

The Senate

---

Community Affairs  
Legislation Committee

---

Provisions of the Therapeutic Goods  
Amendment Bill 2005

November 2005

© Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 2005

ISBN 0 642 71576 9

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee Secretariat

Ms Christine McDonald – Acting Secretary

Ms Leonie Peake – Research Officer

Ms Ingrid Zappe – Executive Assistant

The Senate

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Phone: 02 6277 3515

Fax: 02 6277 5829

E-mail: [community.affairs.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:community.affairs.sen@aph.gov.au)

Internet: [http://www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_ca](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_ca)

This document was produced by the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee Secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, Canberra.

## Membership of the Committee

### Members

Senator Gary Humphries, Chairman	LP, Australian Capital Territory
Senator Claire Moore, Deputy Chair	ALP, Queensland
Senator Judith Adams	LP, Western Australia
Senator Guy Barnett	LP, Tasmania
Senator Steve Fielding	FFP, Victoria
Senator Helen Polley	ALP, Tasmania

### Participating Members

Senator the Hon Eric Abetz	LP, Tasmania
Senator Lyn Allison	AD, Victoria
Senator Andrew Bartlett	AD, Queensland
Senator Mark Bishop	ALP, Western Australia
Senator the Hon Ronald Boswell	NATS, Queensland
Senator Bob Brown	AG, Tasmania
Senator George Campbell	ALP, New South Wales
Senator Kim Carr	ALP, Victoria
Senator Grant Chapman	LP, South Australia
Senator the Hon Richard Colbeck	LP, Tasmania
Senator Helen Coonan	LP, New South Wales
Senator Trish Crossin	ALP, Northern Territory
Senator Alan Eggleston	LP, Western Australia
Senator Chris Evans	ALP, Western Australia
Senator the Hon John Faulkner	ALP, New South Wales
Senator Alan Ferguson	LP, South Australia
Senator Jeannie Ferris	LP, South Australia
Senator Michael Forshaw	ALP, New South Wales
Senator John Hogg	ALP, Queensland
Senator Annette Hurley	ALP, South Australia
Senator Barnaby Joyce	NATS, Queensland
Senator Ross Lightfoot	LP, Western Australia
Senator Joseph Ludwig	ALP, Queensland
Senator Kate Lundy	ALP, Australian Capital Territory
Senator Anne McEwen	ALP, South Australia
Senator Julian McGauran	NATS, Victoria
Senator Jan McLucas	ALP, Queensland
Senator Christine Milne	AG, Tasmania
Senator Kerry Nettle	AG, New South Wales
Senator Kerry O'Brien	ALP, Tasmania
Senator Stephen Parry	LP, Tasmania
Senator Marise Payne	LP, New South Wales
Senator Robert Ray	ALP, Victoria
Senator Rachel Siewert	AG, Western Australia
Senator John Watson	LP, Tasmania
Senator Ruth Webber	ALP, Western Australia
Senator Penny Wong	ALP, South Australia



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Membership of the Committee .....	iii
REPORT –	
THE INQUIRY .....	1
THE BILL .....	1
ISSUES .....	3
RECOMMENDATION .....	10
SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS – Australian Labor Party .....	11
DISSENTING REPORT - Australian Democrats .....	15
APPENDIX 1 - Submissions received by the Committee .....	17
APPENDIX 2 - Public Hearing .....	18



# **THERAPEUTIC GOODS AMENDMENT BILL 2005**

## **THE INQUIRY**

1.1 The Therapeutic Goods Amendment Bill 2005 (the Bill) was introduced into the House of Representatives on 17 August 2005. On 7 September 2005, the Senate, on the recommendation of the Selection of Bills Committee (Report No. 9 of 2005), referred the provisions of the Bill to the Committee for report.

1.2 In recommending the reference of the Bill to the Committee, the Selection of Bills Committee provided the following issues for consideration.

To examine the provisions of the Bill relating to new enforcement options for the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) to:

- identify if the Bill provides sufficient detail on the scope of alleged breaches to which infringement notices may apply, on the use of alternatives to court proceedings, and the extent to which the processes of investigation of offences will be in line with procedural fairness (including the use of media during investigations and prosecutions);
- ascertain if the Bill adequately accommodates differences between registrable and listable goods;
- examine inequity implications for Australian based manufacturers due to the non-applicability of the civil penalty regime to foreign entities; and
- examine the need for ad hoc appeals mechanism against the imposition of an infringement notice and a fine under the civil penalties regime currently included in the Guidelines, to be included in the Regulations to preserve the appeal mechanism and prevent arbitrary variations and application.

