

**THE INFLUENCE OF PRIVATE INTERESTS IN POLICY MAKING
IN NIGERIA: A CASE STUDY OF COMMERCIAL
AGRICULTURAL PROJECT IN KWARA STATE, 2004 – 2010**

DR. ABUBAKAR O. SULAIMAN*

LAWAL ABDULLAHI OLADIMEJI**

ABSTRACT:

Public Policy in contemporary societies have assumed significant position in the performance of governmental functions and more importantly in driving societies towards development. However, in Nigeria and other third world nations the private interest of the policy makers appears to be the major determinant of government policy decisions. This study examines commercial agricultural policy of Kwara State Government with a view to identifying how the private interests of Government officials influenced the choice of white farmers at the expense of Nigerians. The paper used survey approach, and other documented information in its investigation alongside informal interaction with people in Tsonga area. With the aid of elites theory of public policy, the paper argued that the political and bureaucratic elites who are usually few in every political organizations makes policies in their interests, using the state resources for their implementation. Hence, the paper discovered among other findings that, the New Nigerian Enterprises to which the Tsonga Farm Holdings was sold belongs to the Saraki family. It is recommended that, the Kwara State House of Assembly should review the MOU and the entire activities of the white Farmers in Tsonga.

*** DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, UNIVERSITY OF ABUJA.**

**** DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, CENTRE FOR DISTANCE LEARNING AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF ABUJA.**

Introduction:

Public policies are important instruments with which government perform its numerous responsibilities of maintenance of law and order, provision of public goods and many others. This is to say that authoritative allocation of values are done via the instrumentality of public policy within every political system to resolve the various contending interest in such territory. In this sense, “a public policy could be domestic policy, foreign policy, development policy, defence and national security policy” (Jega, 2007:100).

Unemployment, high rate of poverty, insecurity, inadequate health facilities and even rural-urban drift are examples of social problems which domestic or development policy may address. However, the interest of the policy makers is of paramount importance in public policy. It is of great significance not only in determining which sectors of the societal problems should be address, but also in deciding which option to be taken in dealing with the identified problem(s).

Among the numerous problems confronting the people of Kwara State in particular, and other States of the Nigeria Federation are high rate of unemployment, poverty, absence of infrastructural facilities such as good road network, shortage of food items due largely to subsistence farming. The commercial agricultural project of Kwara State Government was pronounced as government ideas of transforming agricultural practises in the State and it's productivity, as a result of which several problems of the State are expected to be overcome.

Against the above background, this paper examines the influences of private interests in the choice of the policy by the Kwara State Government with a view to identifying the reasons for the choice of Zimbabwean farmers, and not local farmers in the State. The paper is divided into the following sections: introduction; conceptual and theoretical framework; the commercial agricultural project in Kwara State, and it's operations; and lastly, conclusion and recommendations of the paper.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework:

The Concept of Public Policy

Human conduct is generally governed by what is sometimes loosely referred to as 'policy'. In this broad sense, everyone would seem to have one policy or another regulating one's behaviour or action. Thus, it is conceivable to talk of 'private' policies, policies which help to regulate private domains (Sambo, 1999:282)

The above quotation presupposes the fact that policy is a pervasive term that is both consciously or unconsciously utilised on daily basis. Such kind of policies as it affects individual and personal life are described as 'private policy'. This is because, they help to regulate the do's and don't of individuals in question and more importantly are limited in scope and impact. Sambo (1999: 282), illustrated this point by citing the decision of an individual 'not to eat breakfast' as private policy intended to regulate the nutritional behaviour of that individual.

He explained further that, the behaviour is private to the extent that there are no demands made on other people to conform to such behaviour by denying them the pleasure and delight of a delicious breakfast. Small actions and choices as well as important ones are all called policies. Ikelegbe (1996:1), however, proceeded to define a policy as "simply actions taken or to be taken or not to be taken by government or private organisations". It is according to him, a statement of what an organisation wants to do, what it is not doing, what is doing and what would be done. It can also be regarded as general rules, regulations, guiding practices or actions in a particular activity or problem area. It specifies the line of action or proposed line of action in relation to certain activity area.

