

**"Fw: PQ HLHL36 Lord Jenkin of Roding"**

Document Type:	Formal
File Title:	Private Office : PS(Q) - Lords Parliamentary Business - Oral Questions
File Reference:	YPL/154/002
	No Marking
Filed by:	Julia Scott/DEL-GBT/DOH/GB on 18/01/2008 at 23:28
Created by:	Patrick Hennessy on 27/11/2007 at 13:18

**Named Security Prior To Moving To Archive:**

Nobody
Julia Scott/DEL-GBT/DOH/GB
All readers of the document database

Julia

I am afraid the optimism was misguided, and the correspondence team has traced eleven letters using the same phrase in respect of Lord Archer's inquiry to which he has objected, and for which we have apologised for any misunderstanding (attached for information). Nine of these were from MPs and one forwarded from No 10. The letters all arrived within about 10 days at the end of July and beginning of August and replies had gone back before anyone was aware of a problem. MS(PH) signed the ten Private Office cases, and we will draft a short follow-up letter for her to send to clarify. This will say that she has been made aware of a potential misunderstanding and is writing to remove this possibility. We will aim to make it as positive as possible by referring to our recent second meeting with Lord Archer's team, and the release of around 18,000 pages of relevant official documents to Lord Archer and on the DH website.

The response to Lord Jenkin's PQ could include the phrase:

'Officials have traced 11 pieces of correspondence in July and August that used the same information. These were received and replied to before we were aware of any possible misunderstanding from the wording used. A follow up letter has been sent to clarify our position and prevent any further misunderstanding.'

I can only repeat that the phrase referred to by Lord Jenkin, namely that the Department implied that Lord Archer had 'ignored the Department's offer of a meeting with the inquiry' was not used by the Department in any of these letters, and was not intended, and that is why we will be writing to clarify the position with other correspondents.

Patrick

Patrick Hennessy  
Review of Blood Safety Documentation  
Infectious Diseases and Blood Policy Branch

517, Wellington House  
135-155 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG.

Tel.: **GRO-C**

GTN: **GRO-C**

patrick.hennessy@ **GRO-C**

----- Forwarded by Patrick Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB on 27/11/2007 12:47 -----

**David Burke**

26/11/2007 16:56

Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

To: Patrick

cc:

bcc:

Subject: Re: Fw: PQ

HLHL36 Lord Jenkin of Roding 

Patrick,

Much worse than I had thought or intimated, I'm afraid. Please find attached copies of 10 POs and 1 TO case using this line. I can provide copies of the inbound correspondence if you want to see it (or you can view it on the Contact system).












This should be it, but as I said before it's difficult to be sure. I've searched the database for different sections of the offending sentence and these are the cases I've found. If there are any more, they will use a substantially different wording.

Once again, I'm sorry not to have got back to you sooner.

David Burke

Team Leader, Ministerial correspondence for MS(PH)

**GRO-C**

        
231154\_reply.tif 228230\_reply.tif 228377\_reply.tif 228393\_reply.tif 228420\_reply.tif 228804\_reply.doc 229384\_reply.tif  
     
230015\_reply.tif 230024\_reply.tif 230026\_reply.tif 230158\_reply.tif

Patrick Hennessy

**Patrick Hennessy**

20/11/2007 14:55

To: Burke/POLICY/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

cc:

bcc:

Subject: Lord Jenkin of Roding

David

Fw: PQ HLHL36

David

I attach the latest draft of a reply to a PQ concerning the letter from DH to Mrs Bullock of 14 August. The issue is whether the information about the Department's contacts with Archer (as set out in the reply to the PQ) was included in any other correspondence. We know of no other similar correspondence here. We became aware very quickly of a problem with the wording of the 14

August letter (as we received further correspondence on the subject from Mrs Bullock of 22 August and Lord Archer of 4 September) so it is very unlikely there would be anything beyond that date. It will be very helpful if you can search from mid August on to confirm this. Many thanks.

Patrick

Patrick Hennessy  
Review of Blood Safety Documentation  
Infectious Diseases and Blood Policy Branch  
517, Wellington House  
135-155 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG.

Tel.: **GRO-C**

GTN: **GRO-C**

patrick.hennessy@ **GRO-C**

----- Forwarded by Patrick Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB on 20/11/2007 14:47 -----

**Julia Scott**

20/11/2007 14:22


To: Hennessy/POLICY/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

Patrick

cc: Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**; William Connors/PD-  
PMD/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

Ailsa

bcc:

Subject: HLHL36 Lord Jenkin of Roding 

Re: PQ

Patrick,

Thanks - this looks very helpful. The only thing we haven't addressed is how many other letters it went out in. Can we give this information?

Thanks

Julia

Julia Scott  
Private Secretary to Lord Darzi  
Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Lords)  
Tel: **GRO-C**

Patrick Hennessy

**Patrick Hennessy**

20/11/2007 12:55

To: GBT/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

Julia Scott/DEL-

cc: Wight/PH6/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**; William Connors/PD-  
PMD/DOH/GB@ **GRO-C**

Ailsa

bcc: Subject: Lord Jenkin of Roding

PQ HLHL36

You asked for further details for the reply to Lord Jenkin. I have drafted a longer reply, attached. This is on the long side, as it seems important to underline that no-one in the Department has claimed that Lord Archer has 'ignored the Department's offer of a meeting with the inquiry' (quote-

unquote, as in Lord Jenkin's question). The reply gives the relevant wording from all the correspondence, including with Lord Archer, to support that point. We have apologised that the wording of our original reply of 14 August may be capable of that interpretation, but have always said this was in no way intended.

If you feel this is too long as a reply to the PQ, it could be possible to use the first paragraph only, with a line to say that Lord Darzi would write in more detail to clarify what was said in correspondence. However, as this is a second PQ on this subject, expressing dissatisfaction with the first, it may be that chapter and verse is required.

Patrick Hennessy  
Review of Blood Safety Documentation  
Infectious Diseases and Blood Policy Branch  
517, Wellington House  
135-155 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG.

Tel.: **GRO-C**

GTN: **GRO-C**

patrick.hennessy@ **GRO-C**

<< Attachment Removed : PQ HLHL36 Lord Jenkin - 2nd question about Mrs.  
Bullock's letter.doc >>