

Mulhern, Kevin

From: Mulhern, Kevin
Sent: 15 April 2004 17:39
To: Gowdy, Clive
Cc: Shannon, Colm
Subject: UTV Letter

Secretary

I have read the letter that you received from UTV and would like to take issue with certain comments made within it, especially certain aspects made directly towards myself.

The paragraph (page 2) referring to my involvement in this matter is in the first instance misleading and in certain aspects untruthful.

In the opening sentence they say you have criticised them for not briefing me appropriately. I have reread your letter and as far as I can see you do not criticise them, rather you relay to them the outcome of the conversations I had with Trevor Birney. On the matter of my so called concern for S/L Trust, Trevor said to me that the Board but mainly the Trust did not come out of this at all well and I said to him that I could see how this may come across but that the CMO could not answer for the Trust or the Board.

The letter says that I did not explain the role of the CMO, I categorically deny this and as I have put in correspondence to you before, I explained to Trevor the role of the CMO and how she had overseen the new guidelines and was further ensuring that they were all in place and being strictly adhered to. As for admitting that the Trust "had kept Lucy's death to themselves", I had made Trevor aware in an earlier discussion that the CMO had not been made aware of Lucy's death until after the death of Raychel Ferguson, this was not some new revelation as seems to be suggested in Mr Bremner's letter. This particular point is used to twist the conversation that I had with Trevor and is downright misleading.

Again, I categorically stand by my earlier comments that I made Trevor aware of the messages that the CMO wanted to get across and am not very amused about how again they try to distort my conversation with Trevor on how the Trust would be perceived. I did ask Trevor how the programme would come across for the Trust and he said they would not come out of it very well and that the Trust was not putting anyone up for interview. He again reiterated that they were not holding the CMO accountable and that the criticisms were not being aimed at the CMO. What Trevor did not know was that Hugh Mills had rang me earlier that day about what line the programme might use and that I had agreed to ring Mr Mills back the next day if I had any further information about the programme. I did say to Trevor that I may speak to the Trust to see if they definitely were not putting anyone up for interview as in my view it was important for an organisation to get its particular case across. Again, I believe that this is being used to muddy the water and nowhere does it state in the letter Trevor's comments to me that they would not be holding the CMO accountable or that they would not be heaping all the blame at her door.

In my view the contemporaneous notes UTV made of the conversation between Trevor Birney and myself are selective to say the least.

I also take issue with certain other aspects of the letter notably page one last paragraph. It states that it was entirely appropriate to interview the CMO and see if measures had been put in place, I would like to ask where in the programme did they give the CMO the opportunity to discuss this. On page two paragraph four it states that the CMO and the Coroner disagreed about the cause of death, this is not true.

I believe that the letter from Mr Bremner requires a response and if I can assist any further am happy to do so.

I am on leave tomorrow, Colm will be in and I am back on Monday.

Happy to discuss

Kevin