me in the know now. I am not sure what 'that' is?

Mr. Williams: That the forms that we have before us might not have been filled by the relevant personnel who normally deal with this in the Army? That is what I put to him.

Mr. Pilgrim: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I would object to that question on the basis that it invites conjecture, firstly, and the Witness has already pointed out that persons who he believes to have filled out these forms is in existence and available to us so as to invite him to say "well I feel that this could be", I would suggest, is objectionable.

Mr. Chairman: The Witness can receive any invitation. If he does not want to accept the invitation he will say so. He is a professional Witness of 34 years standing. Have you not been observing him?

Mr. Pilgrim: Grateful, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Williams: Thanks for your protection from this purported strategy.

Mr. Chairman: Put the question if you...

Mr. Williams: Yes, I am asking him.

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Yes, I am saying the regular person who does this in the Army would not have made all these mistakes in filling up the forms that we have before us.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Mistakes, Sir?

Mr. Williams: All these omissions.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Madam Commissioner, all these omissions.

Lt. Col. James: I cannot answer that question, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You cannot answer that?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Alright, you also said that notwithstanding the requirement on these forms, the note about original and triplicate for the Consignor and duplicate for the Consignee, it is your opinion that the documents you have are all separately prepared.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Good. I am asking you therefore that, since you also said that these documents are supposed to be in bound book of volume, that these pages could have also been acquired by non-GDF Personnel?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, I had a number of other supporting documentation, other than the vouchers, which indicated that there were issues and also that there were weapons that were returned, Sir.

Mr. Williams: No, that is not what I am asking you. Certainly we do not expect the members of the Guyana Defense Force who have the custody of importing items like weaponry not to understand the procedure and the safeguards within those procedures in dealing with weapons.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You have brought a plethora of documents in which almost every document is replete with omissions and that is why I suggested to you that the regular persons dealing with this process could not have been the persons to have filled up these forms. You said that you cannot agree with me but I am saying to you also that it is quite possible that other persons including non-Army Personnel could have obtained these forms since they are not in triplicate or anything and filled them up?

Lt. Col. James: I do not agree with you, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You will not agree with me?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I think that, am I correct, that the Witness also said that there is other supporting documentation and the records that show that these were issued by the Army? Is that what the Witness said?

Lt. Col. James: Yes, Ma'am.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Thank you.

Mr. Williams: You are saying that we did not have the first names for Caesar and King? Do you remember you said that?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Yet you are saying that you know who King is and who Caesar is?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: How did you arrive at that?

Lt. Col. James: I am saying, Sir, that those two named individuals were working in that area during the period of time mentioned in the vouchers and the other supporting documents, Sir.

Mr. Williams: They would not state their names correctly?

Mr. Pilgrim: You have to ask them that.

Mr. Chairman: I think that it is full enough for him to...

Mr. Williams: Fully? His procedure is that it must their first and surnames; that is the procedure he outlined, so if they were the persons and they did not do so is it not reasonable for me to suggest to you that they were not the persons? You would have to bring them because unless and until you do that you cannot convince anybody that, yes, you know that those persons were the persons who were supposed to be there at the period.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Is that a question for him to answer?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Yes, I am putting that to him.

Mr. Pilgrim: There is no question. There is nothing before him.

Mr. Williams: Are we going to have a commentary or you want me to get into it.

Mr. Pilgrim: Just ask the question. It is a duty on Counsel to ask questions to assist this tribunal.

Mr. Williams: The Q.C, like he is out of touch, I do not know what he is...

Mr. Pilgrim: In circumstances where my learned Friend continues just to make these speeches to advance his political cause...

Mr. Chairman: Okay, but we not...

Mr. Williams: ...but you cannot interrupt me all the time. You cannot lecture to me or anything. What is your problem? He does not understand what is happening. He should wait and see what is happening.

Mr. Chairman: I understood the question to be whether the fact that the first name was not indicated, even though the form called for it, whether he would agree with you that that means that it is not...

