

As a health practitioner who often utilises complimentary therapies on a personal level, I am concerned about Option 4, which seems could undermine homeopathy in Australia. Consumers, homeopaths, and manufacturers would all suffer as a result. More specifically, there is a risk that:

- >Provision of information on homeopathic remedies would be prohibited, even as a complimentary solution to traditional medicine.
- >Homeopaths would not be able to prescribe remedies
- > Homeopathy would tacitly become illegal.
- >The loss of the therapeutic good accreditation would invite criticism from medics and others opposed to homeopathy.
- >Community and practitioners would have restricted access to homeopathic remedies.

Option 4 would drive homeopathy underground, escaping regulation, and subsequently undermining quality control and public safety. If the current regulatory regime is working, why fix it?

Option 1 is preferred, with Option 2 a close second.

In concluding, I disagree with the conclusions reached by

The NHMRC report cautioning lack of scientific evidence for homeopathy was flawed as evidenced by a continuing Commonwealth Ombudsman challenge by three peak bodies in the natural health field. The blatant support of the TGA by pharmaceutical companies supplies a conflict of interest and inescapable bias which would negatively filter any view of often highly effective healing modalities like homeopathy.

In sum I would strongly support the Swiss Government's 'Homeopathy in Healthcare' document, being used to justify the adoption of Option 4.