



Eleventh Programme of Law Reform consultation response

.....

Application : To the Law Commission for reform of the Cancer Act 1939.

Submission : Dounne Alexander MBE. FRSA.

Date : 15th October 2010.

Note.

If the application is approved it could take 1½ to 3 years for completion.

Cancer Act 1939 - Reform Application.

(By email & post 15th October 2010 : Time 12:32PM).

Questions & Answers.

1. In general terms, what is the problem that requires reform?

The CANCER ACT 1939

For a full explanation of the case for reform of the Cancer Act in the UK, please see the **'CANCER REFORM DOCUMENT_1'** (see page 2). For a summary account of the problems of introducing original, novel or natural treatments for cancer, the following is a good introduction.

The problems of providing non pharmaceutical natural treatments or ancillary support for people with cancer should be taken out of the courts where it is all too often assumed that those who dispense natural therapies are quacks, charlatans or criminals.

An independent register of different practitioners should be set up so that patients can be advised of the qualities of different treatments. This Register should be headed by individuals who have absolutely no contact with the pharmaceutical industry. A register like this could only come into being if the Cancer Act was considerably changed.

That this situation is becoming a serious problem for innovative health practitioners in both the US and Europe, can be gauged by taking a look at Suzanne Somers book which became a best seller in the US, *Knockout: Interviews with Doctors Who Are Curing Cancer--And How to Prevent Getting It in the First Place.*

Somers interviewed a number of qualified doctors whose treatment and diagnostic practices in cases of cancer had been blocked at every turn. The number of these doctors and alternative practitioners are growing.

In the Preface to her book Somers writes:

As I finished the final edits to this book, the *New York Times* featured an in-depth article about the failure of conventional medicine to cure more cancers. According to the *New York Times*, adjusting for the size and age of the population, cancer death rates dropped only 5 percent from 1950 to 2005. What other technology has performed so miserably over this fifty-five year period? Would you accept a medical therapy that has not improved much since 1950? In contrast, the death rate from heart disease dropped 64 percent in that time, and for flu and pneumonia it fell 58 percent. The *New York Times* was especially critical of expensive conventional treatments that subject patients to much

mutilation and suffering, yet yield survival improvements of only a few months. Clearly, as the *Times* states, "we are not winning the war against cancer."

It is a very brave choice to go against traditional medicine and embrace the alternative route. It's easier to try the traditional route and then, if it fails, go to the alternatives, but often it can be too late.

I know that for myself, after having interviewed all of these incredible doctors, scientists, professionals and patients, my choice overwhelmingly would be to use only alternative treatments regardless of what kind of cancer I contracted. I am not a doctor or a scientist, but merely a passionate layperson, a filter, a messenger. I spoke with so many patients who are living normal, happy, fulfilled lives, and their enthusiasm and great quality of life convinced me that indeed you can live with cancer. You can manage cancer. You don't have to be degraded by humiliating treatments and protocols.

Section included. (CANCER REFORM DOCUMENT_1)

IN ADDITION TO QUESTION 1 – (above).

The 1939 Cancer Act came into being at a time when the Medical establishment was backing the introduction and use of radium as a cure for all cancers. In the 1920s when this 'treatment' was introduced, the initial capital out-lay on it was considerable. In the first instance, it could be said that the Cancer Act was introduced for two clear reasons, firstly to protect the capital investment and secondly to protect the competitiveness of the emergent medical and pharmaceutical industry.

Over the last century, however, as 'orthodox' medicine has shown itself less and less able to solve the problem of different cancers, and much research and treatment has moved outside the boundaries of the 'official' cancer research institutions, the Act has been used to halt progress in safe and successful research and treatment and defend the monopoly position of the pharmaceutical sector.

In order to pursue the above interests, the medical establishment with the help of the 1968 Medicines Act and particularly parts of the Cancer Act, has defined a large number of qualified and genuine researchers and alternative practitioners as quacks and criminals.

Over the last two decades the pharmaceutical industry and the medical establishment has sponsored a continuous wave of attacks on 'alternative' and natural medicine, this has led to an almost complete lack of public funding for homeopathy and the framing of European statutes which come into force in April 2011, the banning from sale of all medicinal herbs and herbal preparations.

We believe very strongly that the law should not be used for the purposes of constraining trade and that the Cancer Act is out-of-date, bias, discriminatory and unjust. Violation of

'human-rights'; it discriminates against the poor, cultural traditions & spiritual beliefs and consumer choice. The Act prohibits the availability of 'safe & effective' alternative-treatments for cancer sufferers, many of whom are left to suffer unnecessarily or die without being informed or given the choice of 'alternative natural treatments'.

It is being used unjustly to 'criminalize & intimidate' natural-health practitioners, producers & suppliers for selling or promoting 'safe & effective' alternative and ancillary treatments i.e. natural foods, herbs, products and supplements which have been proven to be beneficial for cancer.

The Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (**MHRA**) is the body that is almost entirely responsible for the upkeep of the law in relation to 'alternative' treatments. In our opinion the charges they bring, are usually completely lacking in evidence that the alternative treatments in question do any harm to those on whom they are used.

The Act is not in the best interest of public health or safety and has become a tool for deception (i.e. suppressing the adverse side-effects of cancer-drugs and also prohibiting the truth about the significant benefits of 'alternative natural treatments' in order to control competition and secure maximum profits.

THE ACT IS OUT OF DATE

71 years ago, the Cancer Act was established for scientific purposes; to support 'scientific' methodology for experimental cancer drug-treatments. In those days, cancer was considerably rarer than it is today; 1 in 40 to 50 and radium therapy seemed to hold the promise as the 'best, most advanced & effective' solutions to eradicate the disease. Instead of continuing research on all fronts with regard to all treatments, the medical and scientific industry concentrated on radium and its corporate context while trying to halt all other treatments.

71 years on, 'pharmaceutical cancer-drugs' based mainly on the 'cell' have proved relatively unsuccessful and preventative research is considered of no account amongst those carrying out orthodox research, especially in the field of environmental causes of cancer. Cancer has escalated to its current pandemic levels of being a life experience in 1 in 3 - in some cancers the figure is 1 in 2 and is rising year-on-year. Such figures show clearly that our approach to prevention is failing radically and the rise in the death rate in many cancers show that cancer drugs do not cure, improve or assist in the treatment of the disease or its pre-conditions.

Many people die from the side-effects of drugs used to treat cancer eg. chemotherapy, radiotherapy, morphine and other toxic poisoning, instead of the cancer itself or many are left permanently damaged. To further prove this point, in recent years several high profiled celebrities, those whose stories tend to be made public, such as Farrah Fawcett, Patrick Swayze, Eartha Kitt, Michael Turner, Jade Goody subjected to the best, most

advanced and expensive drug-treatments, still died in agonizing pain from the disease. 'Alternative' treatments i.e. natural foods, herbs, supplements, cultural & traditional practices, spiritual beliefs, etc have had centuries of effectiveness, with no known harmful side-effects or cause of deaths. Furthermore, 'synthetic drugs' initially derived from the known 'folklore medicinal' benefits of natural foods & plants.

