

3 PERSPECTIVES OF INDIVIDUALS WHOSE INTERESTS ARE, OR HAVE BEEN, AFFECTED BY THE SERVICES PROVIDED

3.1 Background

In January 2005 and March 2005 respectively, the relatives of two former patients of the Hope Clinic contacted the Office of the Health Services Commissioner (OHSC) regarding services provided by Noel Campbell. For the purposes of the Inquiry, the March caller was interviewed by the Inquiry in August 2005 and the January caller was interviewed by the Inquiry in November 2005. The March caller volunteered the names of two additional former patients, with whom telephone interviews were subsequently conducted for the purposes of the Inquiry.

'A Current Affair' was approached for details of former patients of the clinic willing to be contacted for the purposes of the Inquiry. The names of relatives and friends of several such patients were provided. For the purposes of the Inquiry, two individuals were interviewed by the Inquiry (one in September 2005 and the other in November 2005).

An individual had made a complaint to the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) in October 2004 regarding the activities of Noel Campbell. The OHSC had been notified about this complaint by the TGA in November 2004. For the purposes of the Inquiry, this individual was interviewed by the Inquiry in October 2005. Contact was also made with the husband of the former patient of the clinic, whose circumstances instigated the individual's complaint to the TGA. For the purposes of the Inquiry, the husband of the former patient was interviewed in October 2005.

In the course of 2005, the OHSC was contacted by two further individuals (one a relative of a former patient of the clinic and the other a friend of a former patient of the clinic) regarding services provided by Noel Campbell. For the purposes of the Inquiry, the relative of the former patient was interviewed by the Inquiry in October 2005 and the friend of the former patient was interviewed by the Inquiry in November 2005.

In August 2007, the Victorian Department of Human Services referred a complaint to the OHSC from the mother of a former patient of the Hope Clinic. For the purposes of the Inquiry, contact was initiated with the complainant by the Inquiry in September 2007, with further contact made in December 2007 and April 2008.

3.2 Positive perspectives

3.2.1 *Individual A*

Individual A, a former patient of the clinic, stated he had no complaints about Noel Campbell. He described Noel Campbell as 'a wonderful person' who had been helpful with his treatment and believes he would not be alive today if it had not been for him.

3.2.2 *Individual B*

Individual B, a former patient of the clinic, stated he had no complaints about Noel Campbell, his treatment or the clinic.

3.2.3 *Others*

In September 2005, Noel Campbell showed the Inquiry complimentary cards and letters sent to him by grateful patients and their families.

3.3 Negative perspectives⁷³

3.3.1 Complainant A

According to complainant A, the wife of a former patient of the clinic (from interstate):

- Her husband was diagnosed with cancer but conventional treatments, such as chemotherapy and radiotherapy, were not recommended by his doctors. He subsequently learnt about 'Professor' Campbell at his workplace. They rang the clinic for an appointment with him and were asked to forward any scan results in their possession to the clinic. The complainant conducted an internet search and located a website called 'Operation Hope', which gave her some information regarding the theory of what happens at the clinic.
- On the day of the appointment, the complainant attended the clinic with her husband. Prior to seeing Noel Campbell, they were required to fill in a questionnaire (about eight pages long) which sought extensive details of her husband's medical history. In terms of the initial consultation with Noel Campbell, the complainant felt they were treated in a very unprofessional manner. There were numerous interruptions with people coming in and out of his room and Noel Campbell answering telephone calls, which extended the length of the consultation. The room was full of papers and boxes. Noel Campbell explained the process of the treatment but no written information was provided. He did provide them with diagrams of the skeletal system, on which he noted the location of her husband's cancers. (The complainant provided the Inquiry with a two-page copy of these diagrams.) The theory behind the spirulina extract was explained to them. (The spirulina extract is said to adhere to the cancer cells; the heat treatment then starves the oxygen which, in turn, slows the growth of the cancer.) Noel Campbell made clear he would not be able to cure her husband and the best that could be achieved was that his life would be prolonged. He outlined the cost of the treatment (which was \$2,000.00 per week) and explained that blood tests would be required and a hair test carried out (which would be sent to America to measure heavy metals). He also explained that at the end of the treatment, there would be equipment that would need to be taken home. The type of equipment required would depend upon the results of the treatment and could cost up to \$6,000.00. The complainant believes this consultation took about two hours.
- After the consultation, the complainant and her husband left the clinic and had a discussion with their children about the process involved. Her husband made the decision, that same day, to undergo the treatment. She believes he commenced treatment at the clinic that afternoon or the next day.
- Over a three-week period, his treatment at the clinic included the sauna, ozone cupping and microwave treatment in combination with an intravenous drip. The treatments were carried out by two registered nurses (Shirley and Andrew) but he was not medically examined by anyone. He was sent for a blood test, which he and the complainant paid for. A hair test was also carried out. No contact was made with his treating doctors.
- Towards the end of the treatment period at the clinic, they attended a seminar presented by Dr Ballard. There was another patient in attendance. The topic was 'Understanding Cancer and its Treatment – an Overview'. (The complainant provided the Inquiry with a copy of this paper, which is a 22-page document by Dr Ballard

