

Mr John Leech MP: Resolution Letter

Letter to Mr John Tarpey from the Commissioner, 17 March 2009

I have now concluded my consideration of the complaint you sent me on 25 November 2008 against Mr John Leech MP about his apparent use of parliamentary funds to send communications to people outside his current constituency.

In essence, your complaint was that Mr Leech had used the Communications Allowance to communicate with people who are not his constituents, contrary to the rules of the House.

I have consulted Mr Leech and the House of Commons authorities about this matter. Mr Leech has explained to me that the letter which you received dated 6 October and which you enclosed with your letter to me was not in fact funded from the House of Commons Communications Allowance. The letter was paid for by his local political party. Unfortunately the letter was printed using the wrong letterhead. The party has a different letterhead for use when communicating outside the constituency.

Mr Leech has also explained to me that, where this and other material is circulated to people outside his current constituency, the costs of the printing and circulation of those documents are all met from party funds. He will take action to try to prevent such material being printed on the wrong letterhead in future.

Having consulted the House of Commons authorities, I accept Mr Leech's explanation. Since no parliamentary resources have been used for this circulation, Mr Leech has not been in breach of the rules of the House. I therefore dismiss the complaint.

I should add that Mr Leech has told me that on receiving the survey that your wife returned on or near to 20 November last year, Mr Leech removed you from his mailing database. You should, therefore, no longer be receiving communications from Mr Leech.

Thank you for raising this matter with me.

I am copying this letter to Mr John Leech MP.

17 March 2009

Mr John Leech MP: Written evidence

1. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr John Tarpey, 25 November 2008

I am writing to complain about communications that I receive from John Leech MP (Manchester Withington) paid for by funds provided by parliament to assist them in representing their constituents.

I object to these communications mainly because I am not one of Mr Leech's constituents. My MP is Tony Lloyd, Manchester Central.

At the next election my address will be in the Manchester Withington constituency and what Mr Leech is doing is using parliamentary funds to try and get an unfair head start in the next election.

I enclose a letter from Mr Leech dated 6th October 2008. This is not the first or the last communication from Mr Leech. The last was a blatantly political "fact finding" questionnaire, (also funded from parliamentary funds) which my wife returned to Mr Leech raising the point that we are not his constituents. Mr Leech has not responded.

This letter is interesting for 3 reasons, first it says at the bottom of the page that it is funded out of monies received to communicate with Mr Leech's constituents, second, it is personally addressed to me, at this address showing that it was not just an overenthusiastic flier delivery. And third it is quite clearly a campaigning document.

I also sent an email to Mr Leech drawing his attention to this matter. He has not responded.

In summary I object to the abuse by Mr Leech of funds provided to communicate with his constituents for blatantly political purposes. I object to his casual assumption that he will be the next MP for Withington and so that I am one of his constituents and I object to the fact that he does all this while writing sanctimoniously in the local press about standards in public life.

This may be only a small amount of money, but if he cannot manage small amounts properly may not be trustworthy with larger amounts.

I look forward to hearing your opinion on this matter.

25 November 2008

2. Letter from Mr John Leech MP, 6 October 2008

Many people are struggling to make ends meet under the credit crunch, but going green does not have to hit us in the pocket.

As a means of reducing both food miles and cutting the cost of food bills, I have been leading calls for an expansion in the number of allotments in our local area. Until recently, local residents had been under the impression that the council had sold Parrs Wood allotments in the 1990s, but now that it has emerged that they have in fact not been sold, I have been pressing the council to reopen the site. This would ease our local area's chronic allotment shortages and help address the lengthy waiting lists for allotment sites that local residents are currently facing.

I have also been liaising with the Environment Agency with a view to persuading them to rethink plans to cut a flood channel through the Bradley Fold allotment site at the expense of up to 40 plots. I have no doubt that work needs to be carried out in the Mersey Valley basin to improve flood defences. However, alternative solutions can be found that will avoid the loss of these allotments and the cost of their relocation, which would inevitably come about as a result of the proposed flood channel.

Keeping an allotment is a great way of keeping food miles and food bills down and staying fit and healthy, which is why I am actively seeking to promote their uptake in our local area.

