

**Submission
No 70**

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

Name: Miss Lisa Kelly
Date Received: 8/12/2013

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

08/12/13

To the Parliament of New South Wales Committee on the Health Care Complaints Commission Inquiry into the Promotion of False or Misleading Health-Related Claims.

I am deeply concerned and disturbed by the Terms of Reference proposing that the HCCC have such all-encompassing areas of concern as well as the legal power to shut down any individual or organisation who offers an alternative view.

As an Australian citizen I am very concerned about any loss of freedom to access information and freedom to exercise choice. I am also concerned as a Naturopath because any system that prevents me exercising efficacious health care is to the detriment of my patients & my profession.

These Terms of Reference are extremely dangerous both to the freedom of the Australian people (NSW is a part of Australia therefore this affects all Australians) and to the advancement of medicine and health care in general. The rampant use by the medical doctors of Calomel (a mercury compound) were practising according to 'accepted medical practice' in their day. People were injured and/or died as a result of the use of calomel until enough people dared to openly question its use and propose alternative treatments. If the HCCC were around back in the days of calomel we would all be subjected to a vile and poisonous medicine that killed more than ever it cured.

So called 'false and misleading health-related advice' today may be viewed in the future as inspired and crucial to the evolution of medical care, unless the HCCC is granted the power to suppress anyone who offers an alternate view point. If this happens such knowledge and insight will never get to see the light of day. If adopted, this proposal gives the HCCC the power to silence absolutely anyone (the guy down the street, the documentary film maker, the book author, your neighbour, etc.) who dares to question the current drug-based medical system. Very often these people offering different perspectives have little to gain other than the desire to help ease suffering & promote the facts.

But facts, & science appear not to have much bearing on this proposal. Much of the current accepted medical practice has little scientific backup proving

efficacy. Nor is it proven safe. Indeed, the research consistently reveals many injuries and deaths to be directly attributed to currently acceptable medical practice. Much of the current accepted medical practice is based on research done by pharmaceutical companies, and as the various court proceedings show is heavily biased. Conflicts of interest, negative research not released, fudging of results, massive budgets allocated to promoting drugs to our GP's, etc are how many of these pharmaceutical companies operate. They also have massive political influence which is used for the benefit of the company and its shareholders. This is why it is imperative for us all to be able to discuss freely & access information from all perspectives so we can make our own informed choices. But these Terms of Reference clearly show that the HCCC wants to force 'accepted medical practice' onto everyone regardless of their individual needs or preferences. And it proposes using much more of my taxpayer dollars to 'investigate' and prosecute individuals and organisations that dare to question the status quo.

Because of logic, professional ethics, and a moral understanding of what is right and what is wrong, I oppose all of the Terms of Reference in this proposal. What I propose be put in place is an independent and unbiased panel of people with no conflicts of interest looking after the people of NSW. This is to be done by investigating legitimate complaints from the public concerning health care providers who breach common sense standards of care and professional ethical standards. Not individuals who offer alternate views, not organisations who offer alternate views and research that reveals outcomes that do not support the current 'accepted medical practice', not authors or filmmakers, and not health care providers who offer alternative views or treatments that the health care user has chosen of their own free will.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa Marina Kelly (Bach. Nat)