⁷³ The patients, the subject of the complaints of complainants A, B, C, D, E, G and H, variously attended the clinic between October 2004 and February 2005. These complaints had not been brought to the attention of Noel Campbell prior to the commencement of the Inquiry. Noel Campbell reported his clinic has complaints resolution procedures in place and that prior to the Inquiry, only one complaint had been made to him which was resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant.

marked 'Version – 22 December 2004'.) Dr Ballard was professional in his manner and answered all questions asked. There was no opportunity for the complainant and her husband to have a 'one on one' meeting with Dr Ballard.

- No information was ever provided as to the qualifications of the staff at the clinic. With respect to Noel Campbell, he mentioned his dentistry to them but never told them about his qualifications in relation to the alternate treatment offered at the clinic. The complainant recalls him being referred to as 'Professor' Campbell in all the documentation, including his business card.
- The complainant did ask for information on the drip that was given to her husband. She was provided with documentation, which she no longer has. Other than vitamin C, she does not recall what else the drip contained.
- The only medication provided during the course of the treatment at the clinic was the spirulina (at no extra cost) but they were not given any information about it.
- The cost of the treatment at the clinic was \$2,000.00 per week. One week was \$400.00 less due to a public holiday. There were no health rebates for the treatment but they were informed by staff that the treatment was tax deductible.
- The complainant is of the view that all questions asked of Noel Campbell or his staff were answered as best they could. She is satisfied with the information they received.
- At the end of the treatment period at the clinic, they had to purchase an electrode machine and infra-red lights for about \$2,000.00 for the purposes of home treatment.
- They also purchased spirulina tablets for three months of home treatment. The tablets were provided in a plain brown bottle with the following written on it: 'Take three hours before treatment'. The contents were not identified. The tablets cost \$1,200.00, which amounted to \$40.00 per tablet. The complainant thought this was a lot of money and made enquiries at a health food store. She discovered a bottle of 40 tablets could be purchased for \$20.00. The complainant contacted Noel Campbell to enquire why the tablets were so expensive. He informed her the process used by the clinic involved the extraction of chlorophyll from the spirulina, which increased the cost of production of the tablets.
- The complainant and her husband spent about \$11,000.00 in total on the treatment as well as on the spirulina tablets provided by Noel Campbell.

Nevertheless, complainant A believes the treatment provided by Noel Campbell has been of significant help. Six months after the initial consultation with Noel Campbell, she and her husband went back to a specialist they had seen prior to attending Noel Campbell's clinic. A scan was ordered which showed her husband's cancer had grown only about seven centimetres and had not spread to any other major organs. The specialist expressed surprise that the cancer had not grown more in the time since he had last seen her husband.

