
Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/10 23:44

A bid by Labour to force a Yes/No referendum between Scottish independence or staying in the UK could be blocked on legal grounds, it was claimed today.

The full article is at:

<http://edinburghnews.scotsman.com/latestnews/Legal-setback-to-Wendys-straightchoice.4070893.jp>

and <http://tinyurl.com/5mtgyv>

The level of incompetence shown by Wendy Alexander over this issue is the clearest indication of the quality of government we could expect if Labour ever got back into power in Scotland. She is becoming more of a liability every day.

The SNP did their homework and ensured the wording adhered to the legal necessities to allow a referendum which could not afterwards be discredited by Westminster.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/11 07:14

Questions that need to be asked.

- 1) Why is Gordon Brown so scared of a referendum?
 - 2) Does Wendy Alexander have any brains considering it probably took Henry McLeish about two minutes to work out why Alex Salmond was so careful with the wording he chose.
 - 3) What is Henry McLeish up to?
 - 4) The rest of the Labour MSPs must have been aware of what Wendy was about to say at FMQs because we had the "applause" before she started her first question so what are they up to, have they chosen another leader already.
 - 5) Does anyone know of a cure for sore sides 'you know, the ones you get from laughter'.
- =====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/11 10:18

Lydia said: What is Henry McLeish up to?

I'm not sure what you are asking about here Lydia. AFAIK the only comment Henry McLeish has made is: Former Labour first minister Henry McLeish also criticised Alexander. He said: "In one week we have managed to marginalise the Calman Commission, confuse the Scottish public, sour relations with the LibDems and Tories, and we now seem more keen than the SNP on a referendum." To me he is speaking as an ex First Minister who is as disgusted with Wendy's histrionics as most people. The full article for that is in today's Sunday Herald.

<http://www.sundayherald.com/search/index.php>

Is this what you are referring to?

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/11 10:22

Brenna1508 wrote:

A bid by Labour to force a Yes/No referendum between Scottish independence or staying in the UK could be blocked on legal grounds, it was claimed today.

The full article is at:

<http://edinburghnews.scotsman.com/latestnews/Legal-setback-to-Wendys-straightchoice.4070893.jp>

and <http://tinyurl.com/5mtgyv>

The level of incompetence shown by Wendy Alexander over this issue is the clearest indication of the quality of government we could expect if Labour ever got back into power in Scotland. She is becoming more of a liability every day.

The SNP did their homework and ensured the wording adhered to the legal necessities to allow a referendum which could not afterwards be discredited by Westminster.

Brenna

Indeed they did. The odd thing I have seen over recent days however is a minority of supporters of Independence attacking others who wished to follow the proposals put originally on a referendum. We were labelled "Salmondistas" and indeed one, who, frequently implies he knows better than Salmond on most issues, criticised Salmond as a "victim of theft" for having lost his wits in not rising to Alexander's challenge.

It is interesting to learn more now about the actual legal position on what Alexander actually wanted to do and how little research she had carried out. But isn't it sad that some nationalists were willing to sink to ridiculing other nationalists in such a way and Salmond too when it is even more clear today that Salmond knew exactly what he was doing.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/11 10:41

Clare asked: But isn't it sad that some nationalists were willing to sink to ridiculing other nationalists
It may well be sad Clare but, in my experience, it is the way in which those who are somewhat blinkered in their views try to shut down any reasonable discussion of an issue.

It happens with monotonous regularity on other newsgroups that I read and seems to be part of the thinking that approves personal attacks when one is losing an argument and there is little left to be said! Two perfect examples of it would be PMQs and FMQs - otherwise known as "children's playtime". ;)

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/11 21:25

yes but this is a labour MSP with the knowledge that they are not allowed to brief against each other in that way.

I believe he is trying to put himself forward for leader again.

I read that article

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Viv - 2008/05/11 23:00

I am so desperate for this referendum I can taste it. But I appreciate Alex Salmond's competence and his wish to proceed, but carefully.

