BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL

LEADING ARTICLES

SATURDAY 5 DECEMBER 1981

Reform of mental health legislation JOHN GUNN	Removal of lymphocytes in rheumatoid arthritis A M DENMAN
MALCOLM L CHISWICK	Safe dental anaesthesia BRIAN LEWIS 1494
CLINICAL RESEARCH • PAPERS AND SI	HORT REPORTS • PRACTICE OBSERVED
Postexposure immunoprophylaxis against B virus (Herpesvirus simi Smoking and drinking by middle-aged British men: effects of social	(3e) FAROUTED HT TWADTOUW BITHODATION 1405
	A M WEINDLING, J M HAWKINS, M A COOMBES, J STRINGER 1503 EASLEY, SUSAN E F JONES
Managing Chronic Disease: Diagnosing arthritis RAY MILLION, TER A general practice expands P G KAY	RRENCE REILLY
MEDICAL PRACTICE Survey of sickle-cell disease in England and Wales LR DAVIS, ER DECRC Clinical Trials Centre: guidelines for those wishing to apply for Debate: Is bran useful in diverticular disease? KW HEATON. Doubts about diverticular disease ER LITTLEWOOD, MH ORNSTEIL Lesson of the Week: Acetazolamide and symptomatic metabolic acid Dental anaesthesia: two working parties. ABC of Alcohol: Tools of detection KO LEWIS, A PATON. Any Questions? Materia Non Medica—Contributions from BARBARA PHILLIPS, ROBER Medicine and Books. Personal View DOUGLAS MODEL. Corrections: Lithium treatment SCHOU; ABC of Alcohol SAUNDERS	1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1526 1527 1528 1529 1529 1529 1529 1529 1529 1529 1521 1522 1528 1521 1522 1528 1526 1533
CORRESPONDENCE—List of Contents	SUPPLEMENT The Week 1555
OBITUARY 1539	The Week
NEWS AND NOTES	From the GMSC: Primary health care team
Views	Effects of UGC cuts in Scotland
Parliament 1553 Medical News 1553 PMA Notices 1553	NHS training authority proposed
BMA Notices	Hospital pharmacists and reorganisation

CORRESPONDENCE

The secret technical defence: a case for changing the law A Usher, FRCPATH	Dental health in patients susceptible to infective endocarditis H A Fleming, FRCP, and S W B Newsom, FRCPATH	Slow-release morphine I M C Clarke, FFARCS Transdermal drug administration—a nuisance becomes an opportunity B Cheadle, MB, and others	
Antismokers under attack A W Fowler, FRCS	pyuria Mina Clarke, AIMLS, and Rosalind M Maskell, BM	Vasospastic disease, cold stress test,	
G T Millar, FRCSED	low-pressure endotracheal cuff P J Sanderson, MRCPATH	Haematology in developing countries J M Gurney, and others	1549
Freda Freedman, MB; K C Harvey, MRCGP 1543 Treatment of erythema multiforme secondary to herpes simplex by prophylactic topical acyclovir B E Juel-Jensen, FRCP	A further hazard of ventilation D K Jones, MRCP, and A R Luksza, MRCP 154 Megadose vitamin C and metabolic effects of the pill M H Briggs, DSC	and S J Jachuck, MRGGP	1550
Acute viral encephalitis PE Klapper, BSC, and M Longson, MD 1544 Acute ileitis	Effect of supplementary food on suckling patterns and ovarian activity during lactation R H Gray, MD	P L Mulrooney, FFARCS; J A T Duncan, FFARCS	1550
PF Schofield, FRCS, and BK Mandal, FRCP 1545 Primary health care in residential	Therapeutic embolisation D C Cumberland, FRCR	T B Boulton, FFARCS 7 Changes in DCH examination	
homes for the elderly G Masterton, MRCPSYCH	Azathioprine-induced shock A I. Pozniak, MB, and others	KnA expenditure	
Acute appendicitis in nine British towns C A Hicks, BA	Ann G Dally, MB; T E Webb, MB 154 Tricyclic antidepressant poisoning and prolonged external cardiac massage	J G B Russell, FRCR	
C Mallia, MD	M G Bramble, MRCP		1551

We may return unduly long letters to the author for shortening so that we can offer readers as wide a selection as possible. We receive so many letters each week that we have to omit some of them. Letters must be signed personally by all their authors. We cannot acknowledge their receipt unless a stamped addressed envelope or an international reply coupon is enclosed.

The secret technical defence: a case for changing the law

SIR,—Since I am mentioned by name in your account of the case of Dr Leonard Arthur (14 November, p 1340), perhaps I might be permitted to comment on some aspects of this matter

The Crown's opening assertion was that there was no need for any drug to have been given to infant Pearson in order to treat his mongolism. Clearly, when later he developed pneumonia he, like any other infant, required antibiotic treatment if he was to survive. The Crown's case was that failure to provide such antibiotic treatment showed the accused's intention that the child should not survive.

The pathological aspect of the case is particularly interesting. In fact, following the long-established practice in paediatric forensic cases in Sheffield, I had looked at more than 30 slides from all of this child's major organs with a specialist paediatric pathologist before writing my report. We had agreed that, apart from pneumonia due to lung stasis-exactly what one would expect in poisoning by a respiratory depressant drug such as dihydrocodeine-no other abnormality was present in these sections. It later transpired that the same specialist paediatric pathologist was retained to advise the defence and changed his opinion materially on the histology as the result of studying further material, stained by a variety of sophisticated methods. These new slides were made privately and never shown to me and the defence pathologist's change of opinion was deliberately kept

secret (he was actually expressly forbidden to speak to me about the matter) until I was in the witness box and giving my evidence. I was then permitted a short time during the luncheon interval to study this new histological material before being cross-examined on it. The new "defects" consisted of small areas of calcification and fatty change in the brain and minimal endocardial thickening, etc, all of which can be seen to a greater or lesser extent in a high proportion of infant postmortem histology. I had to concede that they were present and much was made of this by defence counsel; but whether they really played any significant part in the fate of this neonate kept without nourishment or antibiotics and given dihydrocodeine in doses which produced a blood level of that drug slightly more than twice the average fatal level for adults is entirely a matter of opinion. My own opinion is that they did not-others may

Dr Arthur's defence was brilliantly conducted, and I join in the general rejoicing that this skilled and caring physician was acquitted; but the case highlights the basic differences between the legal and the medical approach. The doctor is concerned to arrive at the truth, the lawyer to present the best possible case for his client. Had the paediatric pathologist, as I am sure he would have wished, been permitted to acquaint me with the new evidence before the trial, it would have been possible not only for me to reassess

it at my leisure, but also for the Crown to obtain the additional opinion of a specialist paediatric pathologist—which I freely admit that I am not. His opinion might have been in agreement with the defence contentions, in which case Dr Arthur might never have been brought to trial. Alternatively, it might not, in which case the Crown's hand would have been materially strengthened. It was clearly this latter risk that those conducting the defence decided not to take—hence the secret histological evidence sprung at a time when it was far too late for any third opinion to be obtained.

Those who trust in secrecy, it seems to me, have little faith in the justice of their cause. Doctors are not accustomed to being less than frank with their colleagues. Lawyers sometimes complain that medical men are reluctant to become involved in legal work. Is this surprising if they are required to take part in distasteful legal manoeuvres of this sort? The sole effect of the secret technical defence, like the former alibi defence, is to foil proper investigation by late declaration. The law should be changed, as it was in the case of alibi, to make all such defences declarable before trial.

ALAN USHER Consultant pathologist to the Home Office

University Department of Forensic Pathology, Medicolegal Centre, Sheffield S3 7ET