71 years ago, the UK population comprised mainly of Caucasian born UK citizens. In comparison, 71 years on, the demography has completely changed, as today's UK population consist of a large and growing number of 'foreign' UK citizens - 1 in 10 (estimated to rise to 1 in 5 by 2020). They include Chinese, Indian, Caribbean, African, European and others, whose cultural traditions recognizes the effective use of more natural therapies. These incorporate natural foods, herbal remedies, holistic practices, intuition & spirituality as part of their healing process. These are the very same principles followed by the three most respected ancient fathers-of-medicine - **Imhotep** (the Egyptian Demigod-of-healing and the true ancient father of medicine who 5000 years ago extracted medicines from plants; **Hippocrates** (the Greek father of medicine), who 2500 years ago famously quoted "*Let thy Food be thy Medicine and thy Medicine be thy Food*"; and **Paracelsus** (the father of Pharmacology) who 500 years ago quoted: "*All that man needs for health and healing has been provided by God in nature, the challenge of science is to find it*".

Furthermore, these 'foreign' UK citizens have formed 'love' relationships with Caucasian UK citizens which has spawned an equally large mixed-race generation estimated at 1 in 10, and is the largest minority group. The UK is one of the largest growing mixed-race populations in the world. By being denied access to their native-produce & traditional-practices not only discriminates but also disrespects their cultural heritage and ignores thousands of years of religious practices. This will adversely affect the health, wellbeing, cultural and religious education of future generations.

The Cancer Act does not take them into account nor recognize or consider these ancient traditions, despite their proven veracity.

In order to be fair and represent 'good law', any medicines act has to be independently policed, have no contact in any form with the pharmaceutical companies or the medical establishment. The ACT needs to take an overview of integrated 'alternative natural treatments' in order to establish a level playing field and restore the balance. No treatment should ever be blocked, outlawed or its producer criminalized, unless research over a period shows it to be completely ineffective or it can be shown to cause serious adverse reactions. A Government sponsored programme should research and qualify all natural and chemotherapeutic treatments. Such a programme should have no secret ties with the pharmaceutical companies or the medical establishment.

THE COST OF CANCER-DRUGS & ACCOUNTABILITY:

Up until October 2010, the costs of cancer-drugs were too expensive and beyond the financial means of both ordinary people and the National Health Service; between £24,000 to £36,000 per person annually, resulting in a post-code lottery. Some desperate sufferers were forced to take the NHS to the 'European Court of Justice' to fight for the treatments which they hoped would save their lives - for a limited period of 6 weeks or up to 2 years. However, from 1 October 2010, the Government transferred cancer-care from the NHS to doctors; releasing £50 million to make all cancer-drugs (i.e. licensed, unlicensed, untested or untried) available to 'all' sufferers. This move is both unprecedented and extremely dangerous; it not only undermines NICE's authority but also gives the Pharmaceutical Industry considerable power directly over doctors.

The £50 million 'cancer fund' only scratches the surface of the vast amount of money necessary to meet the full cost for all sufferers. The possibility exist that this 'pro-choice gift and progressive initiative' is not being funded by the Government but by the Pharmaceutical Industry. It appears to signal absolute Pharmaceutical control ensuring that only 'prescription medication & over the counter drugs' are available for patient-care throughout the country.

This will firmly bolt the doors to 'alternative natural treatments' within hospitals, doctors, chemists and pharmacies. It also adds further weight to the new EU Legislations coming into force in April 2011, which will out-law all 'Health Claims' on natural foods plus ban thousands of natural products i.e. foods, herbs, vitamins, minerals & supplements from the UK and European markets.

And there is still one even more worrying factor involved here, that is that GP's and general doctors will become increasingly involved in using their patients for research in the testing of unproven cancer drugs.

Such a 'pact' between the pharmaceutical industry, regulators, politicians and doctors, opens further ethical questions of ... accountability; conflict of interest; abuse of power; control of commercial competition; suppression of adverse side-effects; human experimentation 'without informed consent' and consumer-choice.

ABUSE OF POWER UNDER THE ACT

The Cancer Act is being used to prevent the public from being informed about any 'alternative natural treatments' i.e. natural food, herb, supplement or remedy, proven beneficial for cancer. Even if proven safe and effective or used successfully for centuries or if scientific evidence exists ... it is a 'criminal offence' to produce, promote, sell or give away freely to cancer sufferers, even communicate information about a treatment that does not have a Medical License approved and obtained exclusively from 'The

Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA)’. Sufferers are only permitted to use safe, effective, unlicensed natural products as a last resort, after all medical intervention has failed and they are left to die.

EMOTIVE ADVERTISING WITH THE ACT

Although the Act prohibits advertising treatments for cancer... the pharmaceutical industry has found a clever way of using Charities to convey their ‘covert’ message (‘we are beating cancer’ etc), as well as to fund-raise (using emotive advertising campaigns). This should be illegal. Their advertising gives the perception that they are saving lives and has been so effective that the majority of people actually believe that ‘cancer cures’ exist and are available exclusively via cancer-drugs. Therefore, their advertising is misleading, giving people a false sense of security. The majority turn to cancer-drugs ‘first’ and only turn to ‘alternative treatments’ as a last resort when all else has failed. Furthermore, the media actively and positively promotes all scientific ‘cancer breakthroughs’ but rarely covers ‘natural cures’ or if they do, they put a negative spin on information. Hence, the public neither believes nor trusts ‘alternative treatments’. Cancer Research UK raises over £400 million per year. If fund-raising is for the purpose of finding a cure or the best treatment for cancer, then this funding should be shared with ‘alternative treatment’ research.

NEED FOR REFORM

A level playing field needs to be established giving ‘alternative natural cancer-treatments & synthetic cancer-drugs’ equal status and recognition within the Medical Establishment and media; plus made available to all without exception. Everyone should have the right to decide what ever they wish to eat or drink or administer in order to responsibly manage their own health. Furthermore, if unlicensed, untried or untested ‘cancer-drugs’ are approved for sufferers, then the same should be approved for ‘safe & effective’ alternative-cancer-treatments. Additionally, there needs to be an independent body of experts in the field of ‘traditional & cultural natural practices’ to certify and regulate ‘alternative treatments’ to ensure safety and integrity. The exorbitant cost of ‘research trials and licensing fees’ should either be abolished or make affordable for all producers.

* * *

AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT HAPPENS IN PRACTICE

Below I have detailed a common example of what can happen to the small producer of herbal products manufactured to help with the relief of cancer.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

I am the founder of GRAMMA'S (a specialist producer of Traditional Herbal Foods which is based on the ancient holistic principle that 'Natural Foods are meant to FEED & HEAL'). I am also the founder of 'JOINING HANDS IN HEALTH' (an independent, not-for-profit, voluntary awareness campaign, to encourage people back to a more natural way of life and to take responsibility for their own health). Therefore, I am a passionate advocate of 'traditional self healing' and for almost 3 decades has been spearheading 'traditional Natural Healthcare' ; emphasizing the importance of healing mind, body & spirit through the provisions of nature & home-cooking; highlighting the essential role they play in maintaining overall, 'whole body' health. The first to integrate 'natural foods with medicinal & culinary herbs' specifically to improve, manage and maintain optimum health.

