

The Parliamentary Group on Population and
Development (PGPD)



Submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration

*Inquiry into Item 16525 in Part 3 of Schedule 1 to
the Health Insurance (General Medical Services
Table) Regulations 2007*

October 2008

Contact

Jane Singleton
PGPD Secretariat Chair
PO Box 41 Deakin West ACT 2612
Ph. 02 6249 6566 Fax. 02 6249 6577
secretariat@pgpd.asn.au
www.pgpd.asn.au

About the Parliamentary Group on Population and Development

The Parliamentary Group on Population and Development (PGPD) was formed in 1995 to support and promote the Programme of Action from the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), held in Cairo in 1994.

The PGPD is an all-party group made up of parliamentarians from Federal, State and Territory Parliaments who work collegially and across party lines to support the empowerment of women and girls through a commitment to gender equality and the advancement of women as set out in the ICPD Programme of Action. The PGPD currently has 103 members and is chaired by Senator Claire Moore.

The objectives of the PGPD are:

- To engage members of the Australian federal and state Parliaments in supporting and promoting women's human rights and empowerment in the Asia Pacific region, in particular their sexual and reproductive rights;
- To advocate that at least 5% of Australia's aid program expenditure be directed to population and development activities as set out in the ICPD;
- To advocate and promote evidence-based policies and legislation on sexual and reproductive health care policies, practices and services; and
- To increase support for access to systems and services which enable women and men to improve their reproductive health care options.

To pursue these objectives, the PGPD undertakes a range of activities, including:

- Using parliamentary processes to promote issues of population and development, including issuing questions on notice, taking part in debates, participation in budget estimates, and others;
- Engaging individually and collectively in public and private discussions and debates on Population and Development;
- Participating in national, international and UN conferences on Population, Development, Reproductive Health and allied issues; and
- Engaging in person-to-person advocacy with national and international parliamentarians.

Further information on the PGPD can be found at www.pgpd.asn.au.

Summary of Recommendations

The Parliamentary Group on Population and Development recommends that the move to disallow item 16525 in Part 3 of Schedule 1 to the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007 be denied on the grounds that:

- abolishing item 16525 violates the stated intentions of the Australian Medicare system;
- it would remove women's access to a legal medical procedure;
- it would place undue strain on the Australian public health system;
- it would have a negative impact on the emotional and mental health of women;
- it would have a negative impact on the communities of Australia; and
- it is a violation of the human rights of Australian women of reproductive age.

Terms of Reference

(a) The terms of item 16525 of Part 3 of Schedule 1 to the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007;

(b) The number of services receiving payments under this item and the cost of these payments;

(c) The basis upon which payments of benefits are made under this item; and

(d) The effects of disallowing this item.

(a) The terms of item 16525 of Part 3 of Schedule 1 to the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007

Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007

Select Legislative Instrument 2007 No. 355 as amended

made under the

Health Insurance Act 1973

This compilation was prepared on 1 July 2008
taking into account amendments up to SLI 2008 No. 112

Prepared by the Office of Legislative Drafting and Publishing,
Attorney-General's Department, Canberra

Part 3 Services and fees

Item	Service	Fee (\$)
16525	Management of second trimester labour, with or without induction, for intrauterine fetal death, gross fetal abnormality or life threatening maternal disease, not being a service to which item 35643 applies (Anaes.)	267.00

Item 16525 of the Health Insurance Regulations 2007 provides for the payment of a Medicare benefit to a medical professional who carries out a service considered to be "Management of second trimester labour, with or without induction, for intrauterine fetal death, gross fetal abnormality or life threatening maternal disease"¹, when this service is not a procedure to which item 35643 is applicable. "Second trimester" refers to weeks 14 to 26 of a pregnancy. The item also applies to women who are "spontaneously miscarrying or are in spontaneous premature labour associated with relevant clinical conditions."²

¹ *Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007*
[http://www.comlaw.gov.au/ComLaw/Legislation/LegislativeInstrument1.nsf/0/6ECDAD9C9EC4C548CA2573780025AC0D/\\$file/0712628A070907EV.pdf](http://www.comlaw.gov.au/ComLaw/Legislation/LegislativeInstrument1.nsf/0/6ECDAD9C9EC4C548CA2573780025AC0D/$file/0712628A070907EV.pdf), pp. 252

² Pesce, Dr. A. Chair, National Association of Specialist Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 31st August 2008

(b) The number of services receiving payment under item 16525

As stated by Senator the Hon. Kay Patterson in 2005,

“There is no single authoritative or complete data source on terminations of pregnancies in Australia. That means that it is not possible to give a precise number of terminations each year”.³

At this stage, there is no national data collection on abortion, no uniform method of data collection, collation or publication across the states and territories, and the available data sources are all recognised as having significant limitations⁴

Current data relating to the number of medical terminations carried out in Australia, including those under item 16525, is made up of information from a number of sources including the National Morbidity Casemix Data Set, the National Hospital Morbidity Dataset, and the Medicare Benefits Scheme.

Dr Andrew Pesce, Chair of the National Association of Specialist Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, estimates that utilization of item 16525 represents 1-2% of best estimates of all abortions in Australia⁵.