Presthus (1975:14) defined it as a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide and usually determine present and future actions. It is an integrated programme of actions which an actor (or group of actors) is accustomed to or intends to undertake in response to given problems or situation with which he is confronted. From the above, one cannot but agree that policy is a common term and its making and implementation is equally general. Its utilisation and practises is found with private and

governmental organisation. Thus, it can simply be put as framework or guidelines within which actions and inactions are involved towards their accomplishment.

Public policy which is the topic and focus of this paper is much more than private policy. While private policy does not make demand on other people as mentioned before public policy do. While private policy is limited in scope, public policy is wider in scope. Public policy sets the paradigm, and the guideline within which economic, social, political and administrative decisions important to individuals, groups and corporate organisations within the society are made. Public policy. Dye (1978:3) defined public policy as whatever governments choose to do or not to do. This definition introduces the elements of choice and alternatives from among which the choice is made. This definition has been criticised too. In the words of Anderson (1979:5):

There is a rough accuracy to this definition, but it does not adequately recognise that there may be divergence between what governments decide to do and what they actually do. Moreover, it could be taken to include such actions as personnel appointments or grants of licenses which are usually not thought of as policy matter.

This goes to mean that, not all government chooses to do for they may not do some, and not all governmental actions can be regarded as public policy. Olaniyi (2001: 14) maintained that public policy as a concept in politics does not have a straightforward definition, but variety of uses. He averred that the interdisciplinary nature of the concept constitute another problem, pontificating that the only way by which we can demarcate one from another is to add the 'epithet' that will reflect our area of interest. For instance, economic policies, educational policies are policies relating to different areas and portray different meanings. Chandler and Plano (1988: 107) defined public policy as the strategic use of resources to alleviate national problems or governmental concerns. It has been described as deciding at any time or place what objectives and substantive measures should be chosen in order to deal with a particular problem, issue or innovation. In the words of Olaniyi (1999:283) "What makes policies distinctively public is that

they are developed by governmental bodies and officials". He explained that, the special character of public policies stems from the fact that they are formulated by what David Easton called the 'authorities'. By authorities, he meant those persons who engage in the daily affairs of political system and are recognised by most members of the system as having responsibilities for matters and takes decisions that are accepted as binding most of the time by most members so long as they act within the limits of their roles.

Having seen a plethora of definitions and opinions of scholars on public policy and its features, a clue is taken from Anderson (1990:6), in isolating some key elements which distinguishes public policy from other types of policies. The elements are:

- Public policy is purposive or goal-oriented action rather than random or chance behaviour.
- Public policy consists of courses or patterns of action by governmental officials.
- Public policy is what governments actually do, not what they intend to do or say they are going to do.
- Public policy involves some form of overt government action to affect a particular problem; it also involves a decision by government officials not to take actions, to do nothing on some matter on which governmental involvement is sought.
- Public policy is based on law and authoritative. In other words, public policy has an authoritative, potentially legally coercive quality that the policies of private organisation do not have.

The idea of private interest arises in public policy in order to find response to such question as, what motivates policy makers in the adoption of certain public policy? Is it the public interest, or private interest of policy makers? The private interest, represent the notion that government officials generally, and the policy makers in particular have the same motivation with those in the private sector. This is to say that, policy makers into the choice of a particular policy by narrow self interest which may be in terms of wealth, fame, and power. The private interest theory of economic argued that, If what is in the public's interest is also in the private interest of government decision-makers, the public interest will be served. If there is a conflict between the public's interest and the private interest of governmental decision-makers, the public's interest

will lose. It is the incentive structure that determines behavior, with bad performance by government indicating a bad incentive structure, not a problem with motives.

