

Pfitzner, Laura

From: Blanch, Belinda on behalf of Adjudication
Sent: Wednesday, 25 July 2012 11:56 AM
To: Jones, David; Basile, Mark; Cunningham, Megan
Subject: FW: Medicines Australia 17th Edition Code of Conduct [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Security Classification:
UNCLASSIFIED

From:
Sent: Friday, 20 July 2012 1:04 PM
To: Adjudication
Subject: Medicines Australia 17th Edition Code of Conduct

Dear sir/ madam

With respect to the question of disclosure of names of doctors who receive favours in one form or another from the pharmaceutical industry, I am surprised that the concern expressed by Medicines Australia in doing so is over a possible "witch hunt" of those named. If those involved are not named, there is then a risk that the whole profession is besmirched. Without any naming, for example, I would not be able to tell if my own doctor was involved.

Why protect "the guilty" at the expense of those who are innocent?

This is a more general concern. I facilitate what are known as "citizens' juries" in health. These bring together a random selection of citizens, give them good information and ask them to indicate what values and priorities they want for health care. One such jury was in primary care. On that jury some of the members of the jury expressed concern at the influences of the industry on GPs' prescribing.

Citizens and patients know this is going on. Do they not have a right to know if their own doctor is involved and, indeed at least as important, if their own doctor is NOT involved?

Yours faithfully

Gavin Mooney DSocSc (hc) Cape Town

Honorary Professor Universities of Sydney and Cape Town; Visiting Professor Universities of Southern Denmark and New South Wales; and Aarhus University