He has achieved much so far, no reason to mistrust him now.

Regarding dissension and infighting, I would negotiate with the devil himself if it would secure independence. These people should keep their focus on the political aims.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/11 23:32

Lydia said: yes but this is a labour MSP with the knowledge that they are not allowed to brief against each other in that way.

I believe he is trying to put himself forward for leader again.

Thank you for clarifying that Lydia - however, I cannot agree with you on that point. Henry McCleish has not been an MP since 2001 although he remains a member of the Privy Council. He may well still be a member of the Labour Party but as he no longer represents it in an official capacity he is entitled to comment as he sees fit on any political party or the behaviour of any of its members.

In 2004 he was invited back to Holyrood to address the Committee that was enquiring into the Scottish Executive's external relations policy where he proposed that a Department of External Affairs should be set up and headed by a new cabinet minister, with Scottish tourism secretaries based in UK embassies around the world.

He has also worked closely with the SNP since their election. See:

<http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/news/display.var.1704522.0.0.php>

This article is from 2007 where it states: Mr McLeish, a lifelong Labour politician who recently described himself as a "small N" nationalist, was accepting a second post from the new SNP government, having agreed to serve as a member of the broadcasting commission that is looking at the way the industry is operating.

Earlier this year (in March) the Daily Torygraph - sorry, Telegraph - felt moved to publish an article that asked:

Why doesn't Henry McLeish simply make the move that almost all of his recent pronouncements would suggest was a logical one. And that is to resign from the Labour Party - his political home for the whole of his adult life - and join the Scottish National Party. The full article can be accessed at:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2008/03/24/do2406.xml>

Because of the way in which he was treated by colleagues in the Labour party back in 2001 I do not think he will be in any hurry to ally himself to any political party. He is a very capable man who has done much to further the cause of Scottish Devolution and was instrumental in helping to set up the Scottish Parliament.

I believe his love of his homeland may well take him on the same path as the SNP although probably not for a while.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by scunnert - 2008/05/11 23:52

Now or later it will be a gamble. Given that the media is hostile to the cause of independence and will give their support of the unionist cause - it will be a battle we are not yet equipped to win.

Can we trust the opinion polls? I don't think so. Who can say how much they are manipulated and fabricated? So how much support is there for independence? I imagine from the antics of the unionist parties more than we are led to believe. At the same time I would imagine that the SNP have commissioned their own private polls and so know more than the rest of us.

As things stand however, we will not be in control of the process and that is worrying. I honestly believe that the UK power elite will do its best to falsify results if they fear losing. E-voting will make it easy for them.

Before mounting a referendum we must win over the media, wrest control of the process from Westminster, ensure counting is done manually, involve international observers, and have exit polls at every polling station.

We're just not ready. We are lambs in the wolves den and to get out we had better grow some sharp claws and long fangs.

Slainte

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/12 11:26

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia said: yes but this is a labour MSP with the knowledge that they are not allowed to brief against each other in that way.

I believe he is trying to put himself forward for leader again.

Thank you for clarifying that Lydia - however, I cannot agree with you on that point. Henry Mcleish has not been an MP

since 2001 although he remains a member of the Privy Council. He may well still be a member of the Labour Party but as he no longer represents it in an official capacity he is entitled to comment as he sees fit on any political party or the behaviour of any of its members.

In 2004 he was invited back to Holyrood to address the Committee that was enquiring into the Scottish Executive's external relations policy where he proposed that a Department of External Affairs should be set up and headed by a new cabinet minister, with Scottish tourism secretaries based in UK embassies around the world.

He has also worked closely with the SNP since their election. See:

<http://www.theherald.co.uk/politics/news/display.var.1704522.0.0.php>

This article is from 2007 where it states: Mr McLeish, a lifelong Labour politician who recently described himself as a "small N" nationalist, was accepting a second post from the new SNP government, having agreed to serve as a member of the broadcasting commission that is looking at the way the industry is operating.