Commercial Agriculture:

The concept of agriculture is a complex and generic name. This is because it involves and covers a number of activities. The New Encyclopaedia Britannica (1996: 156) defines agriculture as “the science or art of cultivating the soil, growing and harvesting crops and raising livestock”. This is a narrow view of what agriculture entails when compared with other scholars’ position. Halcrow (1980: 6), argued that the word agriculture has long been associated with the growth of civilisation. Originally, he contends the word applied to the growing of crops and the raising of livestock. As economic systems have developed it has taken on a broader meaning. He added that now, it also extends to firms and industries that manufacture farm machinery, produce fertilizer, market farm chemicals. It also covers the industries that process and market farm products. He however, defined Agriculture as an industry covering the organisation of resources—such as land and minerals, Capital in a wide variety of forms, and management and labour – for the production and marketing of food and fibre (Halcrow 1980: 7). Anyanwu (1997: 10) shared the narrow conception of Agriculture as he maintained that “Agriculture involves the cultivation of land, raising and rearing of animals, for the purpose of production of food for man, feed for animals and raw materials for industries”. He identified cropping, livestock, forestry, fishing, processing and marketing of these agricultural products as the activities involves in agriculture.

From the above, one can really see that the concept of agriculture entail lots of things. However, this paper agrees with Anyanwu (1997) that agriculture involves the cultivation of land, raising and rearing of animals for the purpose of production of food for man, feed for animals and raw materials for industries. Farm practices are categorised in a number of ways depending on several criteria. Climate, availability of land and value of goods produced, purpose of produce are the commonest criteria used for classifying agricultural practices. Hence, when climate is used, we hear of tropical Agriculture or middle-latitude agriculture. Intensive and Extensive agriculture are mentioned where land availability and produced are considered. Commercial and subsistence agriculture goes along with purposes of produce i.e. either for sale in large quantity or immediate consumption (The World Book Encyclopaedia 1988: 148).

Subsistence agriculture is practiced where farm families produce barely enough food to meet their own needs. This depends heavily on human labour and requires only the simple farm tools (such as Hoes, cutlasses and simple tools). Subsistence farming could be in the form of shifting cultivation or nomadic farming. Millions of farm families in Africa, Asia and Latin America operate this form of farming system. Commercial farming produces crops and animals chiefly for sale. While the specialised farm earn all or most of their income from the sale of one kind of crop or livestock, a mixed farm diversify and raises a variety of crops and livestock. Commercial Agriculture requires a large investment in equipment and supplies. A great majority of farms in the United State, Canada and Europe are commercial Agriculture (The World Book Encyclopaedia 1988: 148).

Another name with which commercial Agriculture is used is industrial Agriculture. Industrial Agriculture involves large fields and/or numbers of animals, high resources inputs (pesticides, fertilizers, etc) and a high level of mechanisation. Hence, commercial Agriculture can be summed up as the organisation and management of farming operations (of raising animals and crops for human and industrial consumptions) on a large scale with high level of mechanisation for the chief aim of offering the produce for sale. It may be a specialised or mixed farming. Mechanisation has increased farm efficiency and productivity in most region of the world.

Theoretical Framework:

While there are several theories in the study and analysis of public policies, this paper relies on elite theory of public policy for its analysis and discussion. Other theories which exist for interpretation of public policy include the system theory, the game theory, the Marxist theory, to mention but a few. Dye (1978), is one of the prominent contributors to elite theory. The theory was developed as an alternative paradigm to pluralism. In other words, the elite theory rejects the pluralist view concerning the distribution of political powers in the hands of minority groups. “Elitism is therefore, a pattern of decision making characterised by limited mass participation in community issues and their domination by small groups of specialised or general leaders” (Egonmwan 1991: 59). The central arguments of elites theory with regards to public policy are that:

- Society is divided into the few who have power and many who do not.
- Only a small number of persons allocate values for society, the masses do not divide public policy.
- The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproportionately from the upper socio-economic strata of the society.
- The movement of non-elites to elite positions must be slow and continues to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only non-elites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.
- Elites share a consensus on the basic values of the social system and the preservation of the system
- Public policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the prevailing values of the elite. Changes in public policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary.
- Active elite are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elite influence masses more than masses influence elites (Dye and Ziegler, 1984:1).