1.3 The Committee considered the Bill at a public hearing on 13 October 2005. Details of the public hearing are referred to in Appendix 2. The Committee received 10 submissions relating to the Bill and 473 form letters. These are listed at Appendix 1. The submissions and Hansard transcript of evidence may be accessed through the Committee's website at [http://www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_ca](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_ca)

1.4 The Parliamentary Library Bills Digest No 40 dated 5 September 2005 also discusses a number of issues relating to the Bill and may be accessed at <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/pubs/bd/2005-06/06bd040.htm>

## **THE BILL**

1.5 The purpose of the Bill is to amend the *Therapeutic Goods Act 1989* (the Act) to better secure compliance with regulatory standards for therapeutic goods. The Bill introduces new enforcement options for the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA)

'to deal more effectively and efficiently with suppliers and manufacturers who may place public health and safety at risk by failing to fully comply with regulatory requirements including product and manufacturing standards'.<sup>1</sup> Briefly, the enforcement options proposed are:

- *tiered offence regime*: supplement a number of existing criminal offences with a tiered offences regime, which will include offences of strict liability and higher penalties for more culpable conduct resulting in harm or injury;
- *pre-disclosure notices*: require a defendant to provide a pre-disclosure notice of evidence in support of an exception to an offence relating to the importation, exportation, manufacture or supply of goods that are not included in the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods (ARTG) prior to the defendant being committed for trial or prior to a hearing by a court of summary jurisdiction;
- *alternative verdicts*: provide for alternative verdicts for various tiered offences to the effect that if the jury acquits a person of an offence specifying an aggravating element, but is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt of facts that prove that the person is guilty of a lesser offence with no aggravating element, the jury may convict the person of the lesser offence;
- *civil penalty regime*: introduce a civil penalty regime for breaches of the Act;
- *infringement notices*: introduce infringement notices for strict liability offences under the Act and for breaches of civil penalty provisions;
- *enforceable undertakings*: introduce provisions for a person to provide enforceable undertakings to remedy breaches of regulatory requirements, or give undertakings not to engage in future conduct that would breach regulatory requirements;
- *extended geographical jurisdiction*: provides for certain offences to extend to conduct by an Australian citizen or body corporate outside Australia and for an offence to extend to conduct by an Australian resident outside Australia, where there is an equivalent offence in the laws of the local jurisdiction;
- *extension of body corporate liability*: extend the liability of a body corporate to executive officers who are directly involved in the day-to-day management of the company, if the body corporate commits an offence or contravenes a civil penalty provision under the Act;
- *warrant mechanism*: introduce a new warrant mechanism for the purposes of enabling investigations to take place in relation to civil penalty contraventions;
- *search warrant powers*: extend the powers of authorised persons under search warrants to allow for the securing of additional evidence; and

---

1 Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health and Ageing, the Hon Christopher Pyne, *Second Reading Speech*, 17.8.05.



- *release of information*: allows for the release, to the public, of information about actions taken or decisions made under the Act or Regulations and the release, to Australian or international regulatory organisations of information relating to an offence or alleged offence or a contravention or an alleged contravention of a civil penalty provision involving therapeutic goods.

1.6 In addition, the Bill proposes minor amendments to certain advertising requirements; to include an amendment to section 61(3A) of the Act to correct a technical omission by including a reference to section 31AA; and amend section 56A to include an instrument of exemption issued under section 18A in the list of certificates that the Secretary may issue as evidence of certain matters.<sup>2</sup>

1.7 The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health and Ageing concluded that:

With the new measures the TGA will be better placed to deter a company's continuing breaches of regulatory requirements before they become so serious that administrative action has to be taken that could put the company out of business.

Deterring non-compliance by the industry as a whole is important in protecting consumers but it also creates a fairer environment for all players as law-abiding sponsors and manufacturers are not unfairly disadvantaged by their non-compliant competitors. Increased compliance also leads to greater credibility and attractiveness of marketed products.