3.3.2 Complainant B

According to complainant B, the sister of a former patient of the clinic:

- Her sister was diagnosed with cancer and was seeking a 'natural' therapy as she did not wish to undergo chemotherapy. 'Professor' Campbell was recommended to her.
- Not a great deal was said at the initial consultation with Noel Campbell, which she attended with her sister. Her sister told him she had a swelling on her leg and he

took a photo of it. While he did not promise her a cure, he did say the treatment would give her a better quality of life. He then outlined the costs involved (which was \$2,000.00 per week for five weeks' treatment at the clinic). They were also told about items that would have to be purchased for the purposes of home treatment (which included a type of ray lamp for \$1,500.00 and tablets at a cost of \$100.00 per month). However, they were not provided with any written information about the costs or the proposed treatment. A blood test and hair analysis was ordered. The complainant believes the consultation with Noel Campbell took about half an hour at the most. Her sister was charged for the consultation (\$75.00) as well as for the hair analysis testing which would be sent to America (\$85.00). (The complainant provided the Inquiry with a copy of this invoice for \$160.00, issued by Operation Hope (Australia) Pty Ltd.) After the consultation, they made an appointment for her sister to return to the clinic for treatment, which the complainant believes was about a week later.

- The day after the consultation, the complainant's son downloaded information on 'microwave therapy' from the internet at <<http://www.smile.org.au/holt.htm>>. (The complainant provided the Inquiry with a copy of this information, comprising two pages from the website.)
- Her sister subsequently commenced treatment over a six-week period at the clinic (which she describes as having consisted of the 'solarium', the 'sauna', 'cups', 'microwave', 'light' via a ray lamp and the 'drip'). Shirley Krishna operated some of the machines, including the 'solarium', 'sauna' and 'cups'. The rest of the machines were operated by a male nurse and another female staff member. The male nurse also administered the 'drip' (which contained 'vitamin C', 'alpha-lipoic acid' and 'glutathione'). Her sister was put on the 'drip' every second day, which she presumed must have stung because her sister continually asked for it to be removed.
- Throughout the course of treatment, her sister was never medically examined by anyone. The only doctor they spoke to was a herbalist towards the end of the treatment period. The complainant had doubts about the efficacy of the treatment from day one.
- Noel Campbell referred to himself as 'Professor' Campbell. The complainant was told he is a professor as he had trained at Swinburne University but she did not know what he had trained in.
- A blood test taken by her sister at the end of the treatment period revealed high levels of certain components of blood. The test results were to be taken back to Noel Campbell but her sister first had an appointment with Mr Sullivan, the oncologist at the Freemasons Hospital, who admitted her as soon as he saw her. Her sister passed away three weeks later in hospital. The complainant did not know whether the high levels were caused by the treatment her sister had received at the clinic or 'whether that's what happens when you've got cancer'.
- The complainant provided the Inquiry with copies of some of the invoices issued to her sister by Operation Hope (Australia) Pty Ltd for treatment at the clinic. These totalled \$8,055.00.

3.3.3 Complainant C

According to complainant C, the mother of a cancer patient who attended the clinic on one occasion:

- She found out about Noel Campbell through a friend who had received treatment at the clinic. This friend made an appointment for her daughter at the clinic.

- The first time she and her daughter attended the clinic, they were asked to complete a questionnaire which contained several inappropriate questions. Her daughter was asked if she wanted to commit suicide, if she wanted to die and if she picked her nose.
- They were told by a secretary that 'the doctor will see you now', in reference to Noel Campbell. But she said his card used the title 'Professor'.
- Noel Campbell conducted the initial consultation during which he asked them various questions but did not write anything down. He recommended various types of meditation to her daughter. They were told the treatment would cost a minimum of \$4,000.00. The complainant enquired about the type of treatment and was told he would have to do a test on her daughter in order to determine which particular machine would suit her. No explanation was given about the various machines at the clinic. They were also told there would be additional costs for machine parts as well as for medication. They were not provided with anything in writing, such as a schedule of fees. When she asked him if he was part of the Holt Foundation in Perth, he replied he was. He recommended commencing treatment as soon as possible but advised them not to stop the hospital treatment as 'it works better together'. The complainant believes the consultation with Noel Campbell took about 30 to 40 minutes. She was charged for the consultation (\$80.00, as far as she recalls) as well as for a hair test which would be sent to America (also \$80.00).
- Noel Campbell took a personal call during the consultation, during which his private business affairs were discussed. She felt this was inappropriate.
- Neither she nor her daughter felt comfortable with the initial consultation at the clinic. Her daughter did not proceed to undergo treatment at the clinic.
- She believed Noel Campbell had appropriate qualifications to treat people with cancer. She was very unhappy when she later discovered he was a former dentist who had opened a cancer practice.