In spite of criticism of elite theory, it is a useful aid in understanding public policy, especially in the developing societies like Nigeria. Particularly, the theory has been praised for directing the attention of policy analyst to the source of policy flows and whose interest public policy serve. The theory attempts a realistic explanation of the source of policy by predicating it in the elites rather than the masses. The theory has also attracted criticisms. It has been accused of being a provocative theory for assuming a conspirational character of the elites against the wishes of the masses. And for that matter relegating the roles of the masses in policy making to the background perceiving them as apathetic, ill-informed and passive. It is also argued that, strategic placement in elite position as a source of power is hardly a scientific conclusion (Sambo 1999: 295). This means that, the position held by elite theorists, that the position of elites in the society enable them play influential and powerful roles in policy formulation is not scientific, particularly that, the specific roles of the masses in policy formulation is not known.

The relevance of the theory to this study rests in several positions. First, the commercial Agricultural policy and indeed every other public policies in Kwara State are determined and

pursued by the ruling elites i.e. the governor, the Deputy-Governor, the Commissioners, special advisers, personal assistants, members of the State House of Assembly and permanent secretaries in various ministries.

Second, the policy decisions represent the preferences of the elites. In other words, the choice of commercial Agriculture project in which white farmers were invited from Zimbabwe to come and farm at the expenses of thousands of rural farmers that have no assistance only represents channels through which the elite interest (economic, social and otherwise) are better protected and secured and not how the masses of Kwara State have their welfare better provided for. Third, the policy makers are fewer in number compared to the population of Kwarans. The state has a population of about 2.3 million people (N.P.C. 2006 Census figure), and the people involved in the choice of the policy are less than 0.0025% of the entire population (at best they are not more than 100). Fourth, the positive changes in terms of rural development derivable from the project can only be marginal and not fundamental as in the tradition of elites. Fifth and lastly, is that the overall ideals of the policy is entirely foreign in the sense that, the sum of \$250,000 US offered as loan for each of the fifteen farmers by Kwara State Government could be used to revolutionize agriculture using the local farmers and other appropriate mix.

The Commercial Agriculture Project in Kwara State:

The commercial agriculture project refers to the collaborative Agreement signed between the Kwara State Government and the white farmers from Zimbabwe to undertake commercial farming activities in the state. In the agreement which was signed in the year 2004, provisions were made for the specific roles to be played by each actors, namely; the Kwara State Government or its agent, and the Commercial farmers.

On the part of Kwara State Government, the following are the benefits that were offered in Clause 3 of the Agreement:

- a. Fifteen thousand hectares of farmland to fifteen farmers for a term of twenty-five years, renewable for another 25 years.
- b. Provides infrastructure and facilities such as good road network to the farms, domestic water supply, from a borehole, provision of adequate security at the farm

house, electricity supply to the farms, pumping station for irrigation and electricity for the station, Reservoir and pipeline for irrigation.

- c. Assist in sourcing and securing necessary additional local and or foreign investment towards the realisation of the project.
- d. Government of Kwara state will give a loan of thirty-five million Naira (₦35,000,000.00) to each farmer and also guarantee a private sector loan of thirty-five million Naira (₦35,000,000.00) to each of the fifteen farmers.
- e. To process for the white farmers, immigration papers, work and resident permits, entry visas for the farmers; their families and employees who will be employed on the project.
- f. Provide for each farmer conducive housing (bungalow) of 2500 square foot complete with requisite amenities such as a 200 KVA generator, storage sheds and fencing of the farmland on the basis that the cost shall be defrayed by the farmers.
- g. Not to acquire expropriate or encumber or cause or support the expropriation, acquisition or encumbrance of the agricultural lands leased for the project.
- h. To apply to the National Investment Promotion on behalf of the farmers to ensure exemption of such companies from tax liabilities for the maximum permissible period.