GRAMMA'S was started in 1987, with the launch of my extraordinary GRAMMA'S Herbal Pepper Sauces in prestigious department Harrods, Fortnum & Mason, Harvey Nichols and Selfridges. Shortly after, I learnt that the British Medical Establishment believed that 'hot-peppers' were dangerous to health and therefore discouraged its use in food. So in 1990, I initiated the first national 'Health Education & Awareness Campaign' on the nutritional health benefits of 'hot-peppers' and produced the first detailed literature on its 'folklore' medicinal history. With the backing of renowned British medical professor – Irwin Ziment a leading specialist in respiratory disorders & head of the American UCLA School of Medicine, verified that the whole western Chemical Industry of 'cough-medicines & expectorant-drugs' was established because of the ancient folklore knowledge of the hot pepper. Doctors worldwide were requesting the leaflet and within 2 years, my name was recorded in the 'Hall-of-Fame' of the American Chili Institute, for bringing about international recognition of the health enhancing benefits of 'Hot Peppers & Spicy Foods', making it the essential ingredients enjoyed in most meals today. Thereby, transforming the traditionally 'bland British palates into fiery food-lovers', plus gained the respect of the Medical Establishment, Doctors and Gourmet Connoisseurs alike. My Herbal Pepper Sauces even became a favourite of Princess Anne.

This was the start of my mission to educate the nation on the real benefits of natural foods.

However, one of the many health benefits of 'Hot Peppers' is as a cancer preventative, which took Western scientists over 20 years to finally confirm. The Cancer Act, alongside the forthcoming EU LAWS makes it a 'criminal offence' for me to inform my customers, or the entire UK population, of this factual, scientifically proven truth... simply because 'hot-peppers' are not 'licensed' medical treatments and simply foods. The same is true for all 'natural foods' which is beneficial for cancer and other illnesses.

In the US where it was shown through independent research that red coloured foods, especially cherries could play a part in cancer prevention and cure, the Food and Drug

Administration (FDA) threatened to take the cherry producers to court and make cherries saleable only under 'medical license' if they continued to put this information on their web site.

PROVEN TEST CASE

Two of my 'traditional herbal teas' which I classified as Herbal Food Supplements were banned this year (2010) by the MHRA, who classified them as medicines, even though they were approved by the Public Health Minister in 2008. One in particular Zara Herbal Tea, healed our dog, Zara, from terminal cancer in 1994. Zara was given only 2 weeks to live as the cancer was too advanced; too aggressive and inoperable. The Vet confirmed there was "*no hope of survival*", as no medication or treatment could possibly save her and advised 'euthanasia' as our only option. However, I developed this extraordinary tea and put Zara on a special vegetarian diet.

¹ See Appendix One for the report from our independent vet, on the condition and improvement in our dog Zara.

To our complete surprise and delight, (from a dog close to death's door, with a weak heart, damaged lungs, liver & kidney; losing weight rapidly; breathing difficulties, virtually unable to eat; incontinent, in pain and unable to walk)... after drinking the tea 3 times daily, within the first week, Zara became alert, bright eyed, and was running around like a puppy again. She recovered fully within 3 weeks and was in excellent health (i.e. a strong heart; damaged organs repaired; incontinence stopped and no negative side-effects).¹ Amazed, the Vet promptly asked permission to try the tea on another cancer stricken dog. When the same results occurred, she wrote a detailed report and advised me to inform the British Medical Association (BMA) of her findings and to seek scientific research. Unfortunately, they showed absolutely no interest, stating '**not because it worked on a dog, means that it would work on humans**'. To which I questioned - "**Why then have you been spending billions testing all your drugs on animals for use in humans?**" At this point, they promptly slammed the phone down.

Determined to get the tea scientifically researched, I then sought guidance from several doctors and medical professionals, who believed it showed potential and therefore warranted further investigation. I was warned that the cost of medical trials would be beyond my means but, as a trained Laboratory Technician, I could set up my own

¹ Zara eventually passed away, peacefully and pain-free from old age at 15. This in itself was remarkable, as the average life span for Labradors was only 12. Understanding that one year in a dog's life is the equivalent of 7 years in human life. Then, Zara's 5 years survival equates to 35 years 'survival rate' for humans.

independent ‘in-house’ research to determine its full effectiveness, in order to justify scientific research. Understanding what this would entail, I decided to put my promising business on hold and set about the research using myself, family, customers and their pets.

Whilst conducting the research, I continued the search for scientific trials via the Department of Health & local Primary Care Trust, but later realized that I was sent on a 14 year wild goose chase. Nevertheless, the independent research was successful, as the tea proved to be extremely effective on a wide range of conditions; non-toxic and beneficial for maintaining overall ‘whole body’ health. I have collated hundreds of proven testimonies, plus the botanical history verifying the traditional usage, non-toxicity and effectiveness of each herb. In 2008, the tea was finally approved by the Minister of Public Health for use in hospitals and hospices.

In 2009, however, I received an aggressive letter from the ‘Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA)’, giving me 14 days to stop the production, marketing and sales of Zara’s Herbal Tea. The reason being... they decided to classify the tea as a MEDICINE, overturning my classification as a HERBAL FOOD SUPPLEMENT. I was given no right to appeal, consultation and threatened with court action.

As a result, Zara’s Herbal Tea cannot be sold without a medical license, costing upwards of £250,000 obtained exclusively from the MHRA; scientific verification, costing over £5 million, plus toxicology tests costing over £100,000, which myself and the majority of small health producers would find impossible to afford. Alternatively, to be accepted as a Food Supplement, the MHRA insisted on the removal of 4 herbs ‘they’ considered to be medicinal. However, after lengthy discussions, it became apparent that their concern had nothing to do with public health or safety, but solely centered on obtaining ‘a license’ and the removal of a specific herb - **the African Bush Willow**, which posed a serious competitive threat to the pharmaceutical industry. I uncovered private evidence that this herb had undergone over 20 years extensive collaborative research between British & American scientists ... who confirmed it as one of the most powerful anti-cancer herbs - 85% effective on cancer tumours - and was hailed as a great cancer breakthrough.

Zara’s Herbal Tea & Willow Herbal Tea (another of my products) are the only commercial products containing the natural ‘African Bush Willow’. It was also noted that Zara’s Herbal Tea would be affordable to the public (£500 per person annually) and saving billions for the NHS.

However, Zara’s Herbal Tea contains a total of 15 herbs, all of which have recorded medicinal benefits. The MHRA have yet to explain why or how they have isolated the four ingredients for removal. Additionally, they also insisted that they must be informed of and approve any other future ingredients, I wish to include in the tea. This in fact, means the ‘complete control’ of all future products I intend to market. They further used, ‘blackmail’ to force me to divulge my ‘trade secrets’ (i.e. the detail list of ingredients and

individual weights of both Zara's Herbal Tea and Willow Herbal Tea)...strongly indicating that with this information, they could consider classifying both teas as 'Herbal Food Supplements' within 2 weeks. After they signed a 'non-disclosure agreement', it truly pained me to provide this sacred information (as insisted by my legal advisors). They then reneged on this agreement.

