




Speech By
Shane Knuth

MEMBER FOR HILL

Record of Proceedings, 13 October 2022

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (11.51 am): I rise to speak to the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is complex and can be summed up as giving the government the ability to control the sphere, narrative and delivery of medical and healthcare advice to Queenslanders. This should ring alarm bells across the state. Regulation is important, but we must not be tempted too far down the path of regulatory overreach, which this bill allows.

On the weekend I read with interest an article in the *Australian* titled 'Health disgrace: bureaucrats in bid to silence our doctors'. The article provides a very straightforward and rational explanation of the dangers of the legislation and all Queenslanders should read it. I table that article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Australian*, dated 7 October 2022, titled 'Health disgrace: bureaucrats in bid to silence our doctors' [1649](#).

It is very clear that during the COVID period, through the lockdowns and mandates, the government became drunk on power. Instead of giving that up now, what do they do? They legislate to give themselves more power as they see themselves as emperors of the state rather than servants of the people. Through this bill, either the government is attempting to expand control over the health narrative or it simply has not thought through the implications on doctor-patient relationships and a doctor's ability to give the best medical advice based on a patient's situation and medical history. It would be very naive to believe this bill will not result in negative implications to doctor-patient relationships, which should be considered a private space. Off the back of the COVID-19 pandemic, which saw unprecedented health measures enforced on Queenslanders, some of which are still in place, we need to be very cautious of this overreach.

An incredible admission was made during a European Parliament inquiry. According to a news.com.au article, a Pfizer executive has admitted that the company did not know whether its COVID vaccine stopped transmission when it began rollout. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Article from news.com.au, dated 12 October 2022, titled 'Pfizer did not know whether Covid vaccine stopped transmission before rollout, executive admits' [1650](#).

Despite that, our government was advising everyone to get the vaccine to stop the spread of COVID—which this admission now questions. The advice was the basis for the government enforced vaccine mandate that led to unfair discrimination against and segregation of those who did not take the advice. They were ostracized from society and many lost their jobs and are unable to work today because the government continues to hold onto those mandates. This shows the danger in placing all medical advice in the hands of bureaucrats instead of a patient's own medical practitioner.

If this bill is passed, there will be absolutely no way a patient can have confidence that their doctor is providing the best advice based on their medical history or individual circumstances. Right now, a doctor's primary concern is focused on patient welfare. The bill changes that relationship so that their primary concern will be to not contradict the advice of government and the national regulator rather than

focusing on their patients' best interests. This will lead to a rapid collapse in the trust patients have in their GPs and could have disastrous effects on the already crumbling health system in this state. In fact, in its current form this bill could discourage young people from taking up medical professions, which would be disastrous for rural and regional communities already struggling to get GPs. This type of legislation flies in the face of all international protocols to ensure no government should ever sit above the doctor-patient relationship.

It is incumbent on all doctors, under all existing medical ethical standards around the world, to seek the informed consent of patients. 'Informed' means you must explain the different treatment options, you must explain the benefits and you must also explain the risks that go with them. 'Consent' means no coercion, compulsion or manipulation by the doctor. Under the proposed legislation it is not possible to get informed consent, which represents a violation of all international codes of behaviour and ethics.

The government will attempt to ridicule these concerns as conspiracy theories and try to discredit any opposition to the bill, but the fact remains that this reform has been met with stiff opposition from those in the medical profession and should be viewed in light of the admission made yesterday by the Pfizer executive. The concerns must be heard. They are legitimate concerns and cannot be cast aside by the government, which wishes to impose bureaucratic intervention in doctor-patient relationships and control what health advice is given or followed. For health bureaucrats and regulators to attempt to claim or enforce a monopoly on scientific truth is absolutely outrageous. In good conscience I cannot support this bill.