Please see Table One for a detailed state breakdown of the services under Medicare item 16525 from July 1994 to June 2008.

(c) The cost of service payments under item 16525

The current Medicare fee for item 16525 is \$267.00. Procedures performed under item 16525 on a private patient as part of a hospital stay attract a rebate of 75% of the scheduled fee (\$200.25). Services under item 16525 in an approved non-hospital setting receive a rebate of 85% of the scheduled fee (\$226.95).⁶

Please see Table Two for a detailed state breakdown of the Medicare contributions to services claimed under item 16525 from July 1994 to June 2008.

³ Patterson, K. (Minister for Family and Community Services), ‘Question on Notice: Abortion’, Senate, *Debates*, 4th October 2005, pp. 68

⁴ Pratt, A., Biggs, A. and Buckmaster, L. Research Brief no. 9. *How many abortions are there in Australia?* 14th February 2005

⁵ Pesce, Dr. A. Chair, National Association of Specialist Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 31st August 2008

⁶ Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, *Medicare Benefits Schedule Book*, Department of Health and Ageing, November 2007

Table One: Services under Medicare item 16525 from July 1994 to June 2008 by State

Source: *Medicare Item Reports-Medicare Benefits Schedule Item Statistics Reports*
https://www.medicareaustralia.gov.au/statistics/mbs_item.shtml

Financial Year	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT	Total Number of Services
1994/1995	233	304	193	62	192	14	20	14	1,032
1995/1996	237	227	161	49	118	15	7	12	826
1996/1997	230	171	113	52	62	16	7	4	655
1997/1998	212	162	117	55	63	10	9	11	639
1998/1999	188	157	118	54	48	22	6	4	597
1999/2000	210	196	108	57	46	18	5	5	645
2000/2001	209	229	124	59	45	11	7	8	692
2001/2002	208	191	116	59	42	8	7	5	636
2002/2003	246	170	133	53	31	9	8	10	660
2003/2004	203	179	140	60	27	12	11	5	637
2004/2005	222	304	122	57	29	18	8	7	767
2005/2006	221	272	112	54	54	26	11	5	755
2006/2007	220	286	123	67	59	20	14	13	802
2007/2008	242	286	113	57	49	27	15	5	794
Total	3,081	3,134	1,793	795	865	226	135	108	10,137

Table Two: Medicare contribution to services under item 16525 from July 1994 to June 2008 by State

Source: *Medicare Item Reports-Medicare Benefits Schedule Item Statistics Reports*
https://www.medicareaustralia.gov.au/statistics/mbs_item.shtml

Financial Year	NSW \$	VIC \$	QLD \$	SA \$	WA \$	TAS \$	ACT \$	NT \$	Total Benefits Paid \$
1994/1995	37,167	48,284	31,356	9,854	32,312	2,223	3,203	2,336	166,736
1995/1996	38,359	36,843	26,708	7,899	20,147	2,453	1,156	1,937	135,502
1996/1997	37,398	27,745	18,320	8,468	10,118	2,627	1,162	676	106,515
1997/1998	34,945	26,597	19,259	9,058	10,380	1,621	1,488	1,800	105,148
1998/1999	31,493	26,144	19,658	9,013	8,014	3,660	1,026	692	99,700
1999/2000	35,560	33,325	18,365	9,654	7,765	3,053	848	846	109,416
2000/2001	35,936	39,017	21,378	10,193	7,737	1,830	1,202	1,373	118,667
2001/2002	36,131	33,164	20,202	10,140	7,247	1,392	1,201	874	110,352
2002/2003	43,645	30,105	23,710	9,404	5,553	1,610	1,421	1,785	117,234
2003/2004	36,922	32,634	25,509	10,917	4,937	2,185	2,019	908	116,031
2004/2005	41,714	56,781	22,781	10,650	5,396	3,365	1,490	1,302	143,479
2005/2006	44,418	52,054	21,972	10,308	10,305	4,957	2,093	970	147,077
2006/2007	43,037	55,587	24,639	13,005	11,473	3,871	2,700	2,531	156,843
2007/2008	54,239	57,399	22,423	11,342	9,705	5,351	2,969	997	164,425
Total \$	550,963	555,680	316,282	139,907	151,090	40,199	23,977	19,027	1,797,126

(d) The basis upon which payments of benefits are made under item 16525

The payment of a benefit under item 16525 is made when a medical service, the “management of second trimester labour, with or without induction, for intrauterine fetal death, gross fetal abnormality or life threatening maternal disease”⁷, is provided to a private patient by a medical practitioner in a public or private hospital, or approved day surgery centre⁸.

(e) The effects of disallowing this item

Senator Guy Barnett has moved to remove Medicare item 16525 from the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations and therefore cease government funding of second trimester terminations. The failure to continue government financial support of this item will have a number of negative outcomes.

Medicare and item 16525

Medicare states that it is “Australia’s universal health care system”⁹, aiming to “give all Australians, regardless of their personal circumstances, access to health care.”¹⁰ The removal of item 16525 from the Health Insurance Regulations ignores the stated intentions of Medicare, denying universal access to affordable and safe termination of a pregnancy, and removing women’s right to choose a practitioner based on personal preference, rather than financial circumstance.

