

Q.1: How can you be 'confident' that three former Health Ministers, a former Chief Medical Officer, former Ministry of Justice Ministers, former 'Dr'- Jane Barton, Nurse Hamblin, or any of the others bodies involved will not simply use their 'right to remain silent' under the applicable disclosure rules, or will not abuse use their powers to exempt ministerial documents from this inquiry? If you are confident they will cooperate fully, you must have already been in touch with all of these people, and they must definitely have said they are *willing* to release documents, waive exemptions and give evidence - can you confirm this is the case?

The Government accepted Recommendation 2 ("The Committee recommends that ministers should give reasons to Parliament for a decision not to hold an inquiry, particularly in the following circumstances: when invited to hold an inquiry by the Independent Police Complaints Commission, Ofsted, the Information Commissioner, Parliamentary Commissioners for Administration and Health, the Commission for Local Administration, or a body of similar standing; and when an investigation by a regulatory body has been widely criticized ").

Q2: In view of the fact a) ALL of the investigations were flawed, particularly those by the RCN, GMC, CHI etc, and b) that we can already show both the Assistant Chief Constable, HM Coroner, AVMA and a host of others (including yourself) are on record as *specifically requesting a statutory Public Inquiry with evidence on oath*, can you provide the reason (to me and to Parliament) why you have chosen NOT to convene this Inquiry under the Inquiries Act 2005?

Recommendation 33 was : "The Committee recommends that ministers should be ready to make better use of these powers, and should set up inquiries under the Inquiries Act unless there are overriding reasons of security or sensitivity for doing otherwise."

Q3: No matters of national security are involved. And as for 'sensitivity' -!- NONE of the bereaved relatives has raised any objections to giving evidence on oath or in public, having been dragged through 13 years of campaigning to obtain a statutory Inquiry with a 100% impartial and legally competent member of the judiciary assessing the evidence. Since both of the State's positive and negative obligations under Art.2 HRA are engaged, can you explain why on earth you are going against the Recommendations made by the Lords Select Committee?