

Response to the "OAND"

This information is taken from the "Natural Path", a newsletter published by the Ontario Association of Naturopathic Doctors. ANMA response written in *red*.

GOVERNMENT STALLS NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE

Illness prevention, lower health care costs, reduced drug usage - these are some of the health care goals of the Ontario Government. Naturopathic medicine can help the government achieve these goals. Yet the government is impeding the growth of naturopathic medicine by stalling the introduction of a promised new regulatory law. A new law would:

- Send a clear message that naturopathic medicine fits with the Ontario Government's health care reforms.
- Encourage conventional practitioners, such as medical doctors, to work more closely with naturopathic doctors so that patients can benefit from what both have to offer.

Why would M.D.'s want to work with naturopaths who lie about their education touting themselves as primary care physicians trained just like the M.D., in a school the Minister of Education called a "slippery operation".

- Help the public by protecting the title naturopathic doctor (ND). This will ensure that a practitioner who identifies him or herself as a naturopathic doctor has the rigorous education and hands-on clinical training of a registered naturopathic doctor.

Notice the reference to "registered naturopathic doctor", more evidence they do not license in Ontario. What the public needs is protection from those pretentious, over-reaching doctors. There have been cases of graduates from resident schools harming the public. One of these graduates are likely to be more harmful to the public than one from a correspondence school. The reason is simple, the resident graduate is brainwashed into believing that his/her education is comparable to that of a medical doctor. While the correspondence graduate can be dangerous, the point is no more dangerous than the resident graduate. One case that comes to mind is the Bastyr graduate on the East Coast, formerly Ma,Ct. area, who according to sources, caused a female patient to abort her late pregnancy administering the wrong herb.

The Ontario Association of Naturopathic Doctors has been working with the government on this new law for over four years. In 1994, the OAND and the government began a process which was designed to lead to the inclusion of NDs in the Regulated Health Professions Act. Over the next two years, the OAND submitted four extremely detailed reports to government outlining the philosophy, education, training, treatments and proofs concerning naturopathic medicine.

This paragraph tells quite a story. Take time to analyze it. You submitted four extremely detailed reports to the government, outlining philosophy, education, training, and treatments. I have read the lengthy reports from the government and know exactly where you're at. Basically you get no respect. Could that be because you do not adhere to your philosophy, you lie about your education, exaggerate your training, puff up your treatments, and offer no concise proof in medical trials.

In response to OAND queries about the lack of action on the new law, the Ontario Health Minister's policy assistant, Kathleen MacMillan, recently told OAND's executive director that

"the legislative climate is very complicated." She conceded that the OAND shouldn't expect any action on the law until 1999 at the earliest.

In the above paragraph, the truth is easy to see if you're looking for it. In other words to say the legislative climate is complicated is another way to say "cut the nonsense" come back with something that's real, or better yet, be satisfied with what you have and go home.

One comment regarding a statement earlier, naturopaths in Ontario do not call themselves "naturopathic physicians" because they are not allowed to. They instead use "naturopathic doctor". As to where, besides government, we obtain our information; we actually sent site visitors to the college in the early '90's to examine the validity and reliability of the college training program. One visitor was Dr. Mel Shelton, a 20 year member of the Arizona Board of the Naturopathic Examiners; the second site visitor was an Attorney; the third site visitor, Dr. Patrick Ranch, was a Canadian born former Canadian College student and accomplished Chiropractor with a degree in naturopathy at the time he made the site visit. All three voted unanimously against recognition of the Canadian College.