Nationally too I believe it's important that we don't let the environment slip down our list of priorities, which is why I am fighting to make sure that the Climate Change Bill meets the challenges necessary to bring about the real changes we need for a green, sustainable and affordable future for Manchester, the UK and our planet.

As Parliament prepares to further debate the Bill, I thought that you might be interested in an update on the progress that has been made so far and my voting intentions for the future.

As you may know, the main purpose of the Climate Change Bill is to set a target to reduce the UK's emissions of CO₂ by 60% by 2050. Whilst the Bill is welcome, many people have written to me supporting efforts to get the Bill strengthened. The following are some of the key areas that have been raised with me, together with an update on progress to date:

The 60% target: when the Bill was first produced in draft form, the 2050 target was based on a 2000 report by the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution; but since that report was published, expert views on the scale of CO₂ cuts necessary to prevent dangerous climate change have moved on considerably; most people now think that 80% cuts – as a minimum – are needed by 2050. Steve Webb, one of my parliamentary colleagues, has now tabled an amendment to the Bill that would replace the 60% target with one of 80%, and I will be supporting this amendment if and when the vote takes place this month.

Aviation and shipping: the sectors covered by the CO₂ target in the original Bill excluded the contribution of aviation and shipping; given the large and growing contribution of these sectors to global emissions, I believe that this is unacceptable; the Bill has now been amended to require the Government to include these sectors within 5 years, but it contains a ‘get-out’ clause which would allow them to report back saying it has not been possible; I will be supporting an amendment to remove this provision.

Political accountability: one of the concerns about a 2050 target is that it is so far away it is hard to hold anyone to account for failure to reach it; in the shorter term, the Bill provides for 5 year ‘carbon budgets’ for which the Secretary of State would be responsible, as well as ‘indicative annual ranges’; I feel that the Prime Minister should be responsible for meeting these targets, since the fight against climate change needs to be led from the top and to influence policy in all Departments, and again I will be supporting amendments to ensure that this is the case.

Once the House of Commons finishes its consideration of the Bill this month it will then have to be further considered by the House of Lords and there will be a fair amount of negotiation involved in trying to get a Bill that is to the satisfaction of both Houses. You may be assured that I will be pressing for the strongest possible legislation to ensure that our country plays its full part in tackling climate change.

I hope that this is of interest.

Best wishes,



John Leech MP

PS Please feel free to copy this letter to friends and neighbours who you think might be interested.

3. Letter to Mr John Leech MP from the Commissioner, 27 November 2008

I would welcome your comments on a complaint I have received from Mr John Tarpey in respect of the circulation outside your constituency of a letter apparently funded by the Communications Allowance.

I attach a copy of the complainant’s letter of 25 November and of the letter from you which he enclosed with it.

In essence, the complaint is that you have used the Communications Allowance to communicate with people who are not your constituents, contrary to the rules of the House.

The Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament provides in paragraph 14 as follows:

“Members shall at all times ensure that their use of expenses, allowances, facilities and services provided from the public purse is strictly in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters, and that they observe any limits placed by the House on the use of such expenses, allowances, facilities and services.”

The rules in respect of the Communications Allowance were issued in a booklet published in April 2007 entitled 'The Communications Allowance and the use of House stationery'. Appendix One to that document provides a new section 6 to the Green Book. Paragraph 6.1.1 sets out the scope and purpose of the allowance as follows:

"The Communications Allowance (CA) is available to meet the cost of Members engaging proactively with their constituents through a variety of media. It can be used for the production of unsolicited communications within the parameters set out in this Section."

Section 6.3.1 sets out expenditure which may be met from the Communications Allowance including:

"Regular reports to constituents

...

Targeted communications"

On 6 November 2007, Mr Speaker made the following statement in the House:

"As Members, we are aware that the boundary commissioner is looking constantly at constituency boundaries. All Members have a duty to look after the constituents who elected them. Those boundaries do not change until the next election, so we must obey the convention by not involving ourselves with another Member's constituency until that time."

Mr Speaker also made a statement in response to a Point of Order on 27 October 2008 (HC Deb cols 565-566) which is relevant.