Clause 4 of the Agreement contained the part to be played by the farmers as follows:

- a. To commence operations as soon as is reasonably possible but not later than sixty days from the date of commencement.
- b. To duly incorporate companies under the Companies and Allied Matters Act 1990, at their own cost, which companies shall be wholly owned by the farmers or established in conjunction with interested investors and each company shall be the leaseholder of the Agricultural lands to be granted by the Government. Provided and it is hereby agreed that:
 - i. Each company so incorporated shall execute agreement with the state Government concerning the lease to be granted.

- ii. Each proposed agricultural company shall have an authorised share capital of Ten Million Naira (₦10,000,000.00).
- iii. Each company shall on incorporation pass a resolution adopting the terms of this agreement.
- iv. The composition of the Board of Directors of such companies shall be the exclusive responsibility of the individual companies with two non-voting members representing the interest of the Government provided:
 - a. The membership of the Government representatives shall cease upon the liquidation of the loans granted to the farmers by the Government;
 - b. The Government representatives shall not unnecessarily disrupt or widely interfere with the operation of the project.
 - c. The Government representative on the Board shall not receive any remuneration from the companies.
 - d. To submit to the Government the banks and the financial institutions concerned the following relevant documents before applying for the project loans:
 - i. Audited financial reports for previous Agricultural business in Zimbabwe during their period of operation for the past three years.
 - ii. Other relevant or related documents that will facilitate the granting of the loans.
 - e. Not to invest without the prior written consent of the government in any other agricultural sector or industry outside Kwara state until all loans and other obligations relating thereto are fully discharged, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld.
 - f. Upon the allotment and issuance of the shares of the companies to be registered by the farmers, to deposit the government the shares certificates of the companies shareholders as collateral for Government loans and Government guaranteed private sector loans granted for the project until such loans have been fully discharged.

- g. Subject to availability, to ensure that 90% of the local manpower employed by the farmers are local indigenes of Kwara state and to adequately recompense farm workers by way of salary or other remuneration.
- h. To provide the technological know-how necessary for the efficient utilisation of the irrigation system in respect of the project.
- i. To patronise local suppliers where reasonably possible in Kwara state for Agro and allied inputs and raw materials needed by the farmers for the project where same are available locally.
- j. In conjunction with the Government to establish and create a Community Trust Fund which shall be operated by the Government, local community leaders and the farmers jointly for the creation of social facilities and infrastructure for the welfare of the people of the various communities where the farms are located. The Community Trust Fund shall be financed by way of social levy of 1% of gross turnover of the companies.

Clause 6 provided other seeming benefits of the project to the people of Kwara state as:

- vii. From time to time but not less than once in each month, farmers shall hold field days (Farm Days) on a particular farm to assist selected members of the local community in learning the various areas of farming practices.
- viii. A training school shall be established and run at Government's cost to be overseen and managed by a person selected by the union. The terms and conditions of his employment will be agreed between the person concerned and the Government. The school shall be established at a place decided by the Government and its purpose shall be the promotion and encouragement of the transfer of skills and technologies to the members of the local and other communities within the state.

Operations and Activities of the Commercial Farming:

This section examines the operations and activities which have taken place in the implementation of the policy in the last 6 years of the project. It also establishes the contributions

of the project to the development of Kwara State, as well as the exploitation of the people of Kwara State by the Government officials, and its collaborators (the Zimbabwean farmers).