3.3.4 Complainant D

According to complainant D, the husband of a former patient of the clinic (from interstate):

- His wife had been battling cancer for about five years, during which time she had had chemotherapy and radiotherapy and gone into remission. When her cancer returned, she did not want to undergo chemotherapy and was seeking alternative therapies when she learned about 'Professor' Campbell.
- He was not present the first time his wife visited the clinic but believes she had the initial interview with Noel Campbell, followed by ozone cupping treatment. He does not recall her having left the clinic with any written information.
- The treatment she subsequently received at the clinic included ozone cupping and ozone treatment via sauna. She also discussed having had microwave treatment. He was never present during any of the treatment sessions. He believes Shirley (the 'receptionist') administered the ozone treatment (via cupping and via sauna).
- Her treatment cost about \$2,000.00 a week for three weeks at the clinic. (The complainant provided the Inquiry with copies of two invoices issued by Operation Hope (Australia) Pty Ltd. One was for \$2,000.00 and the other was for \$2,100.00).
- She then continued with home treatment, which involved the ingestion of spirulina tablets and the use of red light equipment (which her family paid for). The red light

equipment consisted of a red spot light on a telescopic stand as well as two square boxes containing fluorescent red lights and fans. The complainant acknowledged that all of the small lumps on his wife's chest reduced in size and started to clear up during the course of the treatment.

- The complainant did not really have anything to do with Noel Campbell apart from one conversation where Noel Campbell told him he hoped to double the life span that conventional medicine offers to terminally ill cancer patients. At this stage, the complainant's wife had been given about five days to live by an oncologist at a hospital. The complainant wanted Noel Campbell to tell her how much time he could offer her. He was unhappy that Noel Campbell did not do so. Instead, he merely patted her on the hand and told her she would get through this and would be alright.

3.3.5 Complainant E

According to complainant E, a Biomedical Engineer (with 20 years' experience delivering biomedical engineering services to major public hospitals) and the friend of a former patient of the clinic (from interstate):

- He had a look at two machines supplied to the friend by 'Professor' Campbell. The first was an electromagnetic therapy unit and the second was a photodynamic light therapy unit.
- While he was never told how much the machines cost, he was led to believe they were purchased for thousands of dollars.
- There were no labels or manufacturer markings on the outside of the machines. He never saw any written instructions.
- There was no evidence of any conformity assessment by any agency, such as the TGA. His friend was being instructed to use the equipment as a 'medical device'. He checked the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods and found that none of the equipment was registered.

Complainant E made a complaint to the TGA in October 2004 regarding, *inter alia*, the two machines supplied by Noel Campbell to his friend. The OHSC was notified about this complaint by the TGA in November 2004. The TGA advised that whilst it regulates medical devices, the 'home made' medical devices in question appeared to be custom-made devices which are exempt from regulation under the Commonwealth *Therapeutic Goods Act* 1989.

3.3.6 Complainant F

According to complainant F, the friend of a former patient of the clinic:

- Her friend (who lives interstate) had been battling cancer for about a year and a half. She had been receiving conventional treatment at a hospital, including chemotherapy and radiotherapy, but the hospital advised her to discontinue the treatment. She then consulted many alternative therapists, during which time she learned about the Hope Clinic. She made an appointment at the clinic herself then came down to Melbourne for the appointment in late October 2005.
- On the day of the appointment, complainant F accompanied her friend to the clinic. Prior to the initial consultation, they attended a lecture presented by Dr Ballard about the clinic's techniques, methods and beliefs. Three other couples were also present at the lecture. They were told the clinic does not use the microwave treatment invented by Dr Holt in Perth as it had not been authorised as yet by the relevant body. The initial consultation then took place with Dr Ballard as Noel Campbell was

overseas. The consulting room was untidy and disorganised. However, Dr Ballard was kind and direct. He asked a lot of questions, wrote down her friend's history and asked her to return the next day to commence treatment.