Earlier this year (in March) the Daily Torygraph - sorry, Telegraph - felt moved to publish an article that asked:

Why doesn't Henry McLeish simply make the move that almost all of his recent pronouncements would suggest was a logical one. And that is to resign from the Labour Party - his political home for the whole of his adult life - and join the Scottish National Party. The full article can be accessed at:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2008/03/24/do2406.xml>

Because of the way in which he was treated by colleagues in the Labour party back in 2001 I do not think he will be in any hurry to ally himself to any political party. He is a very capable man who has done much to further the cause of Scottish Devolution and was instrumental in helping to set up the Scottish Parliament.

I believe his love of his homeland may well take him on the same path as the SNP although probably not for a while.

This "trustworthy man" sat in a meeting of parents whose dead children had had organs removed at post mortem, listened to some very heartbreaking stories, parents of dead children pored out their anger and frustration, he agreed with everything they said and reported the exact opposite to parliament.

He made finance available to the only group or should I say a small group of four people who were willing to stand up and say "we do not now need a public enquiry to look into organ retention".

If a public enquiry had taken place I do not believe these scientists who are now so controlling of our world would have the audacity to use live embryos or hybrid embryos for research. The reasons for a full public enquiry were never better. The ability to look into the workings of research laboratories and the reasons and abilities to enter the human body with or without authorization never more compelling.

This man is not trustworthy, and I have grave reservations about any connection between Henry McLeish and SNP. Alex Salmond is no fool I grant you but does he really know this man, I do not believe he does.

If it looked like Labour would win an election or some kind of financial benefit could come his way I do believe he would stand again for Labour.

Time will tell what he is really up to over Wendy.

I would shiver at the thought of him joining SNP.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/12 11:57

scunnert wrote:

Now or later it will be a gamble. Given that the media is hostile to the cause of independence and will give their support of the unionist cause - it will be a battle we are not yet equipped to win.

Can we trust the opinion polls? I don't think so. Who can say how much they are manipulated and fabricated? So how much support is there for independence? I imagine from the antics of the unionist parties more than we are led to believe. At the same time I would imagine that the SNP have commissioned their own private polls and so know more than the rest of us.

As things stand however, we will not be in control of the process and that is worrying. I honestly believe that the UK power elite will do its best to falsify results if they fear losing. E-voting will make it easy for them.

Before mounting a referendum we must win over the media, wrest control of the process from Westminster, ensure counting is done manually, involve international observers, and have exit polls at every polling station.

We're just not ready. We are lambs in the wolves den and to get out we had better grow some sharp claws and long fangs.

Slainte

On the subject of the media scunnert

I believe if we could have just one week of everyone refusing to buy papers and refusing to watch any tv channel we could actually go back to a media system that actually reports the truth. We may even use words like honesty and integrity again.

Their whole existence is so wound up with advertising that the loss of even a days revenue would be catastrophic for them.

On the subject of polls and the antics of the unionist parties.

I believe they are aware of the growing number of people who not only support SNP but see Alex Salmond as a steady hand on the tiller. That can be the only reason for this total panic.

The reaction to this has two effects one they lie and the two is lets give a different reason to act as we are now doing. Then we have the power issue, such as, you will do as you are told or we will find a way to make you we are the ruling party.

As shown by two main reasons behind the fact that Westminster intend removing some powers from Scottish Government.

One - the nuclear power stations they want them up here and not down south and they will change that ability in the Scotland Act. They will remove the power from local government to refuse a nuclear power station. It will not benefit Labour but it will help the cause for independence.

Two - the voting system, they will never give up their power over that simply for the reason that it can be fiddled as long as it comes under the control of Westminster.

It would take a more intelligent person than I to find a legal and publicly supported way to overcome these difficulties. Hopefully Alex Salmond is that person.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/12 11:59

The odd thing I have seen over recent days however is a minority of supporters of Independence attacking others who wished to follow the proposals put originally on a referendum. We were labelled "Salmondistas" and indeed one, who, frequently implies he knows better than Salmond on most issues, criticised Salmond as a "victim of theft" for having lost his wits in not rising to Alexander's challenge.