It was apparent that all they wanted was to get the products ingredients, plus take it off the market as quickly as possible. I refused to remove the four ingredients, as their demands went against my spiritual, cultural and traditional beliefs, while reducing the effectiveness of my product and business potential. Hence, the teas were forced off the market this year (2010). I am now left to deal with the daily aftermath and in-humane task of turning away sick people, many already damaged from the side-effects of drug, who desperately need the teas to help strengthen their immunity, aid recovery and maintain overall health.²

I cannot even move forward with trials. The Royal Marsden Hospital, Britain's most respected cancer hospital, had originally approached me to trial the tea on cancer patients, but after the intervention of the MHRA, they said that they could not proceed until this issue is resolved.

Furthermore, in their notice dated 5 June 2009 giving me 14 days to stop production and sells of the tea, the MHRA specifically applied the **CANCER ACT 1939** which stated....

Cancer Act 1939

The Cancer Act 1939 protects cancer sufferers by prohibiting such claims in advertisements unless they are aimed at the medical profession and other specified groups. Section 4 (1) states "No person shall take any part in the publication of any advertisement –

- a) Containing an offer to treat any person for cancer, or to prescribe any remedy therefore, or to give any advice in connection with the treatment thereof: or
- b) Referring to any article, or articles of any description, in terms which are calculated to lead to the used of that article, or articles of that description, in the treatment of cancer.

FURTHER COMMENTS

Scientific research in July 2010 reported that Broccoli, Brussel Sprouts & Watercress can stop the spread of cancer. These ancient wisdoms, known to many for millions of years are only now being discovered by scientists. Any lay-person caught spreading this

² I have a number of very specific testimonials claiming relief in humans and animals using Zara's Herbal Tea but I didn't feel it was right to include them in this submission.

information will be criminalized by the MHRA, because Broccoli, Brussels & Watercress are ‘unlicensed’ natural foods. Yet scientists can reveal this information without any threat of prosecution. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of ‘natural foods & products’ known and scientifically proven to be beneficial for cancer - including turmeric, apricot kernels - B17, red clover, burdock, dandelion root, slippery elm – plus the most recent scandal to be uncovered is the South American/Caribbean Sour-Sop Plant (also known as Graviola). American scientists deliberately buried 40 years research on this plant because they have failed to create a synthetic derivative; claiming it to be the most powerful anti-cancer plant -10,000 times more powerful than chemotherapy. Cancer-sufferers were never informed of this groundbreaking discovery and would be prevented from taking it legally in the UK, yet it is a common fruit which I and all South Americans & Caribbeans were brought up on. From April 2011, EU Legislations will ban all ‘**Health Claims**’ on natural foods, as well as, customer testimonies, doctors/practitioners confirmation reports and disclaimers will also be banned. Additionally, many beneficial ‘natural foods from non-European countries will be banned from entering the UK & European markets.

There is a wide ranging bibliography of writing about how natural treatments have been hampered and blocked and how natural products have been taken off the market. My case is just one small example of the many cases in the UK and US recorded since 1920.

* * *

My research led to countless evidence confirming collaboration and corrupt insider dealings between the MHRA, Pharmaceutical Industry & the Government. Here are a few:

Dr. Irving Kirsch confirms in his new book called ‘The Emperors New Drugs’, “as long as the regulator (MHRA) in Britain is paid by the Pharmaceutical industry, we are not going to see fair play.”

Investigative writer Martin J Walker author of ‘The Fate of a Good Man’ reveals that;- “Despite being a department of the British Government, the MHRA is funded entirely by pharmaceutical companies and a percentage of staff and executives come from the pharmaceutical industry. The MHRA is also the largest pharmaceutically-funded enforcement and policing agency in Europe; plus is linked to the BBC, which frequently carries quack-busting magazine items on it’s behalf. They would happily subsidise the MHRA, as long as the industry itself retained control over its licensing, intelligence and information of adverse reactions to drugs, and the policing of the alternative health sector. In 2001, the American Food and Drugs Administration (FDA) embarked upon a campaign named ‘Operation Cure All’ aimed at wiping out the producers and retailers of any kind of herbal treatments for cancer. The FDA & MHRA work in close collaboration.”

A further American report by Dr. Donald Light on his research findings carried out into the development of new drugs, titled 'Pharmaceuticals : A Two-Tier Market for Producing 'Lemons' and Serious Harm', reveals ... "85% of new drugs released onto the market offer few if any benefits. Despite the lack of effectiveness of many new drugs, their toxic side effects make them a significant cause of death in the United States. Sometimes drugs companies hide or downplay information about serious side effects of new drugs and overstate the drugs benefits. They then spend two or three times more on marketing than on research to persuade doctors to prescribe these new drugs. Doctors may get misleading information and then misinform patients about the risks of a new drug. Because they are in charge of drugs testing, they build 'fire walls of legal protection' around information on the harmfulness or effectiveness of new drugs and the Regulators set the bar low for drug efficacy in the first place. Furthermore, drug companies 'swamp the Regulator' with large numbers of incomplete and poorly designed trial data. The result is that drugs get approved without anyone being able to know how effective they really are or how much serious harm they will cause."

In 2001, two British 'Noble Prize' cancer research scientists Sir Paul Nurse & Tim Hunt revealed that... " there is no single cure for cancer and many more years of research was still required." And Gordon McVie the then head of Cancer Research UK stated in the Observer magazine that ..."many promising new drugs have arrived on a wave of hype in the past 30 years and almost all have disappointed. Often it has been 'natural products derived from plants and fungi' that have proved most effective."

In December 2003, Dr. Allen Roses Vice President of GlaxoSmithKline – one of the world's largest drugs companies, confirmed before a parliamentary committee hearing, 90% of modern drugs only work in about 30% of patients". According to Mr. Craig Sams ex-chairman of the British Soil Association – "Every year the National Health Service spends £7.2 billion on drugs. Each year, 40,000 Britons and 105,000 Americans die from taking prescription drugs, correctly administered. These drugs are now the sixth largest cause of death in the USA (where the average 60 year old regularly takes five different medications). According to Dr Roses figures – 70% of these deaths could be caused by drugs that never had a hope of working in the first place. So why do Doctors prescribe drugs that do so little good and so much harm? Recent statistics (2010) confirmed that prescription drugs are now the number one cause of deaths in the USA and number 3 in the UK.