- During the first week at the clinic, her friend received various treatments (which included the sauna with ozone, ozone cupping, intravenous vitamin C and light treatment). Shirley Krishna administered the ozone treatment (via cupping and via sauna). The complainant recalls her friend asking Ms Krishna what the cupping actually does and her response was 'kills cancer'. When her friend asked Ms Krishna what the vitamin C does, her response was 'it gets into your body and it kind of scoops the cancer cells out'. The intravenous vitamin C treatment was administered by a South African woman named Elizabeth, who Noel Campbell said was an anaesthetist. According to the complainant, she seemed very skilled and seemed to know what she was doing. Microwave treatment was also administered to her friend on two separate occasions by Elizabeth, despite Dr Ballard telling them at his lecture it was not used at the clinic.
- By the second week, her friend was attending the clinic by herself for treatment.
- The intravenous vitamin C treatment appeared to have an adverse effect on her friend. Almost every time it was administered, she would come home from the clinic 'tired' and 'a bit shaken up'. She would go and lie down and after about an hour, she would be in a state 'as if she was in shock'. Her body would be warm but she would be shuddering with cold and nothing could warm her up. She would also sweat profusely. She would remain in this state for several hours. On one occasion at the clinic, at the end of the second week, she could barely speak following the vitamin C treatment, which had been administered mid-afternoon. Noel Campbell kept her at the clinic for the next few hours, 'sitting on a chair with a rug over her', as he wanted to see what effect the treatment had on her. At about 7 o'clock that evening, he drove her to the complainant's house. The complainant expressed concern that a patient was allowed to remain in such a state at the clinic without any medical supervision. Noel Campbell's response was Dr Ballard comes in every week (but this was in fact only one afternoon a week for the lecture). When the complainant pointed out that Noel Campbell is overseas most of the time, he told her he is not actually a doctor but a scientist and his training is in dentistry. He then sought to highlight Ms Krishna's training (but the complainant was told she is only a trained acupuncturist). The complainant believes there was no one with proper medical training at the clinic to attend to patients who had had a reaction to a particular treatment.
- The complainant considered Noel Campbell to be uncaring and unprofessional. She was very concerned about the terrible effects the treatments were having on her friend, who was in a very fragile state. When she raised this with Noel Campbell, he did not take her seriously. She states 'they were so breezy about these brutal treatments and if you were shocked by the brutality of them they just sort of had this glazed...yeah what are you so upset about, that kind of attitude'.

3.3.7 Complainant G

According to complainant G, the sister of a cancer patient who attended the clinic on two occasions:

- The family turned to alternative therapies after her sister was told by doctors in several hospitals that they could not help her. They knew of Dr John Holt in Western Australia and conducted an internet search on him. The first result returned stated microwave therapy was now available in Melbourne and offered a link to a website featuring a picture of Noel Campbell. The complainant and her sister assumed this was a branch of Dr Holt's clinic which had opened in Melbourne and called to make an

appointment. Her sister was sent a questionnaire to complete prior to the appointment.