Commercial farmers commenced operations as soon as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), was signed between the Kwara State Government, and the Farmers. The Government provided the farmers with non- interest loan in the sum agreed in the MOU, and the accommodation facilities, processed their visas and work permits, and that of their dependants. In addition, the Kwara State Government secured tax holiday for the commercial farmers, and accommodation facilities for the farmers. There were 13 distinct farm holdings in the entire project. As outlined in the MOU, each of the 13 farmers was allotted 1 hectare of land to be held for a period of 25 years in the first instance and may subsequently be renewed. Items being cultivated in the project, which started around 2005 include Soya beans, maize, rice, cassava, poultry production, and diary farm. The production is in large quantities, as much as 420 ha of cassava, among other items. And because, viable markets were found for these items in Europe, the Governor constructed a cargo units at the Ilorin Airport in order to serve the transportation needs of the farmers.

Hence, it should not be difficult to understand the fact that, the food situation in Stonga, or any part of Kwara State has not improved both in terms of availability, and affordability, five years into the agriculture project. If there were farm products which the local people do buy from the commercial farmers, it is not more than yoghurts, and sachet milk. But, again, is these the kinds of farm produce we need to revolutionalised agriculture in Nigeria?

In the year 2006, the Tsonga farming project was incorporated as Tsonga F.H ltd as a special purpose vehicle to mobilise “investment and funds” for the project. For this reason, a shareholding of 75.36% was sold through a strategic offer, leaving the Kwara State Government with a shareholding of 24.64% Meanwhile, government claims the project has attracted investment to the tune of three Billion Naira (₦3,000,000,000.00) both in equity and investment.

The first question one will raise is, who is the buyer of the 75.36% of the shares in the Tsonga farming project? The answer to this question is simple, especially if we understand that the Zimbabwe farming project has been renamed as “the New Nigerian Farmers”. The New Nigerian Enterprises is a corporate name registered with the Corporate Affairs Commission (C.A.C) of Nigeria in 1972 with Olusola and Florence Saraki as Directors. This fact only

reiterates the impression that, the Tsonga F.H ltd as it is known today does not belong to Kwara State Government.

The Government of Kwara State had created the impression that the project is not for the State by providing in the MOU that the Government loan to the tune of ₦1,050,000 would be paid back. But again, why was it that, the Government of Kwara State had to stand as surety for the loans collected by the farmers from the Commercial banks? The Government loan was to attract no interest? The second question is that, whose account did the ₦3,000,000,000.00 enter? Obviously, not to the Kwara State coffer.

It is beyond imagination to note that this happened under “a democratic Government”, where the legislature is expected to checkmate the excesses of the executive arm of Government. Indeed, the Kwara State House of Assembly collaborated and aided the manipulation of the State resources by endorsing the MOU for implementation.

The finding on the nature of employment provided by the Commercial farming project showed that unskilled labour was the commonest. This kind of job includes cleaners, housemaids, and gardeners. Only a few indigenes were given skilled employment such as veterinary Doctors, Accountants, Nurses and so on. This means that the economic situations in the area has not significantly improved especially when one consider the fact that the number of qualified but unemployed within the vicinity of Tsonga and Kwara State at large is not different from an average Nigeria society.

Another area of interest is the extent to which the host communities buy farm item from the commercial farmers, the finding revealed that majority of the community do not patronise the commercial farmers. The reason for this choice among the members of the community is the inability of the people to afford their farm output. For instance, a sachet of milk which at the beginning of production goes for Fifty Naira (₦50.00) was increased to Seventy Naira (₦70.00) about a month after while yoghurt is sold for Eighty Naira (₦80.00). In an environment where people are farmers, Artisans or petty traders ₦70.00 or ₦80.00 on yoghurt or milk is indeed difficult to afford. In any case, these are the only farm produce of commercial farming found within market within Kwara state. Other farm items such as soya beans, maize, tobacco among others are not available within Tsonga and the neighbouring communities.