The confidence of the community in the safety of therapeutic goods is of great importance. The observance of Australia's regulatory requirements for therapeutic goods by suppliers and manufacturers enhances the reputation of Australian industry. The provisions in the Bill represent appropriate measures to protect the interests of both the community and industry.<sup>3</sup>

## ISSUES

### The need for alternative options

1.8 The Bill provides for alternative options for dealing with non-compliance within existing regulatory requirements. The Australian Self-Medication Industry (ASMI) supported this approach and stated that:

...the current regime allows for only criminal penalties, which clearly is inadequate and is extremely limited. The new amendment bill suggests that there will be a flexibility and a tiered system, which makes it far more appropriate and for the lower end of the risk spectrum it will therefore continue. Those more flexible, tiered penalties and sanctions will be more appropriate. We feel very strongly about not excluding listed – which includes most complementary medicines – from this new legislation. The

---

2 Explanatory Memorandum, pp.1-2.

3 Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health and Ageing, the Hon Christopher Pyne, *Second Reading Speech*, 17.8.05.

current legislation does not distinguish between the two, and we would not like the new legislation to make a distinction.<sup>4</sup>

ASMI noted that it did have some concerns about aspects of the Bill including the level of penalties.

1.9 The CEO of the Australasian College of Nutritional and Environmental Medicine did not see the need for stricter regulatory provisions and tougher penalties and stated:

I feel that the TGA has been able to act adequately in dealing with Pan, ...there have been a number of examples since the Pan incident where the TGA has used its muscle adequately, from what I can see. People who breach the law and do not provide safe and properly documented products need to be dealt with but I feel that what is there is adequate.<sup>5</sup>

1.10 Johanson and Associates noted that there are other effective administrative procedures that are currently under the Act, for example, cancellation of a product, recall procedures and cancellation of licences.<sup>6</sup>

### **Listable goods**

1.11 Listable goods are considered to be a lower risk. Most complementary medicines are considered listed goods. Some witnesses commented that the complementary medicines industry is very safe and that the proposed changes are 'total over regulation of small business in the low risk complementary medicines industry'.<sup>7</sup>

1.12 ASMI stated that it believed that medicines offered for sale to the Australian public must conform to high standards of safety, quality and efficacy. It noted that the less risk that is deemed to be associated with the product, the less onerous are the rules relating to access, advertising, labelling and other aspects of presentation. ASMI stated:

...the rules about quality and safety are the matters on which a regulatory regime should be enforcing sanctions. We do not see that there is any difference between ensuring the safety of the products made by Pan, for example, or those made by Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKlein. They should be safe. If they are not then those who have not made them safe are guilty and should be punished across the board in accordance with a regime which

---

4 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.3 (ASMI).

5 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.7 (Australian College of Nutritional and Environmental Medicine Inc).

6 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.8 (Johanson & Associates Consulting).

7 *Submission* 6, p.1 (Johanson & Associates Consulting); see also *Submissions* 3 p.1 (Name Withheld); 10, p.1 (Blackmores Ltd).

applies equally and without difference. Therapeutic goods should be regulated without difference. That is our position.<sup>8</sup>

1.13 The Department of Health and Ageing (DoHA) commented:

...any medicine can cause harm. We are not talking about the fact that many complementary medicines may be regarded as low risk in a regulatory sense but, if a low-risk medicine is contaminated – intentionally or otherwise – and those chemicals are then introduced into the body, they can cause substantial harm. In that sense, in terms of regulation and breaches, we do not differentiate between listed medicines and registered medicines.<sup>9</sup>

1.14 Johanson and Associates stated that the amendments will 'unfairly target the complementary medicine industry as 75% of all pharmaceutical products are manufactured overseas'.<sup>10</sup>

1.15 DoHA noted that although Australia's sanctions regime can not extend beyond its borders, provisions exist which enable the TGA to prevent substandard products for being imported into Australia, or if already imported, to be removed from the market. For example, the TGA may refuse registration or listing in the ARTG, cancel an existing registration or listing, impose conditions in relation to goods included in the ARTG, and to require information in relation to manufacturing procedures. The Department concluded:

Those powers go a considerable way to providing balance in the legislation in terms of the treatment of overseas based manufacturers versus those in Australia, and in terms of the ability of the TGA as regulator to respond effectively and appropriately to inadequacies in the manufacturing processes of overseas based manufacturers importing into or supplying therapeutic goods in Australia.<sup>11</sup>

## Impact on industry

1.16 Witnesses commented that compliance costs will increase and impact adversely on small business.<sup>12</sup> In addition, witnesses stated that the change to the regulatory environment had led manufacturers of complementary medicines to move off shore and as a result the once self-supplied market had become an import-supplied market.<sup>13</sup>

1.17 Johanson and Associates stated that:

---

8 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.2; *Submission* 1 p.5 (ASMI).

9 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.10 (DoHA); see also *Submission* 5, pp.38-41 (DoHA).

10 *Submission* 6, p.7 (Johanson & Associates Consulting).

11 *Submission* 5, pp.42-45 (DoHA).