APPENDIX ONE

GODDARD VETERINARY GROUP - (ESSEX) Zara's Vet's confirmation Report



I examined 'Zara,' a 10¹/₂ year old Labrador Retriever on 2nd February 1994. At this time, she had a growth in her mouth which was subsequently removed. No other clinical problems were evident. She was presented again on the 21st October '94 when a colleague examined her and identified the presence of mammary masses. I again examined her on the 2nd November '94. At this stage the masses had grown rapidly and had the typical clinical appearance of mammary tumours. Zara was also drinking a lot, losing weight and breathing rapidly and very shallow. These clinical signs suggested other major organs were involved, which was confirmed by blood tests, which showed very elevated liver and kidney enzymes. I gave Miss Moore a very poor prognosis and suggested she take Zara home until her quality of life deteriorated to the point that euthanasia was our only option.

I examined Zara on the 9th January 1995 and was amazed to find her in such good condition. Her lumps had almost diminished completely, her drinking and breathing were normal and

she was a good weight. Repeated blood tests confirmed that the kidney was no longer functioning abnormally and all but one of the liver parameters had returned to normal. The one enzyme that was still elevated had decreased by 50%.

During the period between the 2nd November '94 and 9th January '95, Zara received no treatment from me. I believe she was given only a herbal remedy made by my client's mother and placed on a special diet.

I have now started another client on this herbal remedy. Again the dog was given a very poor prognosis with a very large mass present on the spleen and small tumours in the lung. She has been on it for four weeks and the reports so far show the dog is much brighter, with a very glossy coat and has certainly not deteriorated any further, rapid deterioration is the normal scenario in a case such as this.

C.R.Nicholson

BCVs MRCVS.

HERE ARE A FEW CUSTOMER TESTIMONIES USING ZARA'S HERBAL TEA.

- **Ms M Anderson – (Bucks).**
Malignant Melanoma / Itchy Skin / Hyperactivity / Chest infection / Food Poisoning.



Mrs. Anderson's dog (Mulder) suffered from a severe 'itchy skin' condition, which was constantly red-hot, covered in a rash, belly almost bald, also developed 'oozing' sebaceous cysts and he was generally hyperactive.

“About January 2002, I had read about Zara's Herbal Tea and decided to try it. By April, Mulder was a different dog. Friends commented about the change in his temperament. He became laid back and would sleep soundly. His coat became glossy, his skin looked so clean, his fur started to grow back and the cysts dried up. I reduced the dosage and one huge cyst immediately erupted, proving that the tea was responsible for his improvement. I immediately returned to the full dose and the three-headed abscess opened up and eventually dried up. His temperament has changed so much that I recommended it to my local dog trainer for aggressive and hyperactive dogs”.

***UPDATE: Follow-up report July 2006:- Food Poisoning & chest infection.**

“As you know Mulder and myself have long been fans of Zara's Herbal Tea and indeed many more 'canines' are benefiting from its magical formula, as I have been able to recommend its use with so much confidence. However, I thought I'd let you know about a few more successes in the 'human' world.

I always turn to the tea for any 'tummy problems' or 'chestiness'. So when my husband (David) had been laid up for nearly a week with very severe vomiting and diarrhea, I gave him Zara's Tea and within 24 hours he was better. I honestly believe it was possibly salmonella. Similarly, after a heavy cold, he was left with severe congestion on his chest. After a month with no sleep, Zara's tea to the rescue – 24 hours later, problem solved”.

Emphysema & cancer:- “Unfortunately, my 85 year old dad was recently diagnosed with a ‘malignant melanoma’ on his ear, but as he suffer with ‘emphysema’ his chest had to be clear in order to operate. After two lots of antibiotics and 4 days to the operation, the chest infection was still lingering. I dosed him up with Zara’s tea. The x-rays confirmed that his chest had cleared completely. However, having now had his operation to remove the cancer, he is religiously carrying on with a maintenance dose of the tea, convinced that it will probably help to stop the spread of this awful illness.

Thank you Zara”.

Mrs. Anderson’s experience with Zara’s Herbal Tea has now led to start training as ‘holistic animal practitioner’.

.....

- **Ms W. Waygood & Kerry - (Hampshire).**
Spindle Cell Cancer.



"Last September (2005), my Golden Retriever (Kerry) was diagnosed with spindle cell cancer on the inside of his back leg. He was operated on and the cancerous lump removed. A friend told me about Zara's Herbal Tea. Kerry has been taking it for almost a year now and is doing very well. I decided to take it as well, as I have had cancer several times. I also had a bad cough, having had a CT scan, x-rays, etc, they could not find out what was causing it. I had the cough for almost six years -

sometimes it was quite bad and very annoying. I think I had tried every cough mixture and many herbal products, which had no effect. I was told I had a very low immune system from taking cancer-drugs, radiotherapy, etc. After taking Zara's Herbal Tea with Blackstrap Molasses twice daily for two weeks, the cough started to disappear and I no longer cough. I still take the tea twice a day (first thing in the morning and last thing at night) and Kerry has it in his food twice daily.”

UPDATE..

Kerry is still very bright and still enjoying his walks. He will try and play with other dogs when out on his walk, I just have to make sure they don’t knock him over. He play fights with Honey our younger Golden Retriever in the evening and rolls about the floor with her. People remark how happy he seems, and how much brighter he is. Sadly, Kerry passed away in September 2010.

- **Mrs J. Dance - (Wolverhampton).**

Cancer / Heart Disease.



“As you know, I have been giving your herbal tea to my cat and she has improved in condition tremendously. The vet could find no outward sign of the **cancer** in a recent examination. Recently, I have been taking the tea myself, and have noticed a great improvement in energy and well-being. Above all, in my recent annual **heart** check up at our local hospital, I was told there was great improvement (not really expected) and the consultant reduced the medical dose to minimum and hopes to be able to stop it altogether when I am examined again in a few weeks time. I am now 79 ”.

- **Mrs. Edwards**

Cancer

The first dog I gave Zara’s Tea to was ‘Betts’ (a cross Alsatian). Although she was a cross-breed, at 12 years she got what a lot of Shepherds succumb to – weakening back legs – until she could not walk at all. Although, she had been spayed, she developed a ‘mammy tumour’. My Vet felt she had enough to contend with and would not cope with an operation. So I put her on Zara’s tea, and then within a short time, took her back to the Vet and he was amazed - the tumour had shrunk completely. She lived until she was 14 ½ and was very much loved.

My second dog (lady) was a cross Collie. She stopped eating and we took her to the Vet. He thought it was a tooth abscess and took her in at 8.30 for operation. At 10 o’clock, my Vet rang and said that it was not an abscess but a tumour and ask ‘should he put her to sleep, before she woke up’ – he could not stop the bleeding. I said no, we will come and pick her up. Zara’s tea arrived by return post and within 3 days the bleeding had stopped. Again, she started eating as normal, the tumour shrunk and she never looked back. She died peacefully in her sleep at 15 years of age. Again, it was Zara’s Tea that worked a miracle.

I myself, when I was feeling low take Zara’s Tea and Willow Herbal Tea. I am now 85 years old – on 3rd.September’09 (God willing) I’ll be 86 years.

I'd like to close with this short piece from Martin Walker's forthcoming book about the regulatory growth of the cancer industry and the assault on novel or natural practitioners over the last century.

