Australian Government

Department of Health and Ageing

Dr Ian Holland
Secretary
Senate Community Affairs Committee
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2066

Dear Dr Holland

Request for Amendment to Evidence Provided at Senate Hearing, 31 May 2012: Outcome 1

I am writing to correct a statement from the May Estimates hearing of the Senate Community Affairs Committee on 31 May 2012.

Senator Di Natale asked the following question:

"The other question I have is around comparing like with like. Often with herbal products the processing of the preparation actually changes the profile of the particular compound, and there are obvious examples: St John's wort – different preparations, proven efficacy for mild depression, and yet you cannot compare one bottle with another because they are all different. It is the same with glucosamine, although the evidence around that is a little less clear. Is anything being done about that? It is really important for consumers to know that one bottle of St John's wort is not the same as another bottle of St John's wort. What is being done around that area? I am getting some blank looks. Do you follow what I am saying? Is the question clear??"

The transcript is as follows:

"The product label has to include not just the name of the herb but also the plant path and the extraction ratio of the herb. It is intended to be specific enough to allow consumers to choose either plant paths of a given herb or the extraction types."

It has been brought to my notice that my statement has been transcribed incorrectly. The transcript should now be amended as follows (changes are underlined):

"The product label has to include not just the name of the herb but also the <u>part</u> and the extraction ratio of the herb. It is intended to be specific enough to allow consumers to choose either plant <u>parts</u> of a given herb or the extraction types"

Yours sincerely

Dr Larry Kelly
Group Coordinator
Monitoring and Compliance Group
Therapeutic Goods Administration
20 July 2012