Claire I did not see that

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/12 12:01

Lydia. I had no idea that the battle over the stolen organs had happened in McLeish's time. That's interesting as is your account of what he did in reporting the opposite of what was being said to Parliament. The nature of the subject makes it all the more shocking that he misled politicians regarding it. I recall experiencing absolute horror myself at the very idea of doctors stealing the organs of dead children without the consent of their parents.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/12 22:06

Lydia stated: This "trustworthy man" sat in a meeting of parents whose dead children had had organs removed at post mortem, listened to some very heartbreaking stories, parents of dead children pored out their anger and frustration, he agreed with everything they said and reported the exact opposite to parliament.

He made finance available to the only group or should I say a small group of four people who were willing to stand up and say "we do not now need a public enquiry to look into organ retention".
Have you any links for this information please Lydia? I would be interested to read more.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/13 00:01

Clare wrote:

Lydia. I had no idea that the battle over the stolen organs had happened in McLeish's time. That's interesting as is your account of what he did in reporting the opposite of what was being said to Parliament. The nature of the subject makes it all the more shocking that he misled politicians regarding it. I recall experiencing absolute horror myself at the very idea of doctors stealing the organs of dead children without the consent of their parents.

The first Health Minister we had was Susan Deacon she set up the independent Review Group on the Retention of Organs at Post-Mortem which all parents objected to. We wanted a full public enquiry. It was nothing short of a way to allow these thieves and vagabonds to escape unpunished.

The parents were sorted into two groups but only technically. The first group were parents where their children had hospital post mortems which were often carried out without the parents knowledge. The organs were all taken without authorisation. They were told things like "don't lift your baby" or "leave the baby in peace don't touch him". Some allowed the hospital to "bury" their child.

Meanwhile these children had every organ removed during illegal post mortems.

70 parents in the whole of Scotland were given £5K each family that is a total of £358K to make us all go away.

Quite literally thousands of parents went through the same horror but the post mortems were carried out under the Procurator Fiscal. I was one of these parents.

Our children had all their organs removed and used for research but because of legal rulings that the post mortem itself was legal these parents never got the satisfaction of the knowledge that it was considered illegal for their children to have their organs removed and given to research.

I think this says it all

LEST THEY FORGET

WE LIVED HE AND I ON LOVE AND A SIGH
IT SEEMED A WORLD THAT CONTAINED HE AND I
WE TWO TOGETHER FOUGHT AND TRIED
NO ROOM FOR SORROW UNTIL HE DIED

HIS LOVE SO POTENT IT GAVE ME STRENGTH
TIME WAS NOT MEASURED IN EVERY DAY LENGTH
WHEN NO CHOICE BUT TO SAY GOODBYE
MY HEART WAS SORE PAST THE WANT TO CRY

NO FUTURE NO FOOTBALL NO BROTHERS NO KNOWING

FOR ME NO WATCHING HIM LAUGHING AND GROWING
A WHOLE LIFE LIVED IN A VERY SHORT TIME
IN MY LIFE TODAY STILL CLOSE AND MINE

CONSIDER THE ATROCITY COMMITTED AFTER
NOW THEY TELL US HE DID NOT MATTER
THESE PEOPLE WE TRUSTED WITH ONES SO PRECIOUS
HIDE, AND CONTINUE TO REMAIN ANONYMOUS

Please do not think that I or any other parent objects to the right of the Procurator Fiscal to carry out a post mortem. We must have this protection for children and adults it is often the only way to prove wrong doing against a person. We believe though that the remit of the Procurator Fiscal at that time was solely to decide the cause of death not to give organs to researchers.