THE GATE KEEPERS

(by Martin Walker)

www.slingshotpublications.com

Clause 4 of the Bill was a most determined assault upon anyone other than medically trained, cancer consultants, who wanted to discuss strategies, prevention or treatment of cancer.

Major Milner, (the minister for south east Leeds) brought up the question of prevention, and why there was so little research into the cause of cancer. He stated:- *"It is important that research should be adequately financed and staffed. I just feel that it is a disgrace to us and to medical science that although this disease has been going all these years we still do not know the cause. If we could find the cause we might be well on the road to dealing with the disease itself. Until we know the cause we cannot effectively deal with the disease ...If we could find the cause and thereby find the means of prevention we should save enormous sums of money in diagnosis and treatment upon particular cases".* Major Milner wanted to know why the **Bill did nothing for research into prevention.** *"I think that the crux of the whole problem is the question of research, which is not provided for in any way in the Bill. What are the government going to do by way of inquiring into the cause and prevention of cancer?"*

Major Milner also considered the work of the British Empire Cancer Campaign (later to become the Cancer Research Campaign; now renamed Cancer Research UK) to be very unsatisfactory. Such research charities which were he said, 'receiving, large sums of public money', had a duty to 'try out any form of treatment of cancer, however unorthodox, which has any possibility of success'. On this matter, he had personal experience of a doctor who had worked on a new treatment for cancer. *"I had a case brought to my notice of a medical man who evolved a theory of his own in regard to the cause and cure of cancer. At his own expense, he tried it out. On a number of cases which were too far advanced for conventional treatment he obtained extremely promising*

results. He continued his experiments and obtained really spectacular confirmation of his views, and obtained an improvement in cases which had been given up by other doctors as hopeless. His theories were investigated by a great authority in the country on operative cancer, who suggested that he was obtaining results which could not be explained in the light of present day medical knowledge. Other medical authorities expressed approval. It seems to me, as is very often the case that the medical profession is honey combed by vested and personal interests, and I hope the government by this Bill will take steps to control or do away with some of these vested interests.”

The Bill then went to the Committee stage, where very little to do with **Clause 4** was questioned and it returned to the Commons in March 1939 to be finally discussed and then voted upon. When it came to the final debate on the Bill on March 7 1939, the Government were given a rough ride over **Clause 4** especially by those MP's who consulted alternative therapists, or who were practitioners.

Mr Leach MP moved an amendment to Clause 4, with the object of leaving open the possibility for registered or unregistered practitioners to be able to write up and give public accounts of experimental treatments. Speaking to his amendment Mr Leach expressed the realistic and genuine fears of a large number of people involved in alternative medicine and some general practitioners based in the community. *‘In my judgement the Clause (as it stands) puts a stop to exploration and study on the part of unregistered practitioners. If one such discovers a satisfactory cure and reports or advertises it, he becomes at once a law breaker. It must be clear that the effect of a rigid application of Clause 4 would be to put a ring-fence round cancer treatment and to say, ‘Inside this ring only registered practitioners are allowed’.* Leach's point was the point which any disinterested person would have made about cancer research and treatment, that rather than ushering in ‘the darkness prescribed by this Clause’, we need the ‘fullest possible light and publicity on the whole subject of cancer’.

Mr Hayday seconded the amendment and he too made the point that all research even if it is carried out by an unregistered practitioner ought to be reported. Under the present Clause Mr Hayday pointed out that a report on cancer treatment, by a medical herbalist in the herbalists own journal would be considered illegal.

The Government, however, was adamant on **Clause 4**, obviously hiding a deeper purpose on behalf of the surgeons, the Solicitor-General refused to accept the amendment, because, he said, in effect, what these opposing members wanted, was the complete revoking of the Clause and nothing less. In the first year of the second European war, the Bill was passed and became **the Cancer Act in May 1939**.

* * *

In Summary:

These discussions prove beyond a doubt that the problem existed; was recognized and identified 71 years ago, yet the same QUESTIONS remain unanswered.

1. Why isn't research into cancer prevention being conducted?
2. Why isn't all treatment methods integrated?

71 years later, with billions raised for **experimental research of 'toxic drugs'**, yet still **'no cures'** are in sight and cancer has reached pandemic levels... to the detriment of millions whose lives could have been saved, if *'alternative treatments'* were given a fair chance. If the Government continues to deny *'alternative treatments'* then may be the only redress is for cancer sufferers to take legal action for *'due diligence & criminal negligence'* for any damage caused.

A POIGNANT REMINDER

Yesterday (14th.October 2010), I attended the funeral of a close friend's father who died from 'prostate cancer'. His appearance brought back painful memories of my father who died from the same condition. Both had undergone 3years of various experimental cancer drugs. Both had absolute faith that the doctors, specialists, nurses and drugs would CURE them. Both rejected their cultural traditions of *'alternative remedies'*; adamant that their doctors knew best. Both hung on to that faith to the very end, until they were told *'we can do no more'*. Both families waited out the seemingly long, stressful days; praying and comforting until all hope was lost and they finally passed away. From full bodied 'proud & strong' men, both were reduced to emaciated skeletons. In contrast, a week earlier, a family member who resided in the UK, lived a full life on a healthy diet, died from old age at 103 and not from disease or experimental drugs. This is a poignant reminder of why I am so passionately determined to see the CANCER ACT finally reformed.

Dounne Alexander MBE FRSA

End of Inclusion (CANCER REFORM DOCUMENT_1)

2. Can you give an example of what happens in practice?

This explanation is covered in the DOCUMENT 1 (above).

3. To which area of the law does the problem relate (please tick)?

(These options were ticked)

Consumer Law

Criminal Law

Commercial or contract law

Regulatory law

4. How did you come across this problem

I am a specialist 'Herbal Food Producer', whose business and products have been directly affected by the pursuit of the Cancer Act. Document (1) details the full facts.

5. We will be looking into existing law that relates to the problem you have described. Please tell us about any court or tribunal cases, legislation or journal articles that relate to this problem?

New EU Legislations coming into force in APRIL 2011 called '**Nutrition & Health Claims Regulations**' - although it is not about the Cancer Act, but will ban all 'health claims' on foods and unlicensed health products including those proven to be safe, effective & beneficial for cancer. The Regulation also imposes **strict censorship**, dictating what can be said, promoted or advertised concerning the health enhancing benefits of natural foods & health products. We will no longer be able to communicate with each other, the true merits of natural healthcare as handed down from generation to generation. We cannot say that 'natural foods' could... *heal, cure, restore, treat, protect or prevent* any illness or disease. This will further push the 'natural health' industry underground.

6. Can you give us any information about how the problem is approached outside England and Wales?

No.

7. Within the United Kingdom, does the problem extend beyond England and Wales? If so where?

I believe the same problem exist in Scotland, the north of Ireland and America.

8. Can you identify particular costs that occur as a result of the problem? In particular, please identify any cost that affect the following groups:

Government.

Business and private sector.

