Submission on: Options for the future regulation of 'low risk' products

I am an Australian citizen currently residing in new Zealand. Am a consumer of complementary health products and a health sciences student.

Aromatherapy products – I am opposed to option 3 – the claim that essential oils are not a therapeutic product is not based on well researched evidence.

My preferred option is 1 and or 2.

Homeopathic products –The TGA's dependence on the flawed NHMRC Report on Homeopathy, which is currently being reviewed by an ombudsman because of irregularites, and the equally flawed UK Science and Technology Report that was ultimately rejected by the UK Parliament, indicates a potential bias by the TGA; while the TGA has shown a preference for these questionable reports, it has omitted the positive Swiss Homeopathy in Healthcare Report from its consultation.)

The TGA's role is to protect public safety, not to make value judgements on faulty evidence. I am strongly opposed to option 3 and option 4. Given that homeopathy is a low risk and safe product (in fact a lot safer than many OTC products – e.g. Panadol overdose is a serious and potentially fatal health risk) it makes me wonder why the TGA are afraid of it? What aspect of governmental control does it threaten – the pharmaceutical big dollar perhaps? There is no valid common sense in option 3 or 4.

As homeopathy is the safest option of any medicine available, I support option 1 and/or option 2.

Any option for anything that aligns most closely with the US model should seriously be avoided at all costs. Options that align with a European model should be preferred.