12 *Submissions* 3, p.2 (Name Withheld); 4, p.1 (MIAA).

13 *Submission* 3, p.2 (Name Withheld).

These new sanctions and penalties will increase the rapid move off shore of Australian companies manufacturing complementary medicines, further impeding the growth of the industry. This will result in consumers importing greater quantities of less regulated products of unknown safety and quality for their own personal use so does not benefit either industry or consumers.<sup>14</sup>

1.18 ASMI however commented that the manufacturers in Australia that are ASMI's members 'have not suffered any loss of business because of the Pan affair. There was a market blip; you would have to expect that' but sales had recovered. It went on to state that 'if you obey the law, have a candid and sensible relationship with the TGA and the inspectors and observe good manufacturing practice, you can run an effective business within this regime'.<sup>15</sup>

1.19 DoHA responded that there will not be a greater burden on industry as there are existing sanctions under the Therapeutic Goods Act and the proposed legislation provides for a greater array of options with those sanctions providing more flexibility rather than an increased burden to the industry.<sup>16</sup>

1.20 The Department also noted that deterring non-compliance by industry would not only protect consumers but would also create a fairer environment for all players as law-abiding sponsors and ensure that manufacturers are not unfairly disadvantaged by their non-compliant competitors. As many sponsors of therapeutic goods subcontract the manufacture of their product to third parties, the failure of the third party manufacturers to comply with regulatory measures can in turn impact adversely on the viability and reputation of these sponsors' businesses. The Department concluded that 'increased compliance also leads to greater credibility and attractiveness of marketed products'.<sup>17</sup>

1.21 Witnesses also stated that given the potential impact on industry development in Australia, a regulatory impact statement should have been mandatory.<sup>18</sup>

## **Level of penalties**

1.22 The Bill introduces a civil penalties regime for breaches of the Act. The Department noted that 'civil penalties are expected to be more effective in deterring and preventing non-compliance with regulatory requirements by body corporates, who represent the bulk of those regulated under the Act and regulations'.<sup>19</sup>

---

14 *Submission 6*, p.6 (Johanson & Associates Consulting).

15 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.4 (ASMI).

16 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.10 (DoHA).

17 *Submission 5*, pp.6-7 (DoHA).

18 *Submissions 4*, p.1 (MIAA); see also *Submission 1*, p.2 (ASMI).

19 *Submission 5*, p.10 (DoHA).

1.23 Witnesses commented that the level of proposed penalties, particularly for civil penalties, is very high.<sup>20</sup> It was stated that the penalties regime departs from the Commonwealth guidelines. Johanson and Associates commented that breaches of the Therapeutic Goods Act will carry double the financial penalty for treason, terrorism or genocide.<sup>21</sup> It also stated:

It is of considerable concern that the intent of the Bill appears to provide for significantly higher pecuniary penalties to be imposed by infringement notices that is detailed in the Commonwealth Guide, raising again the justification for such draconian measures in a low risk environment as the complementary medicines industry.<sup>22</sup>

1.24 The Australian Self-Medication Industry (ASMI) stated:

ASMI has been advised by those responsible for preparation of the Bill that the Attorney-General's Department has consented to the proposed departures from its guidelines. However, we have not been told what were the Department's reasons for having done so.<sup>23</sup>

1.25 DoHA indicated that the civil penalty provisions generally allow for higher penalty levels than those imposed under criminal offences. It stated that there was a deterrence aspect to the level of penalties and that 'the higher penalties imposed under the Bill make it clear, for example, that cost-cutting measures employed by companies may not necessarily pay off'.<sup>24</sup> The Department also noted that many of the companies in the therapeutic goods industry are large and 'maximum penalties therefore should be set at a meaningful level to achieve the objective of effective deterrence for non compliant activity'.<sup>25</sup> DoHA added that the highest tiered offences can only be made out where the non-compliance has resulted, or will result, in harm or injury to a person and that:

The high pecuniary penalty reflects that these offences are directed at corporations standing to make profits, rather than individuals who are able to be incarcerated.<sup>26</sup>

1.26 In addition, the Department stated that the legislation incorporates maximum amounts and 'at the end of the day a court would decide on the appropriate level of fines'.<sup>27</sup>

---

20 *Submissions* 1, pp.2, 7 (ASMI); 2 p.1 (Mr M Browning).

21 *Submission* 6, p.6 (Johanson & Associates Consulting); see also *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.1 (ASMI).

22 *Submission* 6, p.4 (Johanson & Associates Consulting).

23 *Submission* 1, p.2 (ASMI).