*Non-government organizations or charities, and
The general public.*

Using my business as a small test case. Having put my promising business on hold for 15 years to research my Herbal Teas cost me dearly. Although difficult to quantify, I estimate in excess of £2 million. The two Herbal Teas which were subsequently banned by the MHRA this year, were my best selling products which was about to be launched on the UK national market. Cancer being such a wide spread disease, and the teas being beneficial for other chronic conditions (such as heart disease, strokes, seizures, diabetes, hypertension, incontinence, pregnant women, skin disorders, pain managements menopause, food poisoning, allergies, etc); plus also suitable for animals; the potential demand was likely to be extremely high. Therefore, the potential financial loss (in sales) over the next year could be in excess of £5 million.

The Herbal Food Manufacturers Association confirmed in July 2010 that the new EU Legislations will see the loss of over 700 ‘small’ health businesses and over 4000 jobs. This is a considerable low estimation... all told there are 1,500 small health / Independent businesses in the UK; of which the majority can go down with a loss of over 10,000 jobs. This will have a major impact on the national economy.

To challenge this case in court, because the MHRA are funded by the Pharmaceutical Industry, they have the financial resources to hire the best counsel and could string out cases indefinitely. Therefore, businesses weren’t bother and simply buckle under the financial strain.

9. What is the scale of the problem?

This might include information about the number of people affected this year, or the number of cases which were decided by a court or tribunal in a given period.

The true scale of the problem is huge, but because the MHRA is solely in charge of enforcing the Act and have been given more powers than the Police, they use the Cancer Act as Law to effectively control, intimidate and frighten individuals and businesses into submission. Therefore, the MHRA is often not reported and is rarely challenged. I’ve spoken to several individuals who have been forced to work underground after years of MHRA intimidation. In my case, I was initially told by that I had **‘no right to appeal or consultation and was threatened with court action’**. I was also seriously warned that they had the power to raid my office & factory, confiscate computers, letters, ingredients, products etc. which the Police would be unable to do anything to help me. And although I successfully challenged their decision, my products were still taken off the market (all be

it illegally). There appears to be no independent avenues for advice, review or legal redress. To make matters worse, on 14th.October 2010 - the Government announced that they are scrapping over 192 public bodies as part of their cost saving measures but also due to lack of accountability and transparency.

10. Does the problem affect certain groups in society, or particular areas of the country, more than others? If so what are those groups or areas? As an example, if the law relates to agricultural issues, it might affect farmers and their families more than the general population.

Statistics confirms that 1 in 3 of the UK population will develop some form of cancer during their lifetime, which equates to approximately 20 million people. Over one in four people die from cancer. Cancer accounted for 30 per cent of all deaths in males and 25 per cent in females. Therefore, the scale is huge as cancer is not discriminatory and will affect the entire population (i.e. all races, gender, age etc. plus every part of the human body). However, the exorbitant cost of cancer-drugs (£24,000 to £36,000 per person annually) means only the extremely wealthy can afford it. Even beyond the means of the NHS, resulting in a post-code lottery. A few desperate sufferers resort to appeals to the European Court of Justice, to sanction treatment which may save their lives for 2 to 24 months.

Number of people diagnosed with cancer each year?

There are around 298,000 new cases of cancer (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer) diagnosed each year in the UK. Between 1978 and 2007, incidence rates for cancer in Great Britain increased by 25%. There are more than 200 different types of cancer, but four of them - breast, lung, large bowel (colorectal) and prostate - account for over half (54%) of all new cases. Breast cancer is the most common cancer in the UK even though it is rare in men.

Cancer incidence by age:

Cancer occurs predominantly in older people, with three quarters (75%) of cases diagnosed in people aged 60 and over, and more than a third of cases in people aged 75 and over.

Less than 1% of all cases occur in children (0-14 years).

1,367 cases of cancer were diagnosed in children in 2007, with a slightly higher incidence in boys than girls. Almost a third (31%) of all childhood cancers are leukaemias.

UK teenagers and young adults (15-24 years)

In 2007, **1,892** were diagnosed with cancer. The most common cancers diagnosed in this age group include Hodgkin lymphoma, testicular cancer, malignant melanoma and leukaemia.

In adults aged 25-49 years

Around 1 in 10 of all cancer cases. The most common cancers diagnosed in this age group include breast, malignant melanoma, bowel cancer and cancer of the cervix. Breast cancer accounts for nearly half (45%) of all cancers diagnosed in UK women aged 25-49 years.

Cancer incidence by sex

Prostate cancer is the most common cancer in men accounting for nearly a quarter (24%) of cancer cases in men. Lung cancer is the second most common followed by bowel cancer. Breast cancer is by far the most common cancer in women accounting for almost a third of cases. Bowel cancer is the second most common cancer in women followed by lung.

How many people die from cancer in the UK?

In 2008, there were more than 156,000 cancer deaths in the UK, and one in four (27%) of all deaths in the UK were due to cancer. Deaths from cancers of the lung, bowel, breast and prostate together account for almost a half (47%) of all cancer deaths. More than 1 in 5 (22%) of all cancer deaths are from lung cancer, largely due to smoking. Colorectal cancer was the second most common cause of cancer death (10%) and despite being extremely rare in men, breast cancer was the third most common cause of cancer death (8%). Between 1979 and 2008, mortality rates from cancer fell by a fifth (20%).

Cancer mortality by age

Reflecting the incidence of cancer, the majority of deaths from cancer occur in the elderly. More than three quarters of cancer deaths (76%) occur in people aged 65 years and over. Although there is a higher number of cancer deaths in the over 65s, cancer causes a greater proportion of deaths in younger people. Cancer caused more than a third (36%) of all deaths in the under 65s in the UK in 2008 compared with 25% of all deaths in the over 65s.

Cancer mortality by sex

Lung cancer is still by far the most common cause of death from cancer in men, accounting for just under a quarter (24%) of all male cancer deaths. However, male mortality rates for lung and bowel cancers have fallen to their lowest levels in almost forty years. Lung cancer also causes the largest proportion of female cancer deaths (21%) but unlike males the number of deaths is continuing to increase. However, female mortality rates for breast and bowel cancers are the lowest they have been in almost forty years.

Gender inequalities in cancer incidence and mortality

Analysis carried out by Cancer Research UK in collaboration with the National Cancer Intelligence Network showed that there were significant differences in both cancer incidence and mortality between the sexes. In general, men were at significantly greater risk of both getting and dying from nearly all of the common cancers that occur in both sexes. The full report can be downloaded from <http://info.cancerresearchuk>.

Five year survival rates

Five-year age-standardised relative survival rates for the most common cancers in men and women diagnosed during 2000-2001

Cancers are grouped into three survival bands: over 50%, 10- 50% and less than 10%. Of the twenty cancers studied, 7 cancers in women (49% of all cancer cases diagnosed in women) fell into the highest survival category, and 7 cancers for men (38% of all cancer cases diagnosed in men). For most types of cancer women have a small survival advantage over men.

RESEARCH SPEND

In 2006, The National Cancer Research Institute (NCRI) spend £393 million on cancer projects, plus £137 NHS cancer service support.

