

**WITNESS NAME: Dr David Brian McClelland**

**PENROSE INQUIRY – TOPIC B3 - VIRAL INACTIVATION OF FACTOR VIII TO 1985**

**Historical View**

The schedule refers to AIDS/HIV. To be historically accurate, the term HIV should not be applied to this period as it was not introduced till a later date.

**Scope of my response to the points raised in the Schedule.**

I wish to state that I have no expertise in the matter of the inactivation of infective agents in blood products, and that this has never been an area in which I have been engaged. I am therefore only in a position to respond to two of the specific points in the Schedule.

I have one general comment on the Schedule. It appears to me that the schedule may not make entirely clear the distinction between the use of (a) heat treatment to reduce the risk of hepatitis B and non A non B transmission and (b) heat treatment to reduce the risk of transmission of HTLVIII/HIV. All of the work on heat treatment up to late 1984<sup>1</sup> was directed to hepatitis risk reduction. My understanding is that it was only around that time that evidence began to be presented that HTLVIII/HIV could be inactivated by very mild conditions that were known to be ineffective against hepatitis viruses.

**RE paragraph 3**

- 3. The issue of viral inactivation was discussed - briefly - at the meeting of the MRC Working Party on Post Transfusion Hepatitis on 14 February 1980. (DHF.002.4845; paragraph 11.40). A representative of Edinburgh and South East Scotland BTS attended - was this Dr McClelland?**

I attended the first meeting of the MRC Working Party on post transfusion hepatitis.

---

<sup>1</sup> MMWR 26 October 1984 Vol 33 No 42 Update :Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) in patients with haemophilia See p 590

### Re Paragraph 32

32. **Also at this time - although it is not entirely clear when - it had been discovered that a group of patients treated with NHS Factor VIII at Edinburgh Royal Infirmary over the period March to May 1984 had been infected with the AIDS virus.**

On the evening of Friday 26 October 1984, Dr Christopher Ludlam telephoned me at home to inform me that six patients with haemophilia under his care had developed antibody to HTLVIII. The tests had been performed in a research laboratory by Dr Richard Tedder. I recorded the subsequent events up to November 3rd in a memo to Dr Perry and Dr Cash dated November 20, 1984 <sup>2</sup>

On 15 November 1984 I wrote to Professor Cash with the initial conclusions from our efforts to identify any batches of factor VIII which might be more likely than others to have been responsible for infection in these patients <sup>3</sup>. In that letter I drew attention to the fact that we could only make a supposition about the source of the infection in these patients. I have never been party to evidence that would exclude the possibility that some of these patients had been infected by a source other than SNBTS factor VIII.

### Re Paragraph 32

34. **The implication in the minutes of the meeting of PFC heads of department on 26 October 1984 (SNB.010.3479 - see dvd) is that it was known, at least to Dr Perry, that there had been infection by PFC product. Is this correct? The minutes of the meeting on 13 November (SNB.010.3475 - see dvd) are similarly elliptical in their reference to the need to "render all Factor VIII free from HTLV III virus".**

It would seem from the timing of Dr Ludlam's call to me that the PFC meeting earlier in the day would not have been aware of the fact that some patients appeared to have been infected

---

<sup>2</sup> Memo from McClelland to Perry cc Cash 20 11 1984

<sup>3</sup> Letter from McClelland to Cash 15 11 1984

**Statement of Truth**

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed..... *D.W. McLaughlin* .....

Dated..... *3/3/2011* .....