I would welcome your comments on this complaint, in the light of this summary of the rules and of Mr Speaker's statements. In particular, it would be helpful to know:

1. whether you have distributed letters paid for from the Communications Allowance to people who are not currently your constituents, but will be part of the constituency you currently represent at the next general election;
2. the circumstances in which you have distributed such letters outside your current constituency;
3. how many such dispatches you have made since Mr Speaker's statement of 7 November 2007, and the size of each dispatch;
4. whether the Communications Allowance was used either for the printing and/or posting or other means of distribution of these letters, and if so, your estimate of the sums involved;
5. whether you consider the distribution of these letters outside your current constituency was within the rules of the House.

Any other comments you may wish to make would, of course, be very welcome.

I enclose a note which sets out the procedure which I follow. I have written to the complainant to let them know that I have accepted the complaint and am writing to you. I would be grateful if you could let me have a reply within the next three weeks. If there is any difficulty about this, or you would like to discuss any aspect of the complaint, please get in touch with me at the House.

I am grateful for your help on this matter.

27 November 2008

4. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr John Leech MP, 14 January 2009

I am writing in response to your letter of the 27th November 2008. It detailed a complaint from Mr John Tarpey which alleged I have breached parliamentary rules in the use of the communications allowance.

This is a matter I take very seriously and so I appreciate the opportunity to explain why I do not believe I have breached parliamentary rules.

Firstly I would like to address the five direct questions you pose in your letter:

- i. whether you have distributed letters paid from the Communications Allowance to people who are not currently your constituents, but will be part of the constituency you currently represent at the next general election;

No. The area discussed is not currently in the constituency but will be after the General Election. The letters were paid for by the local party and not any parliamentary allowances.

- ii. the circumstances in which you have distributed such letters outside your current constituency;

The letters were inadvertently printed on a letterhead I use for communicating with my constituents using the Communications Allowance by mistake. We have a different letterhead that is used by the local party when communicating with local residents. Despite the inadvertent use of the wrong letterhead the costs were met by the local party, and not the Communications Allowance.

- iii. how many such dispatches you have made since Mr Speaker's statement of 6th November 2007, and the size of each dispatch;

The records I hold on people we will write to about a certain subject are held dynamically (i.e. to be accurate as of today) and are updated when people communicate their interest in a subject and when they ask to be removed from the lists. Therefore it would not be possible to be entirely accurate about the past number and size of the dispatches

I have used around 4,000 second class stamps to distribute literature from the Communications Allowance across the constituency in the last twelve months. This has been in approximately 12 dispatches.

The dispatches in the area where Mr Tarpey lives are not currently in the constituency are paid for by the party.

- iv. whether the Communications Allowance was used either for the printing or posting or other means of distribution of these letters, and if so, your estimate of the sums involved;

No allowances were used. The materials and postage were paid for by the local party. The volunteer staff time for their production was time volunteered to the local party.

- v. whether you consider the distribution of these outside your current constituency was within the rules of the house;

Yes, except for the letterhead mistake. I believe that the content of the letter did not breach any rules.

The paper, print, staff time and postage were supplied by the local party. The letterhead was not the one it should have been, but the one used was paid for by the local party.

I believe the content of the letter did not breach any rules of the house as it met the guidance agreed by the Members Estimate Committee and applied by the Department of Resources (Enclosure 1).

In addition to the questions you posed in your letter, Mr Tarpey makes a number of assertions which I feel I would like to comment on.

I accept that Mr Tarpey could come to the conclusion that the literature he has received from me was paid for from the Communications Allowance because a small number of the publications he receives from me are paid for from the Communications Allowance for the 98% of their print run which is in my constituency. The local party pays for the remaining 2% of the print run which is distributed in the area where Mr Tarpey lives because it is not in the constituency. We have previously written to residents of this small area explaining that I am not their MP. The wording on the report clearly reflects that it is not entirely paid for by the Communications Allowance.

I have consistently delivered Annual Reports and Surveys to this area where the literature has been paid for by the Communications Allowance for the whole of my constituency, but the local party has paid for the small number of homes where the report has been delivered outside of the current boundaries.

The area in question represents slightly less than 2% of the print runs of these communications and therefore it is unreasonable to produce another version for such a small number of homes when the issues are the same. The Department of Resources have been made aware of this ongoing practice and have not objected.

We have a clear policy within my office to refer any cases for this area either to the local councillors or to Tony Lloyd MP whose constituency includes this small area.