- The initial consultation at the clinic, which the complainant attended with her sister and her father, took place with Noel Campbell. Noel Campbell looked through the questionnaire as well as her sister's test results, which were on a file. He stated he could offer her sister treatment (as he had had a very good success rate with her type of cancer) and if she did what he said, it was very probable there would be a cure. In terms of treatment, he recommended microwave therapy, a type of light laser therapy, a change of diet as well as other alternative therapies. They were informed the cost would be \$2,000.00 per week. They were also told that equipment (such as infra-red lights) and different medications would have to be purchased. A hair analysis and blood test was ordered. In response to a question about his association with Dr Holt, Noel Campbell stated the clinic was not run by Dr Holt but he had been trained by a doctor who had been trained by Dr Holt. In response to a question in which she referred to him as 'a doctor like yourself', Noel Campbell did not admit that he was not a doctor. They were charged for the consultation with Noel Campbell.
- Following the initial consultation, the complainant rang Dr Holt's clinic in Western Australia. She was informed they were not associated with Noel Campbell's clinic and that Noel Campbell was not a doctor.
- The complainant's sister and mother subsequently attended the clinic on a second occasion. They purchased a bottle of spirulina for \$165.00.
- The complainant felt the family had been misled by the clinic's website to assume a connection with Dr Holt. As she explained, when an internet search was conducted on Dr Holt, the first thing to come up was a link to the clinic's website.

3.3.8 Complainant H

According to complainant H, the daughter of a former patient of the clinic (from interstate):

- Her father was diagnosed with cancer and was told by doctors it could not be treated.
- Friends told her about Dr John Holt in Western Australia but the earliest available appointment was in five months' time. Another friend conducted an internet search on 'microwave therapy' and discovered a link to the website of a medical centre which claimed to use Dr Holt's treatment (ie. the Operation Hope Clinic). The complainant called and was able to get an appointment the following week. She was told to bring any medical records they had with them. If the clinic agreed to treat her father, treatment could commence immediately and would cost between \$1,500.00 and \$2,000.00 for three weeks. The clinic also sent her father a questionnaire to complete prior to the appointment. The complainant found it to contain odd questions relating to mental health, relationships and non-medical issues.
- The complainant made enquiries about 'Professor' Campbell and found he was not qualified or registered as a medical practitioner and had qualifications in dentistry only. She also made enquiries with Dr Holt's support group, which revealed Noel Campbell had no connection or association with the Holt clinic. She did not tell her father what she had learnt as he was excited about the appointment.
- The initial consultation at the clinic, which the complainant attended with her father and sister, took place with Noel Campbell. They gave him some medical records, x-rays and the completed questionnaire. Noel Campbell briefly looked at a medical report. He did not look at the x-rays or the completed questionnaire. In her view, no

medical questions were asked before he agreed to treat her father. However, he did not make any promises about being able to cure him.

- During the consultation, Noel Campbell outlined the treatments used at the clinic. He specifically stated he was using the Holt treatment and that he had worked with Dr Holt in Perth for 12 months. He then went on to state that he had refined Dr Holt's treatment and that it was a better treatment as it was offered in conjunction with other treatments such as sauna and photo dynamic therapy. Mention was also made of diet and pills that had to be taken.
- At the consultation, the complainant was informed the cost of treatment would actually be \$2,000.00 a week. In addition, the pills would have to be purchased at a cost of \$100.00 a week (for five pills). Equipment for home treatment would also be required which would cost around \$1,500.00 per item. The complainant was offered a discount if she paid cash.
- The complainant specifically enquired about Noel Campbell's experience in treating patients with the same type of cancer as her father. The example given was of a patient in a wheelchair who had come into the clinic the previous week and, after five days of treatment, was able to raise his arm. The complainant also enquired about the side effects of the treatments but no definitive response was given. She was merely told it 'depends on the person'. Nausea and loss of appetite were mentioned.
- A blood test was ordered by Noel Campbell. He also made an appointment with an oncologist for the complainant's father. The complainant believes the consultation with Noel Campbell took about thirty minutes.
- Throughout the consultation, Noel Campbell was interrupted by telephone calls and his receptionist. His room was untidy and disorganised.
- The complainant's father was keen to proceed with the treatment. He went for a blood test then returned to the clinic that same day for treatment. The complainant and her sister met with Noel Campbell again that afternoon to ask him some additional questions, for instance in relation to the diet. Noel Campbell did not have any written information about the diet so gave them the information verbally. Pills were supplied in an unlabelled brown bottle without any accompanying information. Information provided about the procedures at the clinic was the same as that available on the internet.
- The complainant's father subsequently saw the oncologist (Dr Sullivan) and a neurosurgeon, who both recommended that he not continue with the treatments at the clinic.