CANCER RATE IN ANIMALS:

- As euthanasia for animals are legal, statistics are not recorded, but our own research indicates that it is substantially higher than humans (estimated at least 1 in 2 if not 100%). Animals are subjected to far more toxic medication including annual vaccinations, plus over 3 million are used annually for scientific experiments on our behalf. Yet still a cure for cancer is no closer than 71 years ago. However, as a nation of animal lovers, our pets should be treated as an integral part of the family's household and given the same level of respect, healthcare and attention. The **Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD)** is the animal equivalent of the MHRA.

11. What do you see as the benefits of reforming this area of the law?

This might be in terms of economic benefits, such as saving government money or reducing the impact on frontline services. Or it might be a social or environmental benefit such as making the law clearer, or modernizing and outdated approach to a particular social problem.

There is too much inequality in the system favouring the Pharmaceutical Industry, which is endorsed, supported and protected by the Government. Reform will not only change the status quo and create fairness and equality but also transform the perception that there is only one model for treatment and research.

- (a). By incorporating **'alternative natural treatments'** will provide a level playing field ... bringing the Cancer Act up-to-date; fairer; un-bias; non-discriminatory; relevant to people's needs, making **'all cancer treatments'** available to the entire UK population. Most importantly it could **reduce unnecessary suffering; save lives, improve health, plus stem the escalating rate & spread of cancer.** It will also safeguard consumer-rights and health-choice...

giving the people full responsible control over their healthcare. Thereby, bringing the ACT in line with 21st.century healthcare.

(b). By making ‘**all cancer treatments**’ available will create balance, which will lead to substantial reductions in overall NHS cost, year-on-year. Once the truth is told and sufferers learn about the outstanding recovery rate; health improvement benefits and authentic success stories of ‘alternative treatments’ ... less people will opt for expensive Pharmaceutical cancer-drugs. As people become healthier on ‘alternative-treatments’, this it will ultimately improve the nation’s general health; thereby further reducing the cancer-rate ... resulting in substantial long-term cost savings to the NHS, which will also have a favourable impact on the national economy. This will then force the Pharmaceutical Industry (who are in fact, private businesses) to compete by creating less toxic & more cost effective medication.

(c). Allowing ‘**cancer-health claims**’ on *safe, effective & proven natural foods, supplements & products*, will protect producers, providers & educators from ‘criminal prosecution’ ... as well as, safeguard consumer health & safety and preserve nature’s rich history.

(d). The Act is solely about Pharmaceutical drugs (experimentation) and has no reference or support for ‘alternative treatments’ (prevention). By eliminating Pharmaceutical dominant control of research and funding will provide access to the same level of support for research into ‘alternative natural treatments’. Cancer Research UK collects over £400 million per year, plus the Government’s new £50 million cancer budget which all go into Pharmaceutical research. It should be share on a 50% basis. The ever growing escalation of cancer, year on year, proves that they have not yet found any cures with none on the horizon. The evidence on ‘alternative treatments’ indicate it to be far more beneficial and effective than ‘pharmaceutical drugs’, which could greatly improve future outcomes and potential cures. Proper monitoring of the effectiveness of both methods could result in proving which one holds the best solutions and inspire innovation for future cancer-care. This would improve the overall healthcare of cancer sufferers; better NHS service and achieve insignificant cost savings for the Government.

(e). The UK Regulator ‘**MHRA**’ – although this is a Government department, it is entirely funded by Pharmaceutical companies and a percentage of staff and executives come from the pharmaceutical industry. The MHRA is also the largest pharmaceutically-funded enforcement and policing agency in Europe. They would happily subsidize the MHRA, as long as the industry itself retained control over its licensing, intelligence and information of adverse reactions to drugs, and the policing of the alternative health sector. In effect the MHRA is the Pharmaceutical Industry controlling everything behind the scenes. Therefore, establishing an ‘Independent Regulatory Body’ of experts in both methods will remove the ‘dominant control’ and ‘financial influence’ of the Pharmaceutical Industry (open to

abuse, exploitation and manipulation); provides openness, accountability; transparency; social responsibility and create 'fair commercial competition & trade'.

12. In your view, why is the Law Commission the appropriate body to undertake this work, as opposed to, for example, a government department, Parliamentary committee, or a non-governmental organization?

There is obvious mistrust of the Government; its Departments and Agencies... all of whom appears to be under the influential control of the Pharmaceutical Industry. Hence, I see the Law Commission as the appropriate body to undertake this work, as it is supposedly independent of the Government and committed to ensuring that the LAW is simple, fair, modern, accessible, fit for purpose and cost effective. I believe the Commission would have a team of qualified expert individuals who will be able to thoroughly assess the proposal and not shy away from controversy or see the problem as insurmountable. Hence, the Law Commission needs to be bold to protect the health & welfare of the nation which accords the same privilege to those in the 'natural health industry'. There is a huge real 'social problem' here, which needs to be tackle as it is for the greater good. **The heart of legislation should be about saving lives.** Therefore, public health and safety should be paramount. The Law Commission is the appropriate body to ensure fair-play and justice.

13. Have you been in touch with any part of the government (either central or local) about this problem? What did they say?

Yes. In 2009, I sought redress by personally taking my case to the European Parliament in Brussels and presented it to over 700 MEPs; plus sent an 'open letter' to the then Prime Minister (Gordon Brown); Opposition Leaders (David Cameron, Nick Clegg, Nigel Farage, Caroline Lucas), all members of the House of Commons, House of Lords and Regional Assemblies (Greater London, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales). With the exception of Baroness Howells of St. David's, UKIP MEPs, a few MPs and Lords, no one else responded. However, the case pertained to the Cancer Act, new EU Legislations and UK Regulators.

The response from the UK MEPs in Brussels was that they have no influence or power in the European Parliament and are sidelined. Laws are passed by ensuring only members in favour are appointed to approve them. They insisted that democracy does not exist in the European Parliament; they are a Corporation, whose only interest is in large Corporation and not in small businesses. Both MEPs and Government Ministers are resigned to the belief that once something has been passed in Europe it's a done deal and there is no point in fighting or appealing against it. UKIP MEPs are the only ones challenging the legitimacy of Europe and continues to support my efforts. The Government and other

ministers simply toe the line and maintain the status quo, they are not interested in change, primarily because they too are funded by the Pharmaceutical Industry.

14. If the problem you have described has been previously considered by the government, why would it be appropriate for the Law Commission to look into this problem?

As stated in answer 13 above. It has not been considered by the Government but was simply dismissed and ignored. They do not seem to care or have the best interest of UK citizens at heart, nor the political power, will or influence in matters affecting us... where Europe and the Pharmaceutical Industry are concerned. Hence, the status quo remains unchanged.

15. Is any other organisation such as the government or a non-government group currently considering this problem? Have they considered it recently? If so, please give us the details of their investigation of this issue.

No. Not to my knowledge.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

- **Martin Walker** : I'd like to give special thanks to Martin for his extensive research, outstanding support and for generously allowing me to include an extract from his forthcoming book '**The Gate Keepers**'.