Mr Tarpey correctly asserts that his wife returned a questionnaire raising the point that he and his wife are not constituents. When I am asked not to deliver addressed literature to particular people or addresses I take this seriously and my office systematically removes them from the people to receive addressed literature in our databases (both parliamentary and local party to avoid offence).

The completed survey was received on or just before the 20th November 2008, and date stamped. Whereas the letter copied with Mr Tarpey's complaint was printed on the 6th November and dispatched shortly after. Mr Tarpey has been removed from our mailing databases but since we received the reply around a month after the letter was sent I do not see how I could have acted on his instruction at that point.

He then claims to have sent an email raising the same issue with me. I have no record of such an email.

The letter discussing climate change, Mr Tarpey correctly points out, was addressed specifically to him. The information for this mailing came from party records, and should have been on the party's letterhead. Despite this mistake the content of the letter meets the content guidance agreed by the Members Estimate Committee and applied by the Department of Resources (Enclosure 1)¹; it was paid for by the local party; the postage was paid for by the local party and the volunteer time used was time directed by the local party.

Mr Tarpey also objects to my "*casual assumption that I will be the next MP for Manchester Withington,*" without any evidence to support this offensive assertion. Now, whilst I am the present MP for Manchester Withington, it is completely untrue that I make any such assumption casually or otherwise. I work hard for my constituents and will continue to do so.

He in fact goes further to make comments on my character, which are frankly unjustified. The complainant is clearly partisan.

I have an excellent record of not distributing literature paid for by allowance outside of the boundaries of my constituency

I can understand why the complainant may be unhappy to receive literature from me as he supports another party—nonetheless the rules governing the use of the Communications Allowance do not cover literature that parties distribute—and this is how these materials are paid for.

To conclude, I have not used any parliamentary allowances for printing, postage or staff time in the production of the literature Mr Tarpey has referenced in his complaint.

¹ WE 5

14 January 2009

5. Email to the office of Mr John Leech MP from the Quality Assurance Manager, Department of Resources, 29 September 2008

Subject: John Leech MP- Climate change mailing

Thank you for sending in Mr Leech's climate change letter to this office for review.

Please note our review is based on sight of text only and does not apply to any logos, photos or graphics that may be added.

We reviewed your publication on 29/09/08 and can confirm that it meets our guidance and has been cleared for publication.

29 September 2008

6. Email to the office of Mr John Leech MP from the Department of Resources, 4 August 2008²

Subject: Health and education survey for John Leech MP

Thank you for the amended version. Regarding your questions on question 8, the use of the phrase 'cancer capital' in the MP's survey does not serve the purposes of the Communications Allowance, as set out in the guidance. The point it is meant to illustrate is served by the statistics that follow, and by the comparison to the national average. It could otherwise be construed as a political statement and puts Mr Leech at risk of a complaint.

Similarly, with the comparison to Kensington and Chelsea, we generally advise that comparisons are made to the national or regional level, and not to particular areas or constituencies to avoid possible political interpretations. In both cases, due to the possible political point that is raised, it would not be sufficient to add a source, and the words should be removed as requested.

Apart from this question, the remainder of the survey is fine. We have also reviewed the covering letter, and confirm that it is acceptable for the allowance.

4 August 2008

7. Letter to the Director of Operations, Department of Resources from the Commissioner, 15 January 2009

I would welcome your advice and comments on a complaint I have received against Mr John Leech about his apparent use of Parliamentary funds to send communications to people outside his current constituency.

In essence the complaint is that Mr Leech had used the Communications Allowance to communicate with people who are not his constituents. I attach [relevant information].

As you will see, Mr Leech says that the use of the House of Commons letterhead and the attribution to the Communications Allowance was a mistake. The costs of the preparation, stationery and dispatch of this letter outside his constituency were met wholly from local party funds.

Mr Leech refers also to the general arrangements he has for sending communications to people outside his current constituency at his party's expense, and for sending communications funded within his constituency by the Communications Allowance.

I would welcome your comments on Mr Leech's response. In particular, it would be helpful to know whether you agree with Mr Leech that, in the circumstances as he has described them, there was no breach of the rules in

² A copy of this email was enclosed with Mr Leech's letter of 14 January 2008

respect of the dispatch to the complainant of the letter of 6 October 2008, of the survey and of the letter on climate change, or for other communications sent outside his constituency which were funded within his constituency from the Communications Allowance. Any other comments that you would wish to make would, of course, be welcome.

