

Other Document Form

Number

T73

Title E MAIL FROM MR WATTS RE DRAFT RESPONSE TO GMC

(Include source and any document number if relevant)

Receivers instructions urgent action Yes No

Document registered / indexed as indicated

No(s) of actions raised

Statement readers instructions

Indexed as indicated

No(s) of actions raised

Examined - further action to be taken

Further actions no(s)

Code A	
O/M	SIO
Indexer	

When satisfied all action raised Office Manager to endorse other Document Master Number Form.

From: Watts, Steve
Sent: 03 October 2003 14:52
To: Niven, Nigel
Nigel,

Your views please re this draft response to GMC.

"Dear Ms Quinn,

Gosport War Memorial Hospital - Operation Rochester

Thank you for your letter dated 2 October 2003, following our meeting on 30 September 2003 regarding the above matter.

I note your comments, in particular the processes by which the GMC may consider the matter of registration.

The summary which we provided you in respect of our investigation, indicated that a team of clinical experts had examined hospital records in respect of 62 patients at Gosport War Memorial Hospital, under the care of Dr Barton. In a significant number of those cases, the experts take the view that there was negligent care and that the causation of death is unclear. As my colleague DI Niven and I explained, much further work needs to be done to validate and develop these very provisional findings. We took the view, however that the GMC and the relevant Strategic Health Authority should be appraised of this information.

As we explained to you, our primary concern always is the safety of the public. That said, we are also expected to investigate serious allegation such those involved here in a professional and ethical manner. We therefore have to strike a balance between conducting our investigation in the appropriate fashion whilst realistically assessing the risk to the public. Put simply, our ability to disclose information would need to be based on an assessment of the risk that was presented now by Dr Barton.

Our investigation has only considered cases up to 1998 and all relate to the treatment of patients at the Gosport War Memorial Hospital. All the cases of concern raise issues in respect of the use of opiates. My understanding at the present time is that Dr Barton is not allowed to work at the Gosport War Memorial Hospital, and is not authorized to prescribe opiates.

On the basis of the above, I think more assessment needs to be conducted to quantify and clarify the risk that Dr Barton continuing to practice currently presents to the public safety. I would emphasize that our investigation has only concerned itself with issues within the Gosport War Memorial Hospital and not in any other area of practice by any medical staff. You will be aware that Professor Richard Baker was tasked with conducting some analysis by the Chief Medical Officer. His remit would have been wider than ours and although I do not know the outcome of his research, I would imagine any conclusions he has reached might assist you in your deliberations.

It is probable that we will need to interview Dr Barton at length. The interview process is predicated upon a detailed strategy which will include a careful consideration of the information supplied to Dr Barton prior to interview. I note that your letter indicates that any information supplied to the GMC will in its totality be supplied to Dr Barton. Any uncontrolled disclosure to Dr Barton has the potential to detrimentally impact upon the investigation, and I therefore would be reluctant to disclose further information until the above issue of risk has been given thorough consideration.

If I were reassured that material would not be passed to Dr Barton or her representatives, I would be willing to consider, at a future time, providing a more detailed disclosure of information to the GMC. We would be more than happy to discuss with the GMC 'Screener' how we may best achieve the maximum disclosure without a detrimental impact upon the investigation.

Finally, in answer to your question, I can confirm that the patients that you name in the second page of your letter of 30 September were included in those reviewed by the team of clinical experts.

I look forward to hearing from you so that we may progress this matter together.

Yours Etc