

From: PETER FOSTER (peterrfoster@GRO-C)
To: cash3436@GRO-C
Date: Tue, 23 February, 2010 10:47:06
Cc: neilbilling@GRO-C
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma

John

1. These docs on on the DOH website file vol 32 - I will look them out when I can get a moment. No reason is given for saying use of PFC was politically unacceptable.
2. the 1980/81 campaign by ASTMS was against the govt plan to privatise BPL (not about making more use of PFC).
3. No reason was given for rejecting the suggestion from Mr Clive Jenkins that more use should be made of PFC.

I have a number of personal papers re. 2&3 from my own TU activities. Mr Tullis has been informed of this and a set has been given to Susan Murray (see table attached), many of these are on the DOH website. Let me know if there are any you would like copied.

Peter

--- On Tue, 23/2/10, John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C> wrote:

From: John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C>
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma
To: "PETER FOSTER" <peterrfoster@GRO-C>
Cc: "Neil billing" <neilbilling@GRO-C>
Date: Tuesday, 23 February, 2010, 9:11

I like it Peter!

So.....can we get hold of paper evidence of:

1. The exchange of ideas (to which you refer) in October 1983? (Can we also get a handle on why it was politically unacceptable and where this is recorded?)
2. The promotion by ASTMS of the transfer of work/jobs to PFC in 1981?
3. The exhortation by ASTMS in 1983, on the grounds of **safety** (fractionating UK plasma rather than importing commercial products) ?
4. The reasons for DHSS rejecting the proposal (3 above)?

John

----- Original Message -----

From: [PETER FOSTER](#)
To: [John Cash](#)
Cc: [Neil billing](#)
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2010 10:07 PM
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma

John

I should have mentioned that in Oct 1983 there was a view from within Medicines Division (following an adverse inspection of BPL) that processing at BPL should be curtailed and plasma sent to PFC. This suggestion was

described by DHSS as politically unacceptable.

I don't share you view that ASTMS supported the commercial sector. They campaigned in 1981 against the privatisation of BPL - in which it was planned to import commercial plasma to expand the 'business'. In 1983 the general secretary of ASTMS urged the DOH to stop US imports of FVIII because of the risk of AIDS and advised that extra plasma be sent to PFC for fractionation - something which the DHSS rejected.

Peter

--- On Mon, 22/2/10, John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C> wrote:

From: John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C>
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma
To: "PETER FOSTER" <peterrfoster@GRO-C>
Cc: "Neil billing" <neilbilling@GRO-C>
Date: Monday, 22 February, 2010, 12:52

Peter

Thanks once again for adding clarity on distant memories. These associated issues will feature prominently in my narrative.

I have always believed that DOH deliberately sought both to prevent/delay the reorganization of the NBTS so that throughout the 1980s their assault on effective plasma procurement was underinvested and inadequately managed and to ensure that their associated fractionation capacity was well below that required. I was and remain satisfied that this was done to ensure a significant part of the rising demand/market in E/W for VIII and albumin, in particular, was 'reserved' for the commercial fractionators.

I have never had any doubt that ASTMS were party to this conspiracy and thus share the responsibility for the appalling consequences, with regard to HIV infections and massive financial implications for the NHS.

Some time in the not too distant future, if you will, I would like to sit down with you and go over this saga in much more detail.

What you will ask has this to do with Scotland? As I signaled in my 1987 BMJ editorial - one hell of a lot!

John

----- Original Message -----

From: [PETER FOSTER](#)

To: [John Cash](#)

Cc: [Neil billing](#)

Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2010 10:54 PM

Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma

John

Here is the piece that I drafted - I'm sure it was not sent to Archer. We also have minutes of meetings between SNBTA, SHHD & BPL from 1965-73 at which it was agreed that plasma from England should be fractionated at the new PFC. I have attached a short summary that I previously made from the minutes.

Peter

--- On Mon, 15/2/10, PETER FOSTER

<peterrfoster@GRO-C> wrote:

From: PETER FOSTER <peterrfoster@GRO-C>
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma
To: "John Cash" <cash3436@GRO-C>
Cc: "Neil billing" <neilbilling@GRO-C>
Date: Monday, 15 February, 2010, 23:03

John

I did draft something along these lines as a response to Archer, as Archer failed to get to the bottom of why PFC was never used - in the event SNBTS decided not to submit it. I will look it out when I return home.

Peter

--- On Mon, 15/2/10, John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C> wrote:

From: John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C>
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma
To: "PETER FOSTER" <peterrfoster@GRO-C>
Cc: "Neil billing" <neilbilling@GRO-C>
Date: Monday, 15 February, 2010, 20:12

Peter

Thanks!

sadly I really have no time/resource to chase out sundry DOH websites in the time frame I have for Penrose inquiry.

Any chance you could produce an authoritative piece on the topic of the saga of PFC's phantom moment with the UK plasma fractionation idea?

Relevance to the Penrose Inquiry? I would be arguing that had there been an effective outcome to this idea then from it would have flowed very substantial gains for patients throughout the UK throughout the 1980s and 90s.

John

----- Original Message -----

From: [PETER FOSTER](#)
To: [John Cash](#)
Cc: [Neil Billing](#)
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 12:58 PM
Subject: Re: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma

John

There are documents on the DOH website which might relate to this.

Suitable staffing arrangements were needed at PFC to accommodate the extra plasma, mainly some sort of extended working/shift-system to run the continuous fractionation process outside normal working hours. The unions were not opposed but wanted a suitable system properly negotiated - unfortunately, no offer was forthcoming - it turns out the DOH decided in 1978 that a shift system (with extra pay) contravened Jim Callaghan's incomes policy - according to this minute, an unnamed civil servant was instructed to sort it out, but it never happened. BPL were already working an extended day, but somehow this could not be applied in Scotland, so no offer was made to the unions.

Later in 1981 when it was decided to build a new BPL for all E&W, the SHHD wrote to say this decision should not be based on the idea that a shift system was an impediment as they did not see any problem in reaching agreement with unions. There is also a record of opposition from Richard Lane who said BPL had enough capacity for FVIII. ASTMS did strongly back the new BPL, but their parliamentary committee did visit PFC too.

The decision not to use PFC was based on a financial analysis of the relative costs of PFC vs a larger BPL - this analysis (which was kept secret from Scotland) can now be seen to have been grossly wrong. Its all on the DOH website.

Peter

--- On Mon, 15/2/10, John Cash

<cash3436@GRO-C> wrote:

From: John Cash <cash3436@GRO-C>
Subject: Trade Unions/PFC fractionation of English Plasma
To: "PETER FOSTER"
<peterrofoster@GRO-C>
Cc: "Neil Billing" <neilbilling@GRO-C>
Date: Monday, 15 February, 2010, 11:19

Peter

I've found an interesting document which seems to

signal that in the early 1980s the Unions (actually I think ASTMS) south of the border had been persuaded to block moves whereby PFC became a major fractionator of NBTS plasma.

You must be able to fill me in!? It looks to me right now that Mrs T's gang weren't the only impediment to critically important policy decisions related to the provision of safer plasma products for the UK!

John