

Sean Doohan  
Scottish Executive Health Department  
Public Health Team  
3E(s), St Andrew's House  
Regent Road  
EDINBURGH  
EH1 3DG

Date 16 January 2007  
Your Ref  
Our Ref GJB/GB/VM/letters/0116doohan  
Enquiries to Graham Ball  
Extension 6416  
Direct Line 01592 226416  
Email graham.ball@nhs.net

Dear Mr Doohan


### **PUBLIC HEALTH LEGISLATION IN SCOTLAND: A CONSULTATION**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, I have asked colleagues in Health Protection for their views and I have appended a shortened version of these.

In addition I have the following comments:

1. The proposal to assign legislative powers in relation to people to NHS Boards could impact significantly on the workload of the Central Legal Office, not least because any orders necessary would have to be obtained locally and at very short notice – is CLO ready and resourced to do this?
2. Has the financial burden on Boards arising from compensation payments been quantified? If not, it should be.
3. On the question of notification, I am not sure whether the overlap with issues such as Data Protection and the Human Rights Act has been fully explored.
4. On question 4 (statutory powers) I wonder if the recent Mental Health (Scotland) Act could not provide some useful precedents?
5. In general I wonder if it would be better to avoid the disruption of re-distributing statutory responsibilities (not least because we would simply be substituting one set of boundaries for another, and swapping one set of interface issues for another, less well understood) and instead simply introduce a requirement to collaborate as is the case in Civil Contingency Legislation?

Yours sincerely



**GEORGE J BRECHIN**  
Chief Executive

Enc

## COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION DOCUMENT ON REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH LEGISLATION IN SCOTLAND

### QUESTION 1: ORGANISATIONAL AUTHORITY

- 1.1 We agree with the proposal to assign legislative powers in relation to people to NHS Boards; and for property and premises to local authorities with the proviso that the resources to carry out this function needed to be allocated to NHS Boards appropriately.

The change in role may mean that the Central Legal Office would be required to provide advice to the NHS more frequently.

- 1.2 We agree that the legislation in tables 1 and 2 of annex D should be updated as described.

- 1.3/4 We disagree with the requirement for the production of local health protection plans and statements: We think that this would be a paper exercise and would not necessarily lead to any improvement in practice. Some of the sub headings in paragraph 3.17 are too vague: others would merely be a restatement of the new legislative position.

- 1.5 The Aids (Control) Act 1987 act should be repealed. This serves no clear purpose.

- 1.6a The provision and statutory role of the designated Medical Officer should be retained in a new legislation but redefined to take account of whatever legislative powers are transferred to NHS Boards and the final version of the legislation.

- 1.6b We do not agree that the DMO role should be a joint appointment between local authority and NHS. This would not be necessary if powers are transferred to NHS Boards.

- 1.6c: We agree that the qualifications of professionals eligible to fulfil the role of designated Medical Officer (however this is finally defined) should be clearly defined and enshrined in legislation.

- 1.7: We agree that legislation should require certain outcomes, including those which restrict liberty, need input from a competent person and in particular, a professional with defined qualifications. We would add that those outcomes which would restrict liberties should require the signatures of two suitably qualified and competent individuals (as opposed to Section 47s under the national Assistance Act, which only need one Proper Officer's signature).

1.8: These qualifications should be defined in regulations.

1.9: We agree that Scottish Ministers should retain the power to intervene in public health matters as already established in current legislation.

## **QUESTION 2: NOTIFICATION**

- We agree with the concept of a two-tier system of notification and reporting. We would expand the criteria for notification to include the need for urgent or specific action in respect of a named individual. The inclusion of 3 types of notifiable conditions i.e. diseases, organisms or health risk states seems reasonable, though consideration needs to be given to the way in which information about health risk states would flow. In many situations, for example, the investigation of a CJD case or a SARS case, these individuals would be identified by public health so it is not clear who would be notifying to whom.
- We agree that notification should not require consent.
- We agree that a statutory duty should be placed on doctors to inform patients of their notifiable condition as soon as possible.
- We agree with the definition of a reportable hazard and the proposals to place a statutory duty on organisations involved in testing to report on a defined regular basis to a named public health agency the numbers and details of samples in which a reportable hazard is detected. We agree that the system should specify what the reportable hazards are and what details are required. We believe that this should be anonymised data since no specific action in respect of an individual is required.
- We agree that a time limit for notification and reporting should be specified in regulations.
- We agree that there should be penalty in the legislation for not notifying.
- We have no view about whether or not current arrangements for paying a fee to GPs for notification should continue.

### **Additional comments:**

Para 4.4 notes that it is currently a legal requirement to notify certain infections. However we know that despite this, non-notification is a problem and despite that there have been no prosecutions in 117 years. Therefore we should be careful to produce legislation that will work in practice.

Para 4.8 – 4.16: Notifiable and Reportable Hazards These seem to be sensible proposals that build on the current system, with a focus on health protection. It is appropriate that prior consent is not required in these areas, as there are potential wider public health implications, and the systems need to be able to react quickly.

