
From: Dr Charles Hackman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 4 June 2021 10:29 PM
To: Exemptions
Subject: AA1000542 – Honeysuckle Health – submission

Dear Sirs,

I am a retired anaesthetist currently practicing only in the area of occupational health, so I do not have a financial interest in the outcome of your determination. However I do have family whose health has been compromised by the effects of managed care overseas, and I do see the beginnings of a similar push here, which will be further advanced by the success of the present proposal.

While inducing medical practitioners to enter into contractual arrangements with insurers may not appear to be against the public interest in itself, there is a real possibility that, as other insurers adopt similar policies and incentives, there will soon come a time when insurers will be able to limit patients' choices to practitioners with whom they have contracted, and then further to reduce the 'cost of medical care' by applying pressure on practitioners to limit services, failing which there will be financial penalties. While there may be good, evidence-based reasons to limit some services (e.g. knee arthroscopy for many cartilage injuries), this tends rapidly to limit other forms of care.

I do realize that this is a 'slippery slope' argument, which in many other contexts would seem spurious, but this one is a well-greased path overseas, and - curiously - the downward pressure on premiums never seems to materialize, the benefit passing to others in ways that are often difficult to track.

Yours faithfully,

Charles Hackman