

# Tom Lonsdale Veterinary Surgeon

---

PO Box 6096  
Windsor Delivery Centre  
NSW 2756  
Australia

Phone: +61 2 4577-7061  
Fax: +61 2 4577-7019  
E-mail: tom@rawmeatybones.com  
Web: www.rawmeatybones.com

15 June 2018

The Hon. Mark Speakman, SC MP  
Attorney General  
GPO Box 5341  
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Mr Speakman,

## **Open letter of complaint: Re NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT)**

Please find copy of *Raw Meaty Bones: Promote Health* and supporting documents enclosed.

Following experience of bringing a Government Information Public Access Act (GIPA) (NCAT File No. 1510239) [case against the University of Sydney](#), I write to say that I have lost confidence in NCAT. I believe that the Agency lacks competence and objectivity.

I have commenced two further GIPA actions (2018/688 and 2018/1762) against the University of Sydney in respect to their ongoing arrangements with the processed pet-food industry. There is the potential for those actions to lead to further NCAT hearings. ([Tab 1](#)) ([Tab 2](#))

Accordingly I respectfully request that you undertake a formal investigation and thereby help restore confidence in NCAT.

Simultaneously, I respectfully request that you undertake a formal investigation into my allegations of serious illegal activities of Sydney University in partnership with its pet-food partners.

### **Background**

In 1991 I sounded the alarm, published in the University of Sydney, Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science (PGF), *Control and Therapy Series*, regarding what I believed to be widespread, endemic corruption in the veterinary profession, veterinary schools and associations. Dr Breck Muir expressed similar sentiments in the Australian Veterinary Association Newsletter. ([Tab3](#))

From 1991 to 2007, distinguished academics and administrators at Sydney University, at some professional risk to themselves, provided ringing endorsement for my analyses on pet health and veterinary malfeasance.

In 1993 Dr Douglas Bryden, Director of the PGF, commissioned a chapter in the *Veterinary Dentistry Proceedings* in which I expanded on my allegations against the profession. My then lawyer's advice was included:

This paper was written with practitioners in mind. The legal ramifications are a recurring concern for anyone in business. My NSW-based solicitor was asked for an opinion and he advised that the following matters may become issues of relevance in the future.

1. *Potential claims by pet owners under various pieces of consumer legislation throughout the States and Territories of Australia.*
2. *In the Federal sphere potential Trade Practices Act claims for false or misleading claims may be made either in relation to advertising or promotional material or labels.*
3. *The new Truth in Labelling activities instituted by the Federal Government.*
4. *Potential problems or claims under the recently introduced Product Liability provisions in Part V of the Trade Practices Act.*
5. *The, as yet, unknown effect of class actions which have been lawful in Australia since the 5th day of March 1992 which may tend to overcome the existing drawbacks to actions brought by individual pet owners, namely the high cost of litigation and claims which may amount to only several hundreds of dollars in relation to an individual pet.*

The foregoing relates to potential claims against manufacturers, distributors and possibly even retailers of processed pet food. Query what may be the legal problems of veterinarians who fail to consider the issues in this paper or fail to address those issues in advising pet owners who make known to the veterinarian that they rely wholly and solely on processed pet food to supply their pets' diet. Is it too much to suggest that, as pet owners, in common with everyone else in the community become more litigious, veterinarians may some day share top billing on a Writ?" [\(Tab 4\)](#)

In 1993 Professor Colin Harvey, following our extensive discussions during the PGF Veterinary Dental Course, wrote: 'To a large extent, we agree on the central causation of periodontal disease in companion animals.' [i.e. failure of oral hygiene due feeding of processed foods] [\(Tab 5\)](#)

In 1994 Dr David Watson of the University of Sydney, acting at the request of the Australian Veterinary Association, provided a literature review on the connection between diet and periodontal disease in companion animals. Although his research depended on old, unfocused research papers, Dr Watson largely endorsed my analysis. [\(Tab 6\)](#)

In 2001 I published the book *Raw Meaty Bones: Promote Health* detailing widespread malfeasance of the veterinary profession with several passages referring to the University of Sydney. [\(Tab 7\)](#)

Following publication of the book three former Directors of the University of Sydney PGF published glowing endorsement.

