

To whom it may concern,

I write to you in response to your request for feedback on the potential regulatory options for low risk products, and specifically how they may be applied to Homeopathic products.

I studied Homeopathy for 5 years to become a qualified practitioner. I have used this therapy exclusively since year 2000. By choosing to use homeopathy, I have not visited a doctor, medical specialist or hospital for medical treatment since. I do not know how many dollars I have saved the government since 2000 and enjoy extremely good health despite being 60years of age.

When my children were very young, I had no knowledge of homeopathy. Some months it seemed that I always had them to our family GP for primarily frequent middle ear infections. Coming to study homeopathy when they were much older, I started treating them accordingly with amazing results. Illness became practically unknown in our household. Minor injuries were healed without needing anything further. A lingering recurring injury to one child ran the gamut of GP, orthopedic specialist, X-rays, MRI and acupuncture and supplements – all to no avail until homeopathy healed the emotional issues which were at the root cause of the physical injuries. Since being in practice, I have seen chronic conditions of more than 30 years standing completely eradicated from the patient; others whose ailments disappeared within 2-3 days without needing antibiotics or other medicines; others whose general health condition has improved remarkably. I have also successfully treated my family dog who was either taking epileptic fits or was poisoned by cane toad toxins – not once, but 3 times in her lifetime.

Millions of people worldwide use homeopathy – some of them exclusively as there is no other therapy available for them – for both immediate and chronic health care as well as proactive and preventative care against disease. The World Health Organisation (WHO) recognizes homeopathy as a traditional medicine and it is included in the National Health systems of a number of countries. Australian citizens come from a broad range of cultural backgrounds – many of which consider homeopathy as the norm.

Research is continually exposing more and more understanding of the pathways of healing and, as we see with the growth of antibiotic resistant organisms, other types of medicines must be incorporated into the public health regimen. For evidence please try this site: [www.homeopathy.ca/pdf/HomeopathyResearchEvidenceBase\\_10-29-15.pdf](http://www.homeopathy.ca/pdf/HomeopathyResearchEvidenceBase_10-29-15.pdf) By not becoming familiar with homeopathy, all the current research and remaining up to date with same, the TGA is acting most unprofessionally and seems intent on keeping Australians therapeutically behind the rest of the world. Why?

The role of the TGA is to ensure that the products and treatments available to Australians are safe for use. It is not to arbitrarily decide what I and the rest of the Australian public can and can't use especially when safety, as with homeopathy, is not an issue. Incidentally, the TGA and every drug regulating authority around the world considers homeopathic remedies to be "low-risk" medicines and there's no reason for that position to change now.

I and other Australians have the basic right to choose treatments which best suit us

individually. Government agencies should not regulate to restrict our access to information about that treatment. Knowledge equals empowerment and individual Australians have a basic human right to increase their knowledge and use same as they see fit in their day to day lives. Freedom of choice in how we care for ourselves is as intrinsic to democracy as the freedom to choose who we vote for in political elections.

People generally are far better educated and aware than they had the opportunity to be in past decades. Medical professionals are no longer the most highly educated persons in the community and their knowledge and subsequent opinions are no longer sacrosanct. People have access to a multitude of information pathways today and thus are able to research, read, analyse, understand and make much more widely informed opinions than ever before. This is of great advantage to mankind generally.

For the TGA to draw from an Australian report being investigated for complaints of serious irregularities as well as another report which has already been rejected by the UK government, shows either the TGA is genuinely biased against homeopathy, or is manned by people who cannot read – make your choice. Even more incredulous is that the Swiss Report on Homeopathy which says, “There is sufficient evidence for the preclinical effectiveness in the clinical efficacy of homeopathy and for its safety and economy compared with conventional treatment.” was not included. This points to a seriously unashamed bias against homeopathy on the part of the TGA and shows that it's members are being grossly negligent towards their own governmental guidelines and responsibilities.

Apart from the obvious health benefits of using homeopathy, will the student payments of debts incurred via HECS, etc be repaid by the government as those students will no longer be able to put their training into practise and subsequently earn an income from it. Will any outstanding debts be forgiven without any penalty to the individual student? I realise this is a government issue, but, as the agency possibly responsible for the issue, perhaps the TGA should take it into consideration.

As an Australian-born person, mother, practising homeopath, and citizen of the democratic country of Australia, I call on the TGA to act professionally, fairly and without bias or ill-will in its deliberations regarding the review of all complementary healing therapies, not just, but especially homeopathy.

*As John F. Kennedy said: “A nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people.”*

Homeopathy, therefore, should continue to be recognized as a therapeutic option under TGA administered regulations. I propose that Option 1 which provides a balance between regulatory requirements and consumer confidence in quality and safety, be adopted.

Yours respectfully,

Carolyn D. Smith



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]