24 *Submission* 5, p.10 (DoHA). See also Additional Information 24.10.05, p.2 (DoHA).

25 *Submission* 5, p.11 (DoHA).

26 *Submission* 5, Additional Information, 24.10.05, p.3 (DoHA).

27 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.11 (DoHA).

1.27 The Department also commented that there are a number of checks and balances enshrined in the legislation: before the TGA commences an action it needs to access independent legal advice to ensure that the action is likely to have a successful outcome, and generally 'that there is no prospect of a major penalty for a minor breach'.<sup>28</sup>

1.28 The Attorney-General's Department indicated that it had supported the departure from the guidelines because :

...the impact on public health, the fact that you are dealing with commercial conduct and the fact that so much of this conduct is by corporations. It really is something different from traditional Commonwealth criminal law...but it is becoming more common for the Commonwealth to regulate this sort of conduct.<sup>29</sup>

The Attorney-General's Department also noted that the Commonwealth had recently announced that there would be a review of Commonwealth penalties.<sup>30</sup>

## **Infringement notices**

1.29 Witnesses commented on the introduction of an infringement notices regime by regulation. Johanson and Associates pointed to disadvantages of the use of infringement notices including lack of court scrutiny, payment reflects a presumption of guilt and the risk of innocent people paying the amount specified in the notice to avoid the expense of contesting proceedings. Johanson and Associates went on to state that the current provisions in the Act have been used successfully against both Pan Pharmaceuticals and other manufacturers 'indicating that there is provision within existing legislation to adequately address any potential public health issues and raising the question of the need for imposing further penalties and powers'.<sup>31</sup>

1.30 The Department stated that the use of infringement notices 'will allow appropriate enforcement action to be taken where readily assessable elements of a breach are identified and the infringement may appropriately be dealt with expeditiously without proceeding to a court hearing'.<sup>32</sup> The Department also stated that:

Compliance with an infringement notice is not to be taken as an admission of any contravention of the Act. If complied with in relation to an offence, the person will not be prosecuted for the relevant offence and the person will not be taken to have been convicted of that offence.<sup>33</sup>

---

28 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, pp.13-14, 15 (DoHA).

29 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, pp.11-12 (A-Gs).

30 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.12 (A-Gs).

31 *Submission* 6, p.3 (Johanson & Associates Consulting).

32 *Submission* 5, p.8, see also pp.32-35 (DoHA).

33 *Submission* 5, Additional Information, 20.10.05, p.1 (DoHA).

1.31 No appeal provisions are proposed for the issue of an infringement notice 'as appeal mechanisms are usually appropriate for a review of a regulatory decision that binds another party'.<sup>34</sup> Those receiving an infringement notice may elect to pay but are under no obligation to do so.

1.32 DoHA concluded that an infringement notice is 'intended to penalise, and deter, future breaches' and that 'action will only be commenced where there is evidence to support an action, as determined by independent legal advice, and judicial sanction is warranted given the nature of non-compliance'.<sup>35</sup>

### **Enforceable undertakings**

1.33 ASMI described the introduction of enforceable undertakings as 'unusual'. ASMI stated that 'by their nature, enforceable undertakings are more prone to abuse than other means of enforcement because there is no real limit on the undertakings that can be extracted. They can be about a very wide range of matters'.<sup>36</sup>

1.34 ASMI stated that rights of appeal and review, especially for enforceable undertakings, be provided for explicitly in the Bill.<sup>37</sup> It stated that:

But we do not see why there should not be an appeal on the merits about an enforceable undertaking because there is a lot of angst in business, and has been for some many years now, with the way in which enforceable undertakings are – how shall I put it? – extracted from participants or proponents of matters before the ACCC. We would prefer that this legislation made it clear that industry comes to this matter as an equal party and does have access to objective processes rather than merely me talking to one of my friends in the department on behalf of the client, and hoping they will see it my way. It is a question of objective criteria rather than internal assurances.<sup>38</sup>

1.35 DoHA stated that enforceable undertakings are a form of administrative resolution based on voluntary undertakings that may be given by the person concerned as an alternative to regulatory action. Where an undertaking is breached, the TGA may seek enforcement of the undertaking by the Federal Court. The TGA will not have the power to compel a sponsor or manufacturer to give an enforceable undertaking.

1.36 The Department also indicated that court enforceable undertakings 'are intended as an option only where the TGA believes that a resolution based on enforceable undertakings offers the best solution to ensure that no further breaches

---

34 *Submission 5*, Additional Information, 20.10.05, p.2 (DoHA).