If at all possible, it would be helpful to have your response by 4 February. Thank you for your help with this matter.

15 January 2009

8. Letter to the Commissioner from the Director of Operations, Department of Resources, 13 February 2009

Thank you for your letter of 15 January concerning the complaint against Mr John Leech MP. I am sorry for the delay in replying.

The complaint is that Mr Leech sent publications paid from the Communications Allowance to members of the public who were not his constituents but who would come into the constituency he is contesting at the next General Election.

Mr Leech states that the letter on climate change was approved by this Department, as was the survey mentioned by Mr Tarpey. I can confirm that this was indeed the case. The climate change letter was approved for distribution using the Communications Allowance on 29 September 2008; and the survey approved on 4 August, subject to certain changes being made. However, the distribution of this or any other material outside of his constituency, paid for by parliamentary allowances would be in breach of the rules.

I would accept his explanation that the climate change letter was produced erroneously using an incorrect letter template which included his Member of Parliament details as a header and a funding imprint. I would expect Mr Leech to ensure that this mistake was not repeated.

Mr Leech has said that leaflets distributed beyond his constituency boundary were paid for by his local party. A party-funded distribution of this sort would not be a matter for this Department. Mr Leech has also said that he has explained, to those receiving material from him, but who are not his current constituents, the basis on which he would be writing to them. Notwithstanding whether or not public funds were used, the Speaker made a statement to the House on these matters on 6 November 2007, Hansard ref: Column 1-2

Mr Leech also states that when he distributes a number of such publications outside of his constituency that this is a small print run of, perhaps, 2% of his entire constituency material. He further says that a sum equivalent to 2% of the cost is met by the local party. From our administrative records we are unable to verify that this contribution is made.

I hope this covers the matters you have raised.

13 February 2009

9. Letter to the Director of Operations, Department of Resources from the Commissioner, 16 February 2009

Thank you for your letter of 13 February about the complaint against Mr John Leech MP in respect of some communications sent outside his constituency.

Before showing your letter to Mr Leech, there is one matter which I would be grateful if you could confirm. Could you let me know whether the Department considers that it is within the rules for a Member to send outside his or her constituency boundary material such as newsletters produced for their constituency and, for that purpose, funded from the Communications Allowance, as long as no Parliamentary funds are used in so doing? In other words, are the arrangements Mr Leech says he has of paying from other than parliamentary sources for a small proportion of the print run as well as distribution costs of such communications, acceptable to the Department? I take that to be the conclusion of your letter, but would be grateful for confirmation.

You draw attention to the statement by Mr Speaker on 6 November 2007. I take that to reflect Mr Speaker's views on Members who seek to act on behalf of constituents from another constituency. I have not taken Mr Speaker's

statement as preventing Members from campaigning outside their constituency, as long as they do not deploy Parliamentary funds in doing so. If the Department takes a different view on this, please let me know.

I would like to write to Mr Leech shortly after the recess, so a response by 2 March would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your help with this matter.

16 February 2009

10. Letter to the Commissioner from the Director of Operations, Department of Resources, 25 February 2009

Thank you for your letter of 16 February 2009 in which you have asked for clarification on the Department's view about Mr Leech distributing items outside his current constituency boundary.

I agree with your interpretation of Mr Speaker's statement on 6 November 2007. Members are not prohibited from campaigning outside of their constituency area provided the material distributed is not funded from the parliamentary allowances.

The Department of Resources responsibilities in respect of Members' allowances include:

1. Ensuring that public money (from the Members Estimate) is used only for parliamentary purposes and in accordance with rules in the Green Book and;
2. advising Members generally on the wise use of resources when they seek guidance

I accept that the items in question were not paid for from public funds and I therefore agree that there has been no breach of the rules governing the use of the Communications Allowance.

Mr Leech has said that he has informed those people in receipt of his literature outside of his constituency why he is making this available (presumably as a prospective candidate for their vote at the next General Election). However, copying newsletters or surveys paid for from the allowances and using these beyond the constituency would seem unwise. This is because the Member will have described him or herself as the Member of Parliament and will thereby risk causing some confusion, even if the recipient had in the past been informed that Mr Leech was not seeking to represent them in Parliament at this time. However, this doesn't affect my overall judgement based on Mr Leech's evidence that no breach of the Communications Allowance rules has occurred.

