Namibia Today's response

Your letter dated 20 May 2010 has reference.

In that letter, you demanded that we indicate to you “within seven days where and when any tender process was prescribed in any legislation or policy of the Meat Board for the allocation of work of the aforesaid nature and which contracts offered to the local auditing company did not comply with such.”

We have addressed your letter to our lawyers for a legal opinion. Based on the legal advice we will receive in due course, we will revert back to you on your demand. It is very interesting that in our story, we did not mention any name of one of your client’s general managers, but you were able in your letter to confirm that a bursary was indeed granted “in the normal course of events and with her having complied with all the requirements of the relevant audit company for the award of such bursary.” You did not, however, say who that “senior manager” was.

We take note of that admission and omission. That was precisely why we contacted Mr Paul Struycken, Meat Board General Manager to clarify the issue there and then. But he refused to comment on it, saying that he wanted first to know who our sources were. What was so difficult for him to say that the daughter in question met “all the requirements?”

Meat Board is a public company and its actions must be beyond reproach to allay unnecessary suspicions and queries. In short, Meat Board’s decisions and actions should not just be clean and fair, but they must be seen to be clean and fair. Justice, they say, must just not be done, it must be done to be seen.

The Namibian Police and the Namibian Meat Board are public entities. If the Namibian Police have proper training and authority to do their job, they should thoroughly investigate the matter. Meanwhile, the Namibian Meat Board should be prepared to submit the relevant documents to the Namibian Police. In any event, the Namibian Police will deal with the matter seriously since it involves as it does, the well being of all Namibian citizens.
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