The Community Fund established in the agreement between the Kwara State Government and the commercial farmers is another major benefit that would have gone to the people of Tsonga and its environs. Our findings showed that such fund is not in existence. Like mentioned in the agreement, each of the farmers was to contribute 1% of its annual gross profit to the fund which is to be used in financing community oriented projects. The fund as at now only exist in the agreement, and nobody (either government official or members of the public is raising any question).

Similar to the above issue, is the case of field days. The Field Days was also proposed by the collaborative Agreement. It is a day set aside once every month by the commercial farmers to teach the local farmers commercial farming skills so as to achieve the transfer of knowledge and skills of commercial farming. This also according to the finding of this research has never been held since the commencement of farming activities in 2004. In fact, it is interesting to note that, the commercial farmers are not quite friendly with their host let alone having avenue for teaching them such farming skills which could help them in improving their productivity.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

Government in every political system exist, and operate on behalf of the State. Its primary responsibility is to protect and advanced the interests of the state and invariably that of the masses. This in other words is known as public or national interests. Public policy on the other hand refers to a framework of actions within which actions and inactions are undertaken. It is an indispensable tool of government in the day to day administration of the State. Therefore, the choice of a particular policy should be determined by public interest. Public interest is the determinant of a public policy with the aim of bringing the greatest goods to the greater members of the society.

However, in Nigeria and other third world nations, private interest of the policy makers is always the overriding factors in the choice of public policy. The situation with the commercial agriculture policy of Bukola Saraki administration is a classical demonstration of how policy makers allow their personal interest for business empires to dictate policy decisions of government. And as if, the choice of foreign farmers was not enough violation of the oath of

office (sworn to by the Governor and members of his cabinet), people lands were confiscated, and the state resources were also used to get the project done. This obviously explains the failure of the project to make any significant impacts in the life of the people of Kwara state.

The courage of Kwara State Government and belief in revolutionalising agriculture in the state is a commendable one. There is no gainsaying, with proper conditions put in place, agricultural revolution is the most potent and reliable means of dealing with the numerous problems of development in Kwara State. Also, nothing would have been bad in inviting the white farmers for the purpose of undertaking commercial farming and educating the interested local farmers in the science of commercial farming within a specified time frame. In view of the fact that, the farmers were to operate for a period of 25 years in the first instance, this paper suggest a review of the MOU, and the operations of the activities of the farmers. The only institution which has the constitutional responsibility of undertaking such review is the Kwara State House of Assembly. This should be done with a view to correcting the manipulation of the State resources, and by extension stop the exploitation of the people of the State.

REFERENCES:

- Anderson, E.J. (1979), *Public Policy Making*; New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Anderson, E.J. (1990), *Public Policy Making: An Introduction*, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Anyanwu, C.J. (1997), *The Structure of the Nigerian Economy (1960-1997)*; Onitsha: Joanee Educational Publishers.
- Chandler, R.C. and Plano, J.C. (1988), *The Public Administration Dictionary*; England: ABC – CL10.
- Dye, T.A. (1978), *Understanding Public Policy*; Eaglewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Dye, T.A. and Ziegler (1996), *The Irony of Democracy*; USA: Wadsworth C.A.
- Egonmwan, J.A. (1991), *Public Policy Analysis: Concepts and Applications*; Benin City: Smoaka and Brothers Press.

- Halcrow, G.H. (1980). *Economics of Agriculture*; USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (1996), *Public Policy Making and Analysis*; Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd.
- Jega, A.M. (2007), *Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria*; Ibadan: Spectrum Press Limited.
- Olaniyi, J.O. (2001), *Foundations of Public Policy Analysis*; Ibadan: Sunad Publishers Ltd.
- Presthus, R. (1975), *Public Administration*; New York: The Ronald Press Co.
- Sambo, A. (1999), "Public Policy" in Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, F. (eds), *Elements of Politics*; Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publications.
- The World Book Encyclopaedia (1988); Chicago: World Book Inc.
- www.kwarastate.gov.ng