35 *Submission 5*, p.8 (DoHA).

36 *Submission 1*, pp.11-12 (ASMI).

37 *Submission 1*, p.6 (ASMI).

38 *Committee Hansard* 13.10.05, p.3 (ASMI).

will occur or that the breach will be appropriately remedied'.<sup>39</sup> This may occur where, for example, a deficiency in a manufacturing process needs to be rectified by a manufacturer whose general manufacturing ability is not in question.<sup>40</sup>

1.37 The Department concluded:

...one of the principal aspects of the new arrangement is to enable the regulator to better calibrate the response, depending on the nature and severity of the breach. That is why there are new aspects, including enforceable undertakings, infringement notices and a range of other things. I do not want the senators to be of the view that the sole goal of the bill is deterrence. It is also about being able to calibrate the response more appropriately.<sup>41</sup>

### **Recommendation**

**The Committee reports to the Senate that it has considered the Therapeutic Goods Amendment Bill 2005 and recommends that the Bill be passed without amendment.**

Senator Gary Humphries  
Chairman

November 2005

---

39 *Submission 5*, p.36 (DoHA).

40 *Submission 5*, p.9 (DoHA).

41 *Committee Hansard 13.10.05*, p.17 (DoHA).



## SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

### Australian Labor Party

#### Therapeutic Goods Amendment Bill 2005

- Whilst the Labor Party supports the Bill in principle, we are concerned about some aspects of the Bill, particularly the lack of appeal rights and review.
- On the balance of the report, we agree with the recommendation that the Bill should be passed, but we also urge the Government to seriously consider the recommendations in the report. In particular, we would like to encourage the Government to publish more clear and detailed guidelines regarding the practical application of the Bill. We would like to see the Government publish a Regulatory Impact Statement to ensure the objectives of the Bill are observed by varying sectors across the health care industry, as well as giving the industry adequate knowledge to assist in their understanding of the implications of the Bill.
- Labor accepts the need of more stringent laws, but also believes that there needs to be a transparent and fair sanctions regime to ensure consumers have the adequate knowledge, and access to safe, efficacious, quality medications, and the interests of and impacts on the healthcare industries are also duly considered.
- We support the Bill in the interests of consumer protection; public health and safety. To ensure proper regulation, access and quality of therapeutic goods. However, the Bill should include more detailed legislative provisions to make it more clear as to how the tiered penalty regime is meant to operate.

The advantage of the new provisions is the high deterrence factor in relation to breaches under the Act, and important in attempting to avoid another Pan-like scandal. It is necessary to have a level playing field, and also crucial to protect the consumer.

Simultaneously, however, we are concerned about the unprecedented, and absolute discretionary power given to the TGA. Deciding whether a breach has been made, the severity of the breach, what penalty should be imposed and what action to take against a company/manufacturer or individual should be an objective test.

We agree with the Australian Self-Medication Industry (ASMI) in that “*elements of the Bill may be open to administrative abuse.*”

Labor has a number of concerns which are set out as follows:

#### **1. Uncertainty of operational and procedural mechanisms**

The TGA needs to publish adequate and detailed industry guidelines on when, how and why the different enforcement options will be exercised.

The Bill is unclear in relation to when the TGA will impose the range of alternative sanctions and penalties. There needs to be greater clarity in the practical application/operational mechanisms, and the procedures and processes involved in implementing the proposed provisions.

The TGA needs to publish clear and detailed guidelines as to when and how it proposes to invoke the civil or criminal penalty schemes, or other alternative sanctions such as enforceable undertakings or infringement notices.

The Bill is ambiguous in its practical application, and also fails to provide any justification for the TGA choosing one penalty option over another.

For example – if three or four companies commit the same breach under the Act, they may be handed different penalties.

Also, the submissions and the transcript of the inquiry mention the possibility of ‘double jeopardy’. The Bill is unclear whether in some instances there is the risk of being liable under both the civil and criminal penalty regime. The Bill seems to imply that a person might be subject to double jeopardy- that is, subject to both criminal and civil penalty proceedings over the same conduct.

## **2. Publicly naming offenders**

The Bill allows the TGA to reveal the identity of drug companies and employees that flout its rules. Labor is concerned about the risk of publicly naming and damaging a person/company’s reputation before their guilt has been proven.

Labor feels that drug companies shouldn’t be publicly outed for misdemeanours particularly if the charge has not been tried or tested in court and the penalty has not been scrutinised by a court.