3.3.9 Complainant I⁷⁴

According to complainant I, the mother of a former patient of the clinic who lives interstate:

- Her son was diagnosed with cancer and underwent surgery in April 2006, but the tumour was aggressive. When he failed to respond to radiation, his doctor suggested Holt microwave therapy. In late January 2007, the complainant conducted an internet search, using the 'Google' search engine, and discovered this therapy was offered at the Hope Clinic, together with a range of other alternative treatments. When she rang the clinic, she was told the clinic could offer him treatment and got an

⁷⁴ The Inquiry sent this complainant's complaint to Noel Campbell and Dr Ballard in October 2007 for a response. The Inquiry attended the clinic in late November 2007 for a meeting (with Noel Campbell, Dr Ballard and their solicitor) to discuss the complaint. The Inquiry received a copy of complainant I's son's patient file in late November 2007 and a response from Dr Ballard in early December 2007.

appointment for him the following week. On 1 February 2007, she was sent an email from Noel Campbell at the Hope Research Institute. The email, the subject of which was 'Hope Clinic', contained two attachments, one with the description 'MaleQuestionnaireAu' and the other 'Hope Clinic Introduction – 20 November 2006'. She was requested to complete the questionnaire prior to the consultation. (The complainant provided the Inquiry with a copy of the email with attachments. The 'Hope Clinic Introduction' attachment is a 7-page document entitled 'Hope Clinic Integrated Treatment Approach for Cancer'.)

- Her daughter, who lived in Melbourne at the time, accompanied her son to the initial consultation at the clinic in early February 2007. The consultation with Dr Ballard was very brief. He took a quick history of her son then recommended various treatments. They were provided with the following written information at the consultation: a print-out of the treatments at the clinic downloaded from the clinic's website; a document outlining what food her son could and could not eat; and a list of vitamins with directions as to how they needed to be mixed and how often they needed to be taken. Her son commenced treatment at the clinic immediately after the consultation.
- Over a four-week period, her son received the following treatments: 'laser therapy through the mouth to the brain stem; gas treatment through a face mask; electrical impulse through a hand-held machine; and sitting in a tub totally covered except for his face'. 'Professor' Campbell administered the more invasive treatments, while the rest of the treatments were administered by his assistant Shirley. The complainant believes Holt microwave therapy, while recommended, was never actually administered.
- Her son returned home to Canberra, and continued with home treatment (which included neuro-immunology treatment). However, his condition deteriorated and he was brought back to the clinic in late March 2007, at which time intravenous ozone therapy was proposed. According to the complainant, Dr Ballard felt her son would benefit from the therapy and asked Noel Campbell if it could be used the following afternoon. That was the extent of the discussion about the treatment. The complainant and her son were not advised about the implications or possible side effects of the therapy nor were they given a consent form to sign.
- The ozone therapy treatment, via intravenous injection, was administered by 'Professor' Campbell on 3 April 2007. According to the complainant, the change in her son was immediate. She states 'he was flushed, his whole body was leaning over to one side, he could not talk and he complained of no feeling down the right side of the body'. She commented to staff about his response but she was assured the symptoms would pass and to take him home.
- Her son's condition continued to worsen and he was taken to the Epworth hospital. While he displayed all the signs of having had a stroke, the brain scan did not show a bleed. He was taken home later that night and grew weaker with total 'deadness' on the right side of his body. According to the complainant, it was Easter that weekend and the clinic kept saying her son would improve and that they would see him after Easter. So the family decided to wait and see. However, by the Saturday night (7 April 2007), they knew he would never be the same again and took him back home to Canberra. According to the complainant, he had lost his ability to speak, to walk and to sit unaided. He kept falling to the right side and had to be propped up to keep him comfortable. His own words were that the treatment had 'killed' him. In the following weeks, his condition deteriorated rapidly and he passed away on 21 April 2007.
- The complainant states that up until late March 2007 (prior to her son being brought back to the clinic), she was very happy with the treatment he had been receiving.

