EVIDENCE 34

Evidence 34

<u>Letter From Dame Mary Donaldson (ex Chairperson Voluntary Licensing Authority) re</u>
<u>IAC Success Rates (Para 5)</u>

from Dame Mary Donaldson.GBE.

123 Shakespeare Tower, Barbican, EC2Y 8DR. 16.11.91.

Dear Dr Glatt,

Your letter of the 11th has only just arrived as it was sent to me from HEFA. As I wish to send a copy of this to central television I am not using my own notepaper, but paper for my wordprocessor, but you now have my home address.

It is a fact that I phoned the producer of the Cook Report programme on April 17th following your visit to me.

I had shown the recording to some of our consultants who were of the opinion that any of the incidents referred to could and unfortunately did occur occasionally and unexpectedly during sedical treatment. I therefore phoned to suggest that the Cook Report had been very unfair in their treatment of you. I agreed with the producer that it was unfortunate that you had not appeared to rebut their allegations, but quite understood that you did not consider such a programme a suitable forum on which to discuss such matters. Knowing your personality I think I also said that, had you appeared, unlike other professionals (Here I was thinking of Dr Brinsden and especially of Professor Vinston who is always available) you would not be able to do yourself justice.

You will appreciate that this particular phone call took place some seven months ago. As I do not keep a record of such calls but but merely note their occurrence in my diary, I can only tell you what I can recollect of the gist of our conversation.

I believe that in answer to a question asking whether the ILA had any worries concerning your clinics I replied that there was a time some years ago when you were starting to treat patients that we felt that you were working in cramped and unsuitable surroundings. I am positive that I went on to say that we had no criticism of your present set up, or we would not have given you a licence. I am not sure if I added that your centres had one of the highest "Take home baby rates".

Regarding the reference to our stating that as you were not accredited we insisted that you work under the supervision of an accredited consultant gynaecologist. I find this difficult to put into any context in our conversation that makes sense. It was generally accepted that it was a condition of the granting of a licence that if the applicant was not accredited to the RCOG they should obtain the services of an accredited consultant with whom they could discuss the running of the centre and any problems that arose. Many of our centres had this arrangement so it was certainly not peculiar to yours.

1756

I can only assume these remarks arose following a query as to whether we were satisfied with your qualifications!

I think the conversation went on to discuss the type of cases highlighted by the programme. I told the producer of my discussions with our professional members and I am sure I went on to ask if he had obtained medical advice on the content of his programme and he indicated that he had.

You will be interested to know that about a fortnight ago, (this date I have not recorded) the producer phoned me to try and get me to agree the statements which they purported I made. I gave him the same reply as I am giving you.

Jours sincerels.