Our legal system is based on the notion of ‘innocent until proven guilty’. If a company or individual is named by the TGA, firstly the charge must be proven, and guilt must be attributed on the basis of sufficient evidence.

Further, the TGA has the power to invoke infringement notices. The danger in this is that innocent people may pay the amount specified in the notice simply to avoid expense of contesting proceedings.

There is total lack of court scrutiny, and further, the payment of infringement notices reflects presumption of guilt.

## **3. Lack of transparency and accountability**

The Labor Party is concerned about the heightened degree of power granted to the TGA in this Bill, in so far as the TGA is able to enforce any of the alternative sanctions at its discretion.

Whilst Labor agrees that post-Pan, the regulatory regime needs to be tightened, with the need for stricter controls/enforcement mechanisms, we believe it should be done so in a proper, fair, clear and transparent manner.

Labor agrees with the ASMI's comments in its submission that "the tiered fine system would give enormous, unaccountable discretion to the TGA. We know of no precedent for it or anything like it."

We are concerned about what is going to happen step by step through the process in relation to how the TGA comes to a particular decision in imposing a particular penalty, and the justifications in doing so. Where is the accountability and transparency in the TGA's decision of what constitutes civil or criminal action, and how a matter may or may not go to court, and then what happens once the decision has been made to take it to court. What protection is there in the implications of decision made by the TGA?

#### **4. Lack of right of appeal or review.**

Labor believes that the need for appeal is not only mandatory, it is a right; and is crucial for this Bill to work fairly and effectively.

According to the transcript of the inquiry, even the Department believes there should be an appeals process.

There should be appeal rights at each part of the process. We feel very strongly about having a particular penalty imposed (at the discretion of the TGA) and not having a formal appeal process within that.

#### **5. Effect of Joint Trans Tasman Agency**

The Government is seeking to establish a Trans Tasman agency which would provide for a joint regulatory regime with New Zealand.

When enacted, it is important to note that the amended Act may only have effect for a short time because of the impending establishment of the Trans-Tasman agency on or about 1 July 2006. Labor is concerned about the implications of the Trans-Tasman agency in terms of how the legislation will fit into the new regime, and what effect it will have on this Bill if it is passed.

The major concern we have is, following the finalisation of negotiations between both governments, whether the enforcement regime created by this Bill will transfer into the new regulatory environment governing the Trans-Tasman arrangement. Alternatively, it could also be presumed that provisions of the Bill will only last until the proposed Trans-Tasman Agency is established under new and different legislation, with new and different legislation pertaining to the penalty regime.

## **Conclusion**

The Labor Party believes that because the Bill confers greater, discretionary powers on the TGA in terms of who they think has breached the Act, and what penalties should then be imposed, that this carries a greater burden and responsibility on the TGA to demonstrate transparency in their process, and accountability in their procedures.

The decision making route by the TGA to impose particular penalties must be clearly mapped out in the Act or Regulations.

We strongly recommend that the necessity of the right to review and appeal be provided for explicitly in the Bill.

The Labor Party agrees with the Chairman's Draft Report that the Bill should be passed in principle, but we highly recommend that the Government take into consideration the abovementioned points. This will not only ensure that the health and safety of consumers are protected, but will also ensure that industry and public confidence in the TGA is restored, and maintained.

SENATOR CLAIRE MOORE (ALP, QUEENSLAND)

SENATOR HELEN POLLEY (ALP, TASMANIA)

---

## **Australian Democrats Dissenting Report**

### **Therapeutic Goods Amendment Bill 2005**

The Australian Democrats share the many concerns raised by the majority of submissions made to the Committee in relation to this Bill.

In particular, we are concerned about:

- the degree of discretionary power afforded the TGA and lack of clarity regarding how this power will be applied;
- the unjustified and seemingly excessive level of the fines proposed in the civil penalties regime and the potential impact of these fines on the complementary medicines industry; and
- the failure to codify the right of appeal and review provisions and need for better and more transparent due process.

The Government's stated intention in introducing this Bill is to better secure compliance with Australia's high standards for therapeutic goods – presumably to ensure high standards of safety and quality in medicines. However the Government has failed to make a case for how the proposed regulatory provisions would improve public health and safety over and above current existing penalties and sanctions. Australia's current regulatory system is one of the strictest in the world and more than adequate for public safety.

Moreover given the TGA's handling of the Pan Pharmaceuticals debacle, questions must be raised about the ability of the TGA to appropriately administer the existing system in relation to complementary medicines, let alone oversee a more flexible and discretionary system. While it could be argued that the Pan incident demonstrated a system that in fact worked to protect consumers from an unsafe product, allegations have subsequently been made that the TGA's actions were mishandled in a manner that had a significant impact on other companies within the complementary medicines sector – that there was no evidence to suggest that such a huge number and quantity of products needed to be recalled and destroyed.