I hope this clarifies the matter.

25 February 2009

11. Letter to Mr John Leech MP from the Commissioner, 26 February 2010

I have now heard back from the Department of Resources with their advice on this complaint about your alleged use of the Communications Allowance for communications sent outside your constituency.

I attach a copy of their initial response of 13 February, my letter to the Director of Operations of 16 February, and his response to me of 25 February.

Having carefully considered the complaint, your response of 14 January, and the advice from the Department of Resources, I am minded to dismiss the complaint on the grounds that no parliamentary funds were used for the communications outside your constituency to which Mr Tarpey objects. I would explain to Mr Tarpey that the letter of 8 October was not in fact funded from the House of Commons Communications Allowance. It was paid for by your local political party. Unfortunately the letter was printed using the wrong letterhead. If you agree, I will explain that you have a different letterhead for use by the local party when communicating with people outside your constituency.

I would explain also that where other material funded by the Communications Allowance is circulated to people outside your current constituency, the costs of the printing and circulation outside the constituency of those

documents are all met from party funds. I would also like to say, if you agree, that you will take action in future to prevent such material being printed on the wrong letterhead with its reference to the Communications Allowance.

I would also add that, on receiving the returned survey around 20 November last year, you removed Mr Tarpey from your database and that he should no longer be receiving communications from you.

On this basis, and if you agree that this is a fair summary of the facts, I would propose to tell the complainant that I had dismissed the complaint. In particular, before I do so, I should be grateful if you would confirm that you paid separately for printing the annual report and surveys sent outside your constituency, as the Department of Resources have no record of this.

You will see, however, that while the Department of Resources considers that there has been no breach of the rules governing the use of the Communications Allowance in respect of your practice of sending material outside your constituency, which inside your constituency has been funded from the Communications Allowance, the Department considers that copying newsletters or surveys paid for from the allowance beyond the constituency would seem to them unwise. While this is not a matter I need consider in determining this complaint, you may wish to consider your practice in this regard and perhaps consult the Department further about it.

It would be very helpful if you could let me know in the next few days whether you are content that I have correctly described the position as set out in the paragraphs above. If so, I would rely on such information in explaining to the complainant why I have decided to dismiss the complaint.

I look forward to hearing from you.

26 February 2009

12. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr John Leech MP, 12 March 2009

Thank you for your letter of the 26th February 2009 which details your proposed response to the complaint from Mr John Tarpey.

I am content that you communicate the explanations you suggest in your letter to Mr John Tarpey, and that Mr John Tarpey has been removed from our mailing list for the local party. This means that he should no longer receive any addressed communications from either me or the local party, and we will also make every effort to avoid delivering unaddressed materials.

We have already taken action in my office to prevent material being printed on the wrong letterheads, and I am content that you pass this information on to Mr John Tarpey.

I can confirm that the Survey and Annual Reports delivered outside of my constituency are paid for by the local party, whilst those delivered within the constituency are paid for by the Communications Allowance.

For example: the most recent Annual Report's costs within the constituency were £1,059.43, and outside of the constituency were £20.57. The total invoice was £1,080. Only the sum of £1,059.43 was claimed from the Communications Allowance. I am happy to provide further evidence of these payments should you wish.

12 March 2009

13. Letter to Mr John Leech MP from the Commissioner, 17 March 2009

Thank you for your letter of 12 March responding to my letter to you of 26 February about the resolution of this complaint.

I was grateful for your confirmation of the facts of the matter as I proposed to report them to the complainant. Thank you too for confirming that the survey and annual reports delivered outside your constituency are paid for by the local party. I know you have seen the Department of Resources' advice about your practice of issuing material outside your constituency originally funded from the Communications Allowance and my suggestion that you might wish to reconsider the practice in consultation with the Department of Resources.

You may still wish to discuss this further with them. In the light of your letter, however, I have concluded that you did not use the Communications Allowance to communicate to people who are not your constituents, in particular with your letter of 6 October 2008. I have therefore dismissed the complaint.

I enclose a copy of my letter to the complainant. I am copying this letter and its attachments to the Director of Operations in the Department of Resources.

Thank you for your help on this matter.

17 March 2009