Her concern is and always has been that the last treatment (ie. the intravenous ozone therapy) drastically reduced his quality of life for the weeks he had left.

- The complainant states Dr Ballard did not inform them about the dangers of ozone therapy treatment. Research she herself conducted on the internet and articles she read indicated the treatment was safe. However, the experience with her son has led her to believe otherwise and she strongly feels people need to be warned about what could happen when the treatment is administered.
- The complainant advised the Inquiry she spent about \$18,000.00 on her son's treatments over a two-month period.

4 HISTORY OF INVOLVEMENT OF VICTORIAN REGULATORY AUTHORITIES

4.1 Background

In November 2006, the Inquiry wrote to the following Victorian regulatory authorities seeking information on any involvement Noel Campbell has had with them:

- Dental Practice Board of Victoria;
- Consumer Affairs Victoria;
- Drugs and Poisons Regulation Group (DHS); and
- Radiation Safety Section (DHS).

4.2 Responses of regulatory authorities

4.2.1 *Dental Practice Board of Victoria*

By letter dated 5 January 2007, the Board advised the Inquiry of the following:

Noel Campbell was registered as a dentist in Victoria in 1968. A formal inquiry into his conduct was held by the Board in 1998, which found him guilty of professional misconduct as a result of having provided grossly negligent dental treatment. The Board suspended his registration for three months and imposed a set of re-education and monitoring conditions on his practice. Noel Campbell appealed against the decision to the Supreme Court but all points of the appeal were dismissed by the Court.

Following the receipt of new allegations against Noel Campbell in 1999, the Board scheduled a formal hearing for 15 December 1999. On 14 December 1999, he voluntarily relinquished his registration which the Board had no choice but to accept. Once he was unregistered, the Board was prevented by law from holding the scheduled hearing. Nonetheless, his name was removed from the register and he was prevented from practising dentistry in Victoria.

Noel Campbell applied to be re-registered as a dentist in 2001 and was informed by the Board that it proposed to reject his application. The main ground cited his character as the reason registration would be contrary to the public interest. He ultimately withdrew the application and has made no subsequent attempt to obtain registration as a dentist in Victoria.

In late 2001, the Board learned that Noel Campbell was still registered as a dentist in New South Wales and made a complaint about him to the Dental Board of New South Wales regarding the matters that would have been raised at the 1999 hearing. The decision of the New South Wales Board was to take no action.

About two years ago, the Board had reason to believe Noel Campbell was providing his cancer treatments in Victoria under a provider number that related to a New South Wales address. This was brought to the attention of the Commonwealth Health Insurance Commission but as far as the Board is aware, no action has been taken.

4.2.2 *Consumer Affairs Victoria*

By letter dated 29 November 2006, Consumer Affairs Victoria advised the Inquiry it has had no involvement with Noel Campbell.

4.2.3 *Drugs and Poisons Regulation Group (DHS)*

By letter dated 16 November 2006, the Drugs and Poisons Regulation Group advised the Inquiry it has had no involvement with Noel Campbell.

4.2.4 *Radiation Safety Section (DHS)*

By letter dated 8 December 2006, the Radiation Safety Section advised the Inquiry of the following:

Noel Campbell was issued with a licence to use plain dental radiography equipment in October 1987. In the ensuing years, there were numerous periods during which the licence was not renewed, the longest of which was between October 1995 and November 1996. The licence last expired in October 1999. Following enquiries by the Radiation Safety Section in October 2006, Noel Campbell advised he was no longer practising dentistry in Victoria. It was noted a radiation operator licence is only required whilst performing radiography so his failure to renew does not necessarily mean he acted illegally.

Noel Campbell has also had a dental radiography unit registered with the Radiation Safety Section. The first application for registration, which was approved, was made in September 1987 following an inspection and testing of the unit. Payment however was never made and the unit remained unregistered. Another inspection was carried out in June 1990, following which the unit was registered. In the ensuing years, there were repeated failures to renew the registration, the longest period being approximately four months. The registration last expired in October 1999. In October 2006, Noel Campbell notified the Radiation Safety Section the unit had been donated to an overseas charity.