



RENZ LAW, LLC.

Date: 05/20/2024

Testimony Outline: **Chairman Huffman, Vice Chair Johnson, and Members of the Senate Health Committee, thank you for hearing my support testimony for HB 73, The Dave & Angie Patient and Health Provider Protection Act”**

1. Introduction and overview for HB73
 - a. Protecting access to FDA approved drugs used off-label was the basis for the foundation of the bill, Protecting the medical free speech provision in this bill is paramount in protecting the health provider, their patient’s right to informed consent, and even the public who many never hear opposing views if health providers are afraid to express concerns for fear of retribution on their licenses.
 - b. Abortion
 - i. This law does not expand or extend access to abortion drugs. There is a moral or religious exemption for fulfilling a prescription. A doctor or pharmacist that wants nothing to do with abortion can claim a moral exemption.
 - ii. Abortion is now – due to Issue 1 – in our state Constitution. This is a disaster but this law can not expand that.
 - iii. In fact, with the clear language about moral objections, it re-affirms the moral and religious right to object to being forced to prescribe or fill these drugs.
 - c. Veterinary – in no way does this allow pet medicine to be prescribed for people. Federal law requires that veterinary drugs can only be prescribed by a licensed veterinarian and for use on an animal as described in 21 USC 353(f) .
 - d. Because this bill is obviously referring to human patients and since only a Vet can prescribe Veterinary drugs to animals, there is simply no reasonable argument that this law would allow for drugs approved for animals to be prescribed for people unless they were also FDA approved for human usage.
 - e. Drug Shortages – if there is a drug shortage a doctor or pharmacist can choose to prioritize the sickest patients getting the drugs by using a “moral objection” to fill for less severe patients.
2. COVID
 - a. History – CFR and Reproduction Rate and our overreaction
 - b. Hospital protocols – my experiences
 - c. Errors – social distancing, masks, ivermectin
 - i. Officials now recognize that social distancing was never based on science
 - ii. Officials now recognize that masks never worked



RENZ LAW, LLC.

- iii. Officials now recognize that ivermectin is useful in treating COVID
3. WHO Treaty
- a. What it does
 - i. The final language is still being finalized
 - ii. Generally this action by the WHO will likely expand WHO authority into US policy – possibly extending into the states
 - b. Why it matters
 - i. The WHO is not a friend to Ohio and they supported many of the bad policies that failed during COVID.
 - ii. They are pushing for many things that are against the rights of Ohioans in case of a pandemic such as further lockdowns, mandatory vaccinations, possibly forced isolation and testing, and control over treatments
 - c. HB73 states clearly that the WHO will have no jurisdiction in the state of Ohio which will limit their ability to enforce anything in Ohio that is a protected power under the 10th Amendment. This will keep Ohioans safe from foreign interference in our rights.
4. Conclusion- HB 73 crosses party lines, saves lives, protects medical free speech, and ensures Ohio remains sovereign in the face of global interference.
I urge the Senate to **stand with the people of Ohio** vote **YES on HB 73**.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Renz

Attorney/Advocate/Analyst