During the time of Susan Deacon I had meetings with Susan Deacon and her responses were to say the least terrible for the parents. Comments to a group of parents outside Parliament included " you have had all the enquiries you are getting". Her response to written proof that brains were stored in the Western General in Edinburgh was a new enquiry by Audit Scotland this proved our point but none of the parents got the brains of their children back.

Then we got oor Henry as health Minister he described himself as a people person.

When all this first started I helped an organisation called SORRO to set up. I helped with the establishment of their committee their status as a charity and their constitution.

The chair was a woman called Geraldine McDonald. The parents all trusted her. An amazing amount of money was raised. I just let them carry on in the beginning as I too trusted. I took a back seat.

Big mistake. First reports in the record that money was used inappropriately and parent stating this woman did not represent their views. Many came to me after a paper published my telephone number by mistake.

I then set up my organisation but refused to register as a charity and point blank refused to raise money. Any person who does anything for this organisation does so at their own expense.

At the end of the time in which any parents at all attended SORRO meetings one took place with Henry McLeish.

The parents were so excited, he had listened, he was sympathetic, he said he would do everything he could to facilitate a public enquiry.

I got right into it. He stated in Parliament there was no need for a public enquiry. He has no integrity. He has no courage either he would not meet me.

Then Geraldine McDonald stood in front of the press and stated we did not need a public enquiry.

It was later that we discovered that Susan Deacon and Henry McLeish were both paying her expenses and Henry McLeish gave her a job.

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/13 00:18

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia stated: This " trustworthy man " sat in a meeting of parents whose dead children had had organs removed at post mortem, listened to some very heartbreaking stories, parents of dead children pored out their anger and frustration, he agreed with everything they said and reported the exact opposite to parliament.

He made finance available to the only group or should I say a small group of four people who were willing to stand up and say " we do not now need a public enquiry to look into organ retention".

Have you any links for this information please Lydia? I would be interested to read more.

Try the Glasgow Herald and read the answer to Claire's question.

The Daily record did the story about McLeish refusing the public enquiry I think.

I have no idea whether the articles will still be available it is all a few years ago now but I really do not think we missed a paper over the years we often were reported on BBC STV and SKY
My organisation is Justice For The Innocents
We were originally Scottish Parents for a Public Enquiry into Organ Retention

We were not online in those days we used to cut out all the articles from the papers and tape all the interviews I did for tv and radio. We all pay our own expenses even now. I made a choice....stamps, paper, envelopes, travel to hospitals to help parents or the Internet. I don't suppose I will ever know if it was the right choice. I know over the years it has cost us all plenty.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/13 11:30

Brenna, google Yorkhill hospital organs scandal. You'll get lots of links there.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/13 13:34

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia stated: This " trustworthy man " sat in a meeting of parents whose dead children had had organs removed at post mortem, listened to some very heartbreaking stories, parents of dead children pored out their anger and frustration, he agreed with everything they said and reported the exact opposite to parliament.

He made finance available to the only group or should I say a small group of four people who were willing to stand up and say " we do not now need a public enquiry to look into organ retention".
Have you any links for this information please Lydia? I would be interested to read more.[/quote]

every time I come back to copy the links the first one disappears just google lydia reid organs scandal or scotland organ scandal

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/13 21:28

Clare wrote: Brenna, google Yorkhill hospital organs scandal. You'll get lots of links there.

Many thanks for that Clare. I think the number of links it turns up could fill a library.

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/13 21:34

Brenna1508 wrote:

Clare wrote: Brenna, google Yorkhill hospital organs scandal. You'll get lots of links there.

Many thanks for that Clare. I think the number of links it turns up could fill a library.

Brenna it'll keep ye quiet ;)

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy's referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/13 21:41

Lydia suggested: Try the Glasgow Herald and read the answer to Claire's question.

The Daily record did the story about McLeish refusing the public enquiry I think.

I have no idea whether the articles will still be available it is all a few years ago now but I really do not think we missed a paper over the years we often were reported on BBC STV and SKY
My organisation is Justice For The Innocents
We were originally Scottish Parents for a Public Enquiry into Organ Retention

Lydia, I really think it is up to you to provide the evidence in support your assertions about Henry McCleish. It is not up to me to search the web to try and prove your point.