Dr Tom Hungerford OBE BVSc FACVSc HAD (1968 – 1987) [\(Tab 8\)](#)

Dr Douglas Bryden BVSc MACVSc (1987 – 2000) [\(Tab 9\)](#)

Dr Michele Cotton BVSc BScVet MVPHMgt (2003 – 2007) [\(Tab 10\)](#)

In 2004 PGF Consultant, Dr Richard Malik BVSc DipVetAn MVetClinStud PhD FACVSc nominated the book for the College Prize of the Australian College of Veterinary Scientists. [\(Tab 11\)](#)

In 2004 Dr Douglas Bryden seconded Dr Malik's nomination. [\(Tab 12\)](#)

### **2015/16 GIPA action before NCAT**

In 2008, following the retirement of the above mentioned Directors of the PGF the Department changed its name to the Centre for Veterinary Education. The relationship and cross promotions between the University and the pet-food makers increased in frequency and magnitude to the extent that the University appears to be wholly beholden to the mass pet-poisoners Mars Inc and Colgate-Palmolive through their subsidiaries Royal Canin and Hill's Pet Nutrition Pty. Ltd.

29 September 2014 I lodged a GIPA Application:

Please supply details of research funds, sponsorships, agreements and contracts between pet-food companies and the University of Sydney, its staff and students. ([Tab 13](#))

13 August 2015, following failure of the University to disclose its arrangements, I made a submission to NCAT in which I stated:

I suggest that much of what constitutes University veterinary services and facilities amounts to an elaborate intellectual, scientific and commercial fraud.

The University has a large, but undisclosed budget made up, I am led to believe, mostly from taxpayer funds and tuition fees. However, the junk pet-food industry contributes relatively small amounts of cash by comparison, but nevertheless controls the entire curriculum through all years of the educational syllabus and all aspects of the so-called scientific endeavour.

Internal criticism is all but banned and there's a general chill on discussion for fear of retribution.

Public money is used to brainwash trainee vets who then brainwash the community leading to massive excess expenditure on junk pet-food products and endless, needless trips to the vet. This represents a classical, elaborate, enormous case of privatising the profits whilst socialising the costs. The unethical, illegal flow-on effects offend against the basic tenets of the GIPA Act and likely provisions of the following:

- University of Sydney Act 1989
- Sydney University Charter of Academic Freedom
- Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act
- Veterinary Practice Act
- Truth in Advertising regulations.
- Laws of obligation
- Deception and fraud
- Breach of contract
- Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 ([Tab 14](#))

2015 to 2016 Relevant NCAT documentation is available at <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/foi.php>

17 September 2015 Transcript of cross examination of Olivia Alexandra Perks, witness for the Respondent. I believe that the conduct of the NCAT Senior Member was unintelligible and lacked appropriate standards of fairness. ([Tab 15](#))

10 August 2016. NCAT decision fails to accord proper significance to the evidence presented that showed the University of Sydney to be engaged in serious misconduct in likely breach of several laws.

In my view, NCAT provided the University with cover and protection such that animals, pet owners and the wider community are denied proper oversight by the regulatory and judicial system. ([Tab 16](#))

## Summary

In summary I suggest that the multi-national processed pet-food industry, headed by Mars, Nestlé and Colgate-Palmolive, has suborned the Australian veterinary profession and in particular the University of Sydney Veterinary School. In my opinion the University has abandoned its ethical, moral, scientific and legal obligations. By virtue of animals being forced to consume a diet of industrial, processed food they are subjected to systematic cruelty. Owners are deceived and defrauded and vulnerable veterinary students are deceived and defrauded. The University uses and hides behind the legal system to cover up its abuses.

I hope that you will instigate the necessary investigations and thereby begin the process of resolving the massive corruption currently perpetrated in plain sight.

My staff, clients and I will be pleased to answer questions or supply more information as you may require.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Tom Lonsdale  
Encs.