- 2.2 We disagree with developing an additional notification system for non-communicable diseases. This is clearly not a health protection issue. Moreover, it is difficult to envisage what urgent action would be required on receipt of a notification of someone with, for example coronary heart disease. Primary care already has systems in place to identify and manage patients with a range of high risk conditions and there would be little point in duplicating this.
- 2.3 We broadly agree with the listed criteria that need to be considered before a new conditional hazard is made notifiable, but we would add the operational scope for taking specific action in respect of an individual or contacts of that individual to this list. For some conditions e.g. tuberculosis, it is clear that there is specific, though not necessarily urgent, follow-up. At the other extreme there is no specific follow up for an individual with chicken pox so there is no need for a clinician to notify a named individual with this condition.
- 2.4 In our view, sexually transmitted infections should probably continue to be excluded from any new notification system. In addition to the cultural and moral sensitivities described, contact tracing is currently carried out at GUM clinic level rather than at public health / Board level, so this should continue.

The current list of notifiable diseases needs to be examined against the agreed criteria to determine whether or not they stay notifiable or are relegated to reportable conditions when assessed against the criteria for notification; or whether they can be dropped altogether, taking into account their current prevalence and relevance to modern day disease taxonomy.

- 2.5 No comment

### **QUESTION 3: INVESTIGATIVE OPTIONS**

- 3.1 We find this chapter a little abstracted, and it is not clear from the wording of the text whether or not this is a problem significant enough to require legislation and as such the proposals are somewhat Draconian. In operational terms we foresee difficulties over the precise definition of the triggers required to evoke the proposed powers. We also think that the statements about the need for quick, simple and prompt procedures for obtaining information through the courts or appeal procedures are wishful thinking.

### **QUESTION 4: STATUTORY POWERS FOR HEALTH PROTECTION**

- 4.1 We agree that legislation should provide the introduction of quarantine for a period of up to 21 days, with provision for renewal or extension.

- 4.2 The criteria described in paragraphs 6.9 and 6.12 seem reasonable and proportionate.
- 4.3 We agree that exclusion orders should be applied more widely as described.
- 4.4 We agree that exclusion orders should be applied to specified states and/or organisms and/or activities, otherwise these orders would be too open-ended.
- 4.5 Non-compliance with exclusion orders under regulations must, of necessity, have attached penalties.
- 4.6 We agree that compensation payments should extend to all groups liable to be excluded under any exclusion orders or affected by other orders.
- 4.7 Payment of compensation should rest with the enforcing authority. If person issues transfer from local authority to the NHS then payment issues should do so correspondingly
- 4.8 Existing legislation provides for the removal of individuals to a suitable place if they fail to comply with medical treatment. See section 54 of the 1897 Public Health Act. This needs to be brought up to date.
- 4.9 We agree that individuals cannot be compelled to seek medical treatment but the legislation which prevents the public health consequences of this individual decision need to be in place, as in 4.8 above.

#### **QUESTION 5: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CONCERNS AND NUISANCE**

- 5.1 We are not aware of gaps in legislation to deal with threats from the environment.
- 5.2 We believe that it would be helpful to introduce provisions for "environmental health concern" but that an additional definition of "concern" would create confusion where "nuisance" exists. The current environmental protection act should cover such "concerns".
- 5.3 We have no comments on this list.
- 5.4 We are concerned that local authorities would be unable to commit resources to a wider definition of environmental concerns.

- 5.5 We agree that the new system of environmental concern management would include public report, joint assessments and proportionate action.
- 5.6 We agree that the Environmental protection Act 1990 should be expanded to include light and insects and it should also include birds.

#### **QUESTION 6: MORTUARIES AND CREMATION**

- 6.1 We believe that the provision of mortuaries for day-to-day needs should be the responsibility of the NHS provided there are adequate resources to fulfil this function.
- 6.2 We have no comment on charging arrangements with the police.
- 6.3 We agree the provisions in Annex I should be updated.

#### **QUESTION 7: PORT HEALTH**

- 7.1 This would seem to be a rather haphazard system with referral for screening depending on where and when the immigrant arrives in the UK. Strengthening of TB screening procedures at airports in the UK would require an increase in staffing levels to 24/7 at all international airports.

#### **QUESTION 8: SAFEGUARDS**

- 8.1 We agree that there should be legislation Scotland equivalent to Regulation 12 in England and Wales.
- 8.2 It is not clear here whether new legislation to deal with the issue of conflicts of interest when a local authority is involved in an incident is being proposed or whether there is to be a change in guidance. Currently conflicts of interests are already acknowledged and addressed within the workings of an ICT (Incident Control Team). It is difficult to see what further internal procedures could be introduced. It is not clear what the issue is here either in terms of whether or not the current system is working well, so it is difficult to comment.
- 8.3 We disagree that ICT reports are usually sent to a limited audience, as described in paragraph 10.13 of the background text. ICT reports of significant incidents are generally made widely available, including to members of the public. Moreover, they are available to anyone under FOI Legislation, so we are not clear what the proposal in this paragraph would

add. It is not clear whether this is proposed as legislation or amendment to existing guidance.

#### **QUESTION 9: TASKS AND OFFENCES OPTIONS**

- 9.1 Our main difficulty with this section is seeing the benefit of having regulations if they are not in some way enforced, either by financial or other penalties. This being the case, in our view all of the actions which are included in the final version of these regulations should be compulsory and failure to comply with them should, at the very least on paper, result in some sort of fine or other penalty.
- 9.2 We would add a sixth criterion to paragraph 11.6 on principals for enforcement: namely the enforceability of legislation. There seems little merit in having a law which is unenforceable.