The removal of funding from a legal medical procedure

The procedures covered under item 16525 include not only the termination of a pregnancy, for whatever reason, but also procedures undertaken in the event of spontaneous miscarriage or premature labour. Removing funding from this item is removing funding from a series of legal and required medical procedures, denying women in this situation the access to funded healthcare afforded to other members of Australian society.

⁷ *Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007*
[http://www.comlaw.gov.au/ComLaw/Legislation/LegislativeInstrument1.nsf/0/6ECDAD9C9EC4C548CA2573780025AC0D/\\$file/0712628A070907EV.pdf](http://www.comlaw.gov.au/ComLaw/Legislation/LegislativeInstrument1.nsf/0/6ECDAD9C9EC4C548CA2573780025AC0D/$file/0712628A070907EV.pdf), pp. 252

⁸ Pesce, Dr. A. Chair, National Association of Specialist Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 31st August 2008

⁹ *Medicare* <http://www.medicareaustralia.gov.au/about/whatwedo/medicare.jsp> Accessed 24th September 2008

¹⁰ *The Australian Health System* <http://www.medicareaustralia.gov.au/about/whatwedo/health-system/index.jsp> Accessed 24th September 2008

Removal of item 16525 and the public health system

Anecdotal evidence suggests that there has been a decrease in the availability of termination services of public hospitals. Removing the financial support currently made available to private medical providers will place further pressure on the dwindling public services available. The removal of item 16525 will see an increased uptake of termination services in public hospitals and an increased wait time for the women wishing to access these services. This has the potential to *increase* the number of second trimester terminations, as women are forced to wait longer because of their economic inability to access private termination services.

The impact of removal of item 16525 on women and the greater community

The impact of the removal of item 16525 on the emotional health of women

Senator Guy Barnett proposes the abolition of item 16525 on the grounds that, among other impacts, terminations in the second trimester are likely to risk women's mental health and increase their risk of death.¹¹ The removal of this item has the potential to increase the number of foetuses with severe and/or life threatening abnormalities being carried to term which, according to the American Psychological Association's review of 20 years of evidence in relation to abortion and mental health, can result in greater negative psychological reactions in a woman than in women who experience miscarriage, still birth, death of a new born or termination of a wanted pregnancy due to fetal abnormality.¹² Removal of item 16525, rather than decreasing the risks to Australian women's mental health as suggested by Senator Barnett, looks set to *increase* the likelihood of mental health issues in women who are pregnant.

The community impact of increased numbers of children with severe disabilities

The removal of item 16525 from the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations increases the likelihood of a greater number of persons being born with severe disabilities and high support needs. **The Parliamentary Group on Population and Development does not suggest that individuals with severe disabilities cannot live a full, productive, and inclusive life in Australian society.** The cost and impact of an increased number of individuals with severe disabilities living in Australia cannot, however, be ignored, and additional resources and services will need to be made available for this.

¹¹ Senator Guy Barnett, *Briefing Paper on Medicare Funding of Second Trimester and Late Term Abortions*, June 2008

¹² Children By Choice Association Incorporated, *Protecting the Health Care of Pregnant Women in the Second Trimester*, pp. 2

Research identifies the great personal and financial stress placed on a family by caring for a child with a severe disability¹³. Families of children in need of high medical and physical support report that the care required is “stressful, demanding, labour-intensive, constant, costly, tiring and mostly unacknowledged”¹⁴.

The financial cost of caring for a severely disabled individual is high not only for the family, but for the greater community. Removing item 16525 would save the Commonwealth, by some estimates, \$181,560 per year based on 2007 utilisation of item 16525¹⁵. Adequately supporting an individual with high support needs costs the community and families far more than this. It is logical to assume that an increase in demand for disability services as a result of the abolishment of item 16525 will place greater demand on what is already an underfunded and overwhelmed sector.

Removing item 16525 from the Health Insurance Regulations would place emotional, physical, mental, and financial stress on families, denying women and couples the right to decide if they are equipped to raise a child with disabilities and result in further strain being placed on Australia’s disability support sector.

Human rights and the removal of item 16525

The removal of item 16525 has the potential to violate the human rights of women of reproductive age in Australia. Removing the item is tantamount to the government deciding who may give birth and who may not. Why are one category of pregnant women denied the government health and payment programs offered to other pregnant women? The removal of item 16525 is discrimination against a category of women based on their reproductive status.

Recommendations

The Parliamentary Group on Population and Development recommends that the move to disallow item 16525 in Part 3 of Schedule 1 to the Health Insurance (General Medical Services Table) Regulations 2007 be denied.

¹³ Bain, K.J. ‘Children with severe disabilities: options for residential care’, *The Medical Journal of Australia* (169), 1998, pp. 598-600

¹⁴ Bain, K.J. ‘Children with severe disabilities: options for residential care’, *The Medical Journal of Australia* (169), 1998, pp. 598-600

¹⁵ Pesce, Dr. A. Chair, National Association of Specialist Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 31st August 2008