Mr. Jairam: How was he able to trace it?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: "No, that is not the person. Is it not reasonable to suggest that that is not the same person?" That is the question.

Mr. Chairman: "...is not the same person?"

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: That is the question before him?

Lt. Col. James: I was saying Sir, that the Principals are around and I guess we can clear this up by having them appear before the Commission, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You have to bring them.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: Two named individuals appear before the Commission, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: They appeared here or they should appear?

Lt. Col. James: To appear before the Commission, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I said...

Lt. Col. James: I did indicate, Sir, that I gave the information on their current location and whereabouts to the Commission, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, they are available to be summoned, I understood him to be saying.

Mr. Williams: Yes, let us look at the requirement here. The requirement is that the stamp of the consignee must be affixed?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You agree that no document here which you have produced has a stamp for the Ministry of National Development or National Development – I do not see they have Ministry on this document, for example.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: That is another mistake or omission; another omission.

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Therefore, since there is no stamp of ‘National Development’, do you agree with me that one cannot accept that the National Development was involved in this transaction, *ex facie* this document?

Lt. Col. James: I cannot explain that document to you, Sir. As I did indicate in my evidence, those were documents I retrieved during my research into investigation...

Mr. Williams: No, I understand that, Lieutenant Colonel. What I am saying to you, *ex mero motu* the document, you look at the document and you do not see any stamp for the Ministry of National Development. Do you agree with me that that is an irregularity?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: I said, yes, before, Sir.

Mr. Williams: I am putting to you equally; you cannot say that the Ministry of National Development at the time was involved in this transaction that is purported to reflect on this document?

Lt. Col. James: If you were listening carefully to my evidence, Sir, you would have heard me say “purportedly issued to”, I never said “it was issued to”, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Are you answering my question? Is that a ‘yes’?

Lt. Col. James: I said “purportedly issued”, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Good, so these documents that we have here, do you agree with me, are ‘barebones’, ‘barebone documents’, ‘barebones’?

Mr. Pilgrim: I am not sure what that is.

Mr. Williams: It is bereft of all the relevant information that is required by the form. Do you agree with that?

Lt. Col. James: What is the question...?

Mr. Williams: All the omissions on these forms make them make them not authentic; make them not to relate to authentic transactions.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: You are abandoning the first question and your question now is that the omissions make them non-authentic?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Does that follow reasonably; the omissions you think go to authenticity because the omissions relate to filling up of the forms.

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The forms call for this information...

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: ...for particular information...

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: ...but whoever was filling out the form did not always comply with the requirement but does that mean that the form is not authentic?

13:53hrs

Mr. Williams: Sir, they did not overwhelmingly conform. If we go through the categories you will see that the majority they have omitted.

Mr. Chairman: But does that go to authenticity of the form?

Mr. Williams: Well that is what I have been suggesting, Sir. Unless you bring the “King” and “Caesar”, we cannot be satisfied that these documents originated from them and if you bear with me you will see where I am going.

Mr. Chairman: You go ahead.

Mr. Williams: Yes, now...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: The Witness did not answer though.

Lt. Col. James: What is the question you would wish me to answer, Sir?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Do omissions make them unauthentic?

Lt. Col. James: As I did say in my early evidence, Sir, there are other supporting documents which support that the vouchers are authentic, Sir. I did go through a period of analysis of every single voucher that I submitted, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: So your supporting document speaks, in your view, to the authenticity of the vouchers?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman: Well very.

Mr. Williams: What supporting document is he talking about?

Lt. Col. James: The Special Stores Register, in one instance, Sir, which indicates weapons that were issued. It supports the serial numbers on the Issue Vouchers and also weapons that were returned in the Guyana Defense Force systems and also weapons that are not accounted for, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Yes but that is from your end, the Army end. We are talking about the consignees. That is what I asked you to address your mind to. You do not have any stamp of the consignee so you cannot say that the Ministry of National Development was involved.

Lt. Col. James: That was asked and answered.

Mr. Williams: That is what I am saying to you.