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/13 21:45

Clare, being cheeky, wrote: Brenna it'll keep ye quiet ;)
Lol, Clare but I wouldn't bet on it! :laugh:

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by Meg - 2008/05/14 10:35

I have to agree that Henry McLeish is less than useless. I remember back in 1998, he came to our town as there was a public meeting over a "family from hell" who had moved to our town. He talked about his own experiences about this and also how he was going to help us. What did he do? A big fat nothing. (As an aside. The town meeting was arranged by our MP Des Browne who also wanted to "help". Later, we found out that it was his law firm that was representing this family when they went for their numerous court appearances.)

I can believe though that McLeish may be changing his mind over independence, many have. However it would be quite a leap for him as former FM to join the SNP. Also, he knows he wouldn't get an open armed welcome from SNP members however much he was paraded as a convert to independence. Anyone who remembers, for example, Dick Douglas joining the SNP, will remember the suspicion with which he was received.

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/14 10:39

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia suggested: Try the Glasgow Herald and read the answer to Claire's question.

The Daily record did the story about McLeish refusing the public enquiry I think.

I have no idea whether the articles will still be available it is all a few years ago now but I really do not think we missed a paper over the years we often were reported on BBC STV and SKY
My organisation is Justice For The Innocents
We were originally Scottish Parents for a Public Enquiry into Organ Retention

Lydia, I really think it is up to you to provide the evidence in support your assertions about Henry McCleish. It is not up to me to search the web to try and prove your point.

Brenna you are of course right but I am sorry I could find nothing I can only tell you what happened at that time.

I see lots of people seem to be able to copy and paste lots of links onto one post but when I tried to do that the original message disappeared. As you have probably gathered I am not very good with the Internet yet but I am learning day by day.

Not that that helped with finding a link that proved my point because I could not. Then of course I thought, was it reported in that way I just do not know. I would have been happy just to find a report of the meeting or a report that he again refused a public enquiry but I could not find that. What was covered in the media was of very little importance other than to try to use that pressure to try to gain whatever our current project was at the time. I was totally surprised at some of the stories I found as I did not know some of them existed. Maybe if I keep trying and I will, I will find something but not today, have a good day

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by Clare - 2008/05/14 16:34

Brenna1508 wrote:

Clare, being cheeky, wrote: Brenna it'll keep ye quiet ;)

Lol, Clare but I wouldn't bet on it! :laugh:

hahaha I agree Brenna, people have tried the same thing with moi! :laugh:

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by Brenna1508 - 2008/05/14 22:11

Lydia wrote: I could find nothing I can only tell you what happened at that time.

Thanks Lydia - I can accept that and no problems. I only wondered if you had some item I could read to back up the low opinion you have of him.

I guess this is another case of agreeing to differ.

Lydia also wrote: have a good day

Thank you, I hope tomorrow is better for you and that your feet stop aching by then. :)

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/14 22:55

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia wrote: I could find nothing I can only tell you what happened at that time.

Thanks Lydia - I can accept that and no problems. I only wondered if you had some item I could read to back up the low opinion you have of him.

I guess this is another case of agreeing to differ.

Lydia also wrote: have a good day

Thank you, I hope tomorrow is better for you and that your feet stop aching by then. :)

I hope so too

=====

Re:Legal setback to Wendy\'s referendum call.

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/05/14 22:56

LYDIA REID wrote:

Brenna1508 wrote:

Lydia wrote: I could find nothing I can only tell you what happened at that time.

Thanks Lydia - I can accept that and no problems. I only wondered if you had some item I could read to back up the low opinion you have of him.

I guess this is another case of agreeing to differ.

Lydia also wrote: have a good day

Thank you, I hope tomorrow is better for you and that your feet stop aching by then. :)

I hope so too

and I should have said thank you for the thought

=====