

**Submission
No 49**

**THE PROMOTION OF FALSE OR MISLEADING
HEALTH-RELATED INFORMATION OR PRACTICES**

Name: Ms Dee McLachlan

Date Received: 11/02/2014

Submission to the Health Care Complaints Commission

Re: measures to address the promotion of unscientific health-related information or practices which may be detrimental to individual or public health. The Inquiry will focus on individuals who are not recognised health practitioners, and organisations that are not recognised health service providers.

Submission by Dee McLachlan, BSc Hons (University of Cape Town, 1976)

6 February 2014.

Introduction.

The outline and terms of reference of the commission are suspicious - in that it could provide a means and vehicle for 'ACCEPTED' MEDICINE and their corporations to 'investigate' and 'enforce action' against legitimate, but alternative health competition – and thus could become a subversive means of **gaining advantage** over alternative health options. In essence it seems a disguise in hindering freedom of speech.

My submission urges the commission to not be influenced by big pharmaceuticals or by the corporate interests of the accepted medical regimes. Corporate and profit motives could very well play a part and easily take advantage of your commission in crushing ETHICAL attempts in providing ALTERNATIVE health services and optional services to Australians.

Comments:

(a) The publication and/or dissemination of false or misleading health-related information that may cause general community mistrust of, or anxiety toward, accepted medical practice;

False or misleading - by whose standards? And mistrust of what?

Taking anti-depressants is acceptable medical practice. But anti-depressants are a known cause of suicide. Would your commission allow a witch hunt on an individual who wrote a white paper warning the public of the dangers of a specific anti-depressant drug – that had already caused the death/suicide of people?

But I think this commission is possibly targeted at vaccines – and non-democratic regime to implement a system that could inevitably become Orwellian.

Your commission is to address the issue of ‘unscientific methods’ and accepted practice. Accepted modern medicine requires a specific cause and effect relationship – with side effects being an accepted down-side. But take homeopathy for example? It is almost impossible to prove some things – yet I have been astounded by these alternative health avenues.

I had a condition that I suffered intermittently for several decades that confounded my GP and other SPECIALISTS. But one session with an Angelic counsellor - who directed me to one session with a homeopath solved a chronic lung condition immediately. I am happy to relay the detail of this to the commission if requested as this was a revelational and eye opening experience.

Now Angelic guidance (and possibly homeopathy) may sound unscientific to the commission – but it was a health success option for me, where all the anti-biotics and other medicines failed.

May I point out at this point that I embrace many aspects of accepted medicine - my father was a doctor – a radiologist, and my grandfather a famous surgeon in Cape Town, plus I have gone through university with an honours degree - and understand the rigors of science, data and proof.

I sincerely hope that the commission is not targeting homeopathy – as Rockefeller did (for profit motives) in the early part of the twentieth century – despite his personal preference for homeopathy.

Your term of reference is not targeting accepted medicine. Why not – when certain areas create ‘anxiety’? Example: For years, major drug companies have known about the true scientific research behind their highly profitable antidepressant drugs, which in many cases were pegged for actually causing the very deadly effects they are pushed to ‘treat and prevent’. Specifically, for example, pharmaceutical juggernauts like Eli Lilly — the company that covered up links between their Prozac antidepressant product and suicidal behaviour since as early as the 1980s. And it wasn’t until a top Harvard psychiatrist leaked this information to the press that this information came to light. Amazingly, Eli Lilly & Co. managed to keep a lid on the revelations until this emergence of the Harvard whistle blower in 2005. Specifically, the whistle blower said that the American people were being ‘treated like guinea pigs in a massive pharmaceutical experiment’. Australians were also guinea pigs.

(b) The publication and/or dissemination of information that encourages individuals or the public to unsafely refuse preventative health measures, medical treatments, or cures;

Again - Is this a pre-emptive strike on the vaccination sceptics?

I have been vaccinated – and so have my children – but when my son had immediate severe and adverse reactions several years ago (temporary loss of hearing and strange eyesight) I looked into the health issues of our vaccination program. *(I did report this incident to the relevant Victorian authority)*

What I found is disturbing – with evidence suggesting known adverse side effects, non-disclosure of the make-up of the vaccines – and that governments would rather have a very small portion of the population suffering side effects for the safety of the ‘group’.

QUESTION: Is this enquiry specifically designed to SHUT DOWN any dissenting voice in the vaccination debate? What is required is an open and truthful enquiry on all the vaccines (and their additives) now given to all our children.

(d) the adequacy of the powers of the Health Care Complaints Commission to investigate such organisations or individuals;

I would urge caution to the commission – as this sounds like a legal opportunity to implement a ‘witch hunt’ on someone who does not conform to the “standards” of traditional Big Pharma Medicine. It may provide an opportunity to legally / criminally implicate - for example - an ‘alternative health practitioner’ for advising - in an alternative health magazine – (and in certain circumstances) to not undergo **chemotherapy**. Now chemo is the ‘accepted’ procedural cure for some cancers – but it is also a known carcinogen and its track record of success is suspect. It might be very legitimate health advice for some, but via the wrong powers that advice could become ‘criminal advice’ under the new commission’s regime.

If this is a remote possibility – it would be a travesty.

(e) the capacity, appropriateness, and effectiveness of the Health Care Complaints Commission to take enforcement action against such organisations or individuals; and

And what could this lead to:

- crushing the alternative opposition
- suppression of freedom of speech
- allow mainstream medicine to be the only option
- put the fear of God into healing practioners – forcing them underground

- labelling ancient practices as bogus through the courts
- and a means of suppressing facts about accepted medicine ???????

(f) any other related matter.

I hope not.

In conclusion:

I find the scope, the wording and the terms of reference quite sinister.

It raises my suspicions as to the motives of the Health Care Complaints Commission and who orchestrated – or which corporate entity catalysed such an enquiry.

Considering for example a program produced by Catalyst (ABC) where they demonised the chiropractic industry for a handful of serious injuries over many years. The producers failed to balance the program – informing the public of the hundreds of thousands of deaths that have been caused by Big Pharma drugs – through side effects, deliberate suppression of the facts, through malpractice, through misuse, suicide, mislabelling and incorrect intake. Taking prescriptive drugs can be risky and dangerous. The statistics prove this.

My Angelic healer is totally unscientific, but she provided me a path to health that several regular doctors and specialists – and all their science - could never do. My homeopath, chiropractor, naturopath, the Chinese herbalist and GP have all been valuable to my health. I do not want just ONE OPTION – thank you very much.

And of the vaccination debate – this requires a democracy to decide, not a fascist department.

Thus I find the commission's measures to address the promotion of unscientific health-related information or practices which may create anxiety toward accepted medical practice (regardless of the dangers of accepted medical practice) to be an endeavour more suited to a tyrannical government.

I thus urge the committee to take great caution in progressing in this direction.

Dee McLachlan