Mr. Chairman: I think I did not get...

Mr. Williams: No but his explanation suggests, Sir, that he did not understand that that was what I was asking him.

Mr. Chairman: No, but he did understand and he said earlier that there are other supporting documents supporting the authenticity of the vouchers and he was referring to the Special Stores Register and what else? That alone?

Lt. Col. James: I did mention the Special Stores Register, Sir.

Mr. Jairam: And the fact that weapons were returned.

Lt. Col. James: And the fact that weapons were returned base on weapons that were allegedly or proportional issued on the Issue Voucher that you have in your possession, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: So weapons reflected on the Issued Voucher.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Mr. Williams, I think you are overlooking an answer he give regarding the consignees because you put to him 'so therefore with no stamp of Ministry of National

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Development with no stamp of Ministry of National Development one cannot accept that that ministry was involved’.

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: In other words you are asking him about the authenticity?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mrs. Samuels- Brown: And his answer was “I cannot explain the documents. I did say ‘purportedly issued’”. So in other sense he agreed with you on the issue of consignees and then you went more generally and that is when he answered about the supporting documents.

Mr. Williams: Yes it is interesting that he is relaying on his supporting documents because my recollection is that he was answering, for example, in the AB 561 and in relations to the Special Register in negative many times when he was asked about verifications but we could go on that exercise and verify those relevant books that you are talking about but that is not what I want to deal with. I am saying to you that the omissions on these forms – no first name for Skit no legible signature no stamp...

Mr. Pilgrim: No legible signature?

Mr. Williams: Is that not that what he said?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think that the legibility of the signature was in question. It had no first name, only a surname and the surname ‘Skeete’ was clear.

Mr. Williams: ...and the signature of the consignee. He said it had to be clear is not that what you said? The way they write....

Mrs. Samuels- Brown: He should it should be accompanied by writing in first and last name of the person but although the signatures were there the first and last name of the consignees were not recorded in that box.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Exactly, in other words, below the signature, the handwriting, they should have had the letters in scribe so that you could identify who the person is by the signature purporting to sign there, is that no so, as the consignee?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: That is what I understood you to have said. Now do you agree with me that throughout that there is no stamp whatsoever by the consigner?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You still do not want to accept that this transaction here was not a transaction via the proper channels of the Guyana Defense Force?

Lt. Col. James: What is the question you wish me to answer, Sir?

Mr. Williams: The absence of the stamp of the consigner... You said that they must have a stamp. Every Unit has its stamp. You have no stamp running throughout in any of these documents.

Lt. Col. James: Sir, again I did go through...

Mr. Williams: Are you now convinced about what I am saying?

Lt. Col. James: Sir, again I did go through the vouchers that I presented to the Commission and I did outline all the discrepancies, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Are you aware that there is evidence before this Commission that the Working People's Alliance (WPA) boasted that it had infiltrated the Army, the Police and other Security Forces?

Lt. Col. James: No, Sir.

Mr. Williams: You are unaware, G2?

Lt. Col. James: That is correct, Sir.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: It is a matter of record. Could I suggest to you that this form probably could have been obtained by an infiltrator? [*Laughter*]

Attorney for the Working People's Alliance (WPA) [Mr. Christopher Ram]: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to be guided to the words of anyone on record that said that the WPA infiltrated the Army.

Mr. Williams: Is that a question?

Mr. Ram: You cannot use words so loosely.

Mr. Williams: Is that a question, Sir?

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: I think we are just asking to be guided. Can you remember which witnesses said this?

Mr. Williams: Many witnesses came and said that.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: Which are...

Mr. Williams: I think, for example, Mr. Gates was one. You even had some WPA persons saying that. We have on record Gregory Smith's book which is a matter of record here too.

Mr. Ram: And is he WPA?

Mr. Williams: Generally, that is not something hard to find because basically that information was given in a boastful manner that the WPA had influences in the Security Forces. I am sure that has resonated with the Commissioners, it is just a question of finding that.

