



**Letters** The price of silence

## More information needed

BMJ 2009; 339 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b4989> (Published 24 November 2009) Cite this as:  
BMJ 2009;339:b4989

---

**Martin McKee, professor of European public health<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London WC1E 7HT*

[martin.mckee@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:martin.mckee@lshtm.ac.uk)

---

The account of Mr Bousfield's departure from Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust raises matters of the utmost seriousness.<sup>1</sup> The reply by consultants from the trust disputes certain elements of the story<sup>2</sup> but, crucially, does not address the allegation that the trust's solicitors threatened Mr Bousfield with an injunction if he sought to contact local members of parliament.

If this really did happen executives of the trust or their agents may be in contempt of parliament. This would arise if they have taken any action that obstructed or impeded members of parliament in the performance of their duties, such as preventing them from becoming aware of serious allegations that they may wish to raise with ministers. It is now incumbent on the authorities of the House of Commons to investigate these extremely serious allegations and, if true, take appropriate measures against those involved.

## Notes

**Cite this as:** *BMJ* 2009;339:b4989

## Footnotes

- Competing interests: None declared.

## References

1. Gornall J. The price of silence. *BMJ*2009;**339**:b3202. (27 October.)
2. Adams E, Lewis-Jones I, Alfirevic Z, MacDonald R, Dawood F, Mallaiah S, et al. 18 Liverpool consultants reply. *BMJ*2009;**339**:b4981.