7/04/2010

To whom it may concern

I wish to respond to the guidelines presented by the National Chiropractic Board, due for implementation on July 1 2010. In my opinion these guidelines do not represent or reflect the current accepted scope of practice of a significant portion of the profession. Further I believe they would impose a restriction of freedom upon me as a practitioner and upon the consumer to receive their choice of care.

I voiced some of my concerns at a CAAQ general meeting in 2009. As the CAAQ executive is addressing those concerns in its submission, I will not reiterate them here. I do however wish to register my strong objection to some of the content of the proposed guidelines, and also to question the process through which the guidelines were constructed.

Any individual with close association to our profession could not help but be aware of the diversity of opinion over issues such as the scope of chiropractic care, technique, objectives and frequency of care. These diverse opinions are often strongly held and indeed, in some instances, the use of the term “factions” is not inappropriate. Whether or not an individual agrees with the guidelines they would probably suspect them to have been engineered in favour of one extreme model of chiropractic, to the detriment of other equally as valid models.

It is apparent to me that certain phrases (clauses 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 in particular) are hand- me- downs that have been imported verbatim from one document to another, to another and yet to another. Have these statements-as-fact been independently investigated and validated by appropriately qualified persons? Has the source of the statements even been found and the original reference data consulted? Or have they been thrown in because certain individuals thought they looked good?

I undertook a course of study that was accredited by the relevant body. I sat and passed rigorous examination to qualify as a chiropractor. I sat further examination by an independent body to gain an x-ray licence, that body has regular, free and complete access to my radiographic records to renew that licence. In short I am a qualified, licensed, professional. Surely such status confers acknowledgment of my ability to practice chiropractic safely, effectively and appropriately.

Why has the National Chiropractic Board invested itself with the right to dictate the manner in which I execute the practice of a profession I am qualified, legally, ethically and morally to determine for my self. My survey, all be it, very informal, of dentists, medical practitioners and physiotherapists I know, as well as my reading of the current QLD Board documents pertaining to these professions, revealed a most significant absence of comparable stifling and strangling limitation to practice.

I leave it to persons better versed in fields of antidiscrimination, trade practices and the like to point out to the Board the flaws in the substance and process of these guidelines that I confidently believe exist. They will have my full support in any further formal challenge to the implementation of these guidelines.

Yours truly,
Natessa Henville, Chiropractor