Mr. Jairam: You are saying 'influenced' now but you used the word "infiltrate" before. Which one do you mean?

Mr. Williams: Both!

Mr. Ram: Make up your mind.

Mr. Chairman: The time for that fact finding has not yet come.

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: Both but I do not know why my friend, Mr. Ram, is objecting. Mr. Ram is on record as making a very broad statement...

Mr. Ram: I am objecting to a misrepresentation of the records.

Mr. Williams: ...that the GDF deliberately ducked their records and that is why they could not come to this Commission so I am surprised that Mr. Ram...

Mr. Ram: Again Mr. Williams is perpetuating myths and lies. I am sorry about the strength of the language.

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: If I may, I think the point has been made by Mr. Ram and I do not think that we should distract Mr. Williams from his examination because we all want the Commission to move expeditiously and efficiently so we could return to the questions.

Mr. Pilgrim: Mr. Chairman, being a convenient time... It is 14:00hrs and it will give Counsel an opportunity to...

Mr. Chairman: If Mr. Williams is going to be finishing soon...

Mr. Williams: Pardon me, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: He said that he would not be too long.

Mr. Pilgrim: Mr. Williams?! Finish soon?!

Mr. Williams: I am not too sure what is happening with the Q.C., today, Sir. He is somewhat under the weather, very irritable. He was concerned about some siren going off there just now. I am keeping one eye on him.

Mr. Pilgrim: Noise one side and noise the other side. *[Laughter]*

Mr. Chairman: I would urge that you both remain focused and not be distracted by sirens.

Mr. Williams: No, if it is 14:00hrs I will finish at 14:00hrs. Is it 14:00hrs now? Yes, it is a good time to finish. Let us hope, Sir, that tomorrow we do not have all these interruptions.

Mr. Chairman: How long do you have?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Williams: It depends on the interruptions.

Mr. Chairman: I want to be satisfied that you are not running out of gas...

Mr. Williams: I can assure you, Sir...

Mr. Chairman: ...that your tank is full.

Mr. Williams: ...that I will want to be my usual brisk, crisp self.

Mr. Chairman: Very well.

Mr. Williams: So tomorrow we will continue and see if my learned friend is in a better mood. He has this belief that he could distract me.

Mr. Chairman: I think that I am going to order separation tomorrow, but what about the last question? My notes seem incomplete.

Mr. Williams: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: The last question, we can complete on that. What was that again?

Mr. Jairam: Infiltrator...

Mr. Williams: I asked him if he was aware that it came out before this Commission that the WPA had infiltrated and that they had actually boasted...

Mr. Pilgrim: He answered and said 'no' already.

Mr. Williams: And also had influence within the...

Mrs. Samuels-Brown: No.

Mr. Chairman: They are two different questions, you know. "Infiltration" is one separate question and 'influence'...

Mr. Williams: I was asking if it is both and I said 'yes' but we could continue ...

Mr. Chairman: Mr. James, do you appreciate that there were two questions put before you?

WALTER RODNEY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Lt. Col. James: I am fine, Sir. The Counsel could ask any question, Sir.

Mr. Williams: Therefore, I was suggesting to him an infiltrator could have obtained a form, obviously, he did not get a book.

Mr. Chairman: Even though he rejected the premise on which you proceeded previously...

Mr. Williams: Yes so we will continue tomorrow.

[Laughter]

Mr. Williams: Let us see how many more times he is going to reject.

Mr. Chairman: You are not appreciating my observing but that...

Mr. Williams: No, I understand you said he rejected the infiltration bit.

Mr. Chairman: And yet you proceed on that base which is a rejected basis.

Mr. Williams: No, I am not proceeding on that base I said we will continue tomorrow. He wants me to go through the whole thing about the targeting of the GDF, et cetera, by the WPA, the newsletter that they designed specifically for the Army and all of that, so he wants all of that.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, we will achieve more order tomorrow for sure, but for now we stand adjourn until 9:30hrs tomorrow.

Hearing Adjourned Accordingly at 14:05hrs