In response to the TGA's actions in reaction to the problems with Pan, it has been suggested by some sectors of the complementary medicines industry that the TGA staff are, if not actually hostile to natural health products, inadequately informed on their intrinsically low risk nature in comparison to pharmaceutical drugs. This lack of expertise and experience may have contributed to the TGA exercising its authority in an overly partisan manner in relation to the Pan Pharmaceuticals recall in 2003. In light of the Pan crisis it may be appropriate for the TGA to review the nature and frequency of its audits but there seems to be little justification for the introduction of what have been described as 'draconian' measures, particularly given the lack of a regulatory impact statement that would better inform the government and the industry of the impact of these new measures.

Concerns about the TGA's ability to regulate non-prescription medicinal products were raised in the Australian National Audit Office's audit report released in December 2004. This report was critical of the level of consistency, transparency and accountability in TGA systems and procedures. There is no evidence that these processes have been improved. The Australian Democrats believe that as much of the detail of this legislation is expressed in guidelines and will be implemented through regulations that have not yet been drafted, in combination with a seeming lack of procedural redress for any misapplication of the provisions, it would be inappropriate to support this legislation in its current form.

SENATOR LYN ALLISON (AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS, VICTORIA)

## APPENDIX 1

### Submissions received by the Committee

- 1 Australian Self-Medication Industry (ASMI) (ACT)
- 2 Browning, Mr Mike (VIC)
- 3 Name withheld
- 4 Medical Industry Association of Australia (NSW)
- 5 Department of Health and Ageing (ACT)  
*Supplementary information*  
Additional information following public hearing 13.10.05 dated 20.10.05, 24.10.05
- 6 Johanson and Associates Consulting (ACT)  
*Supplementary information*  
Supplementary submission following public hearing 13.10.05 dated 4.11.05
- 7 Piesse, Dr John (VIC)
- 8 Webb, Mr Peter (VIC)
- 9 Westrenius, Mr Axel (NSW)
- 10 Blackmores Ltd (NSW)

#### ***Proforma letter***

The Committee received a proforma letter from 473 individuals relating to Bill. The text of the correspondence read as follows:

*I wish to register my opposition to the terms of the Therapeutic Goods Administration Amendment Bill 2005\*.*

*The TGA already has draconian powers and the proposed new penalty levels and infringement notice powers will serve only to destroy more Australian businesses through increased bureaucracy, without achieving any increased levels of consumer safety.*

*When the Pan Pharmaceuticals saga occurred the TGA already had some of the most stringent powers of any similar regulator world wide and yet it was unable to detect the faults they say existed in those products. Higher powers will do no more than make the TGA, that the Australian Audit Office described as lacking transparency and accountability, even more arbitrary and heavy handed.*

*The penalty levels proposed fail to adequately reflect the distinction between the huge multi national drug companies and the natural health industry, the later are often small industries without the resources to dispute any unwarranted fine the TGA might try to impose. This all shows why natural health should not be regulated through the same body as pharmaceuticals.*

*Please – ensure that the Therapeutic Goods Administration Amendment Bill 2005 is defeated.*

\*Note: The correct title of the Bill is the Therapeutic Goods Amendment Bill 2005.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Public Hearing**

A public hearing was held on the Bill on 13 October 2005 in Senate Committee Room 2S1, Parliament House, Canberra.

#### **Committee Members in attendance**

Senator Humphries (Chairman)  
Senator Moore (Deputy Chair)  
Senator Adams  
Senator Allison  
Senator Barnett  
Senator Fielding  
Senator McLucas  
Senator Polley

#### **Witnesses**

##### **Australian Self-Medication Industry**

Dr Deon Schoombi, Scientific Director  
Mr George Brownbill, Consultant

##### **Johanson and Associates Consulting**

Mrs Val Johanson  
Mr Daan Spijer, Chief Executive Officer, Australasian College of Nutritional and Environmental Medicine Inc

##### **Department of Health and Ageing**

Dr David Graham, National Manager, TGA  
Mr Richard Eccles, Assistant Secretary, TGA Transition Branch,  
Portfolio Strategies Division  
Ms Terry Lee, Assistant Secretary, Legal Services, TGA  
Mr Geoff Gray, Assistant Secretary, Criminal Law Branch, Attorney-General's  
Department