

Pharmacy Business Ownership Bill 2023

Submission No: 3
Submitted by: Amanda Seeto
Publication: Making the submission and your name public
Attachments: See attachment
Submitter Comments:

Committee Secretary
Economics and Governance Committee
Parliament House
George Street
Brisbane Qld 4000

12 January 2024

Via: EGC@parliament.qld.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Committee inquiry into the Pharmacy Business Ownership Bill 2023

I am a community pharmacist and partner at Good Price Pharmacy Warehouse Ashmore. Please see below for my feedback on the Bill.

The definition of core pharmacy services (Clause 8(3))

The current version of the Bill does not adequately define what a pharmacy service is as it is too narrow by limiting to dispensing and compounding of medicines only. This is not an accurate reflection of the services that a pharmacist provides and means that, for example, where the dispensing of a medicine is considered a pharmacy service, the provision of advice about that medicine, is not. The narrow definition then limits how the Bill is able to deal with the concept of external control of how pharmacy services are delivered to the public (clause 22). If control of pharmacy services is linked to the definition of *core pharmacy services*, then there is a risk that a number of relevant pharmacy services will be left outside the regulatory control of the Bill.

May I propose that the definition of *pharmacy services* is broadened to include dispensing, supply, prescribing, selling, administering, repackaging, compounding, possessing, disposing of medicines and the provision of clinical service or advice (either at or from a licensed premises or through digital platforms) provided in the course of practice by a pharmacist or a person who holds themselves out, or is held out by another, as a pharmacist.

Where the intent of the Bill is to describe who may own a pharmacy business, a robust definition of what constitutes a pharmacy business (through definition of the services that business provides) must be offered as part of the Bill.

The definition of a supermarket (Clause 11(3))

The definition of a supermarket is not broad enough to capture the likely increase in online supermarket businesses in the future. By inclusion of the word 'premises' in the definition, it ties the concept of a supermarket to a bricks and mortar place, and it is not able to capture the growing online marketplace. To ensure that the policy objective of the Bill to 'prohibit the council from issuing a licence if the pharmacy business is located in a supermarket' is met, the Bill must have application to pharmacy businesses and supermarkets whether they are online or physical locations.

I propose that the below definition of a supermarket be adopted:

supermarket means a premises or online store used primarily for selling a range of food, beverages, groceries and other domestic goods.

What is a material interest in a pharmacy business (Clause 13)

The exclusion of the terms 'legal' and 'beneficial' from the definition of a material interest is inconsistent with other jurisdictions and is therefore inadequate in capturing the interest that may be held in a pharmacy business. As a result, a failure to appropriately define a material interest means that interests that are not expressed in the current definition may not be able to be deemed unlawful interests.

I propose that an amendment to the definition of 'material interest' to include the words 'legal' and 'beneficial' as follows:

Clause 13(1)(c) should say:

(c) any other interest, *legal* or *beneficial* in the business, other than an interest of an owner of the business.

(2) to remove any doubt, an interest includes, but is not limited to, having a right to receive consideration directly or indirectly that varies according to the profits or takings of the pharmacy business.

The existing clause 13(2) would be renumbered 13(3).

Matters relating to the Queensland Pharmacy Business Ownership Council (the council) (Clauses 147, 150, 153, 207)

One of the main purposes of the Bill is to maintain public confidence in the pharmacy profession. To ensure this can be achieved, it is not acceptable that there is no mandatory requirement that the register of licensed pharmacy businesses is listed on the council's website to ensure there is transparency for the public so that they know who the owner of the pharmacy is. May I suggest that Clause 207 (5) be amended as follows:

The council must publish the information contained in the register on the council's website.

The composition of the council membership as it is currently stated is unacceptable. The council is an industry body that has the potential to be weighted inappropriately, where industry experts may be significantly outnumbered. There must be a majority of pharmacy business owner members to ensure that the council is able to function as intended. I propose that Clause 150 (4) be amended to:

The council must consist of –

(a) a majority of persons mentioned in subsections (3)(a)(i) and (3)(a)(ii) with the actual number dependent on the size of the council

There is currently no limit to the number of terms that a member of the council is permitted to serve. To ensure a contemporary and representative council, there should be a limit to the number of consecutive terms, and terms in total, that a member is permitted to serve and as such Clause 153 (2) should be amended to read:

A council member may be reappointed a maximum of two terms

Thank you for your consideration of my feedback.

Yours faithfully,



Amanda Seeto BPharm
Managing Partner, Good Price Pharmacy Warehouse Ashmore

E: [REDACTED]

M: [REDACTED]