Nurses and abortion

Vincent Argent and Lin Pavey have concluded, in an analysis of the House of Lords case Royal College of Nursing v DHSS [1981] 1 AC 800 (the RCN case), that any change in the law, nurses can legally perform surgical induced abortion. Their article contains some dangerous legal misconceptions.

The RCN case concerned the participation of nurses in post-abortion-induction abortions. The House of Lords decided by a majority of 3:2 that in certain circumstances nurses could participate. The RCN case decided that for the procedure the court was considering:

1. Medical abortion is a process.
2. The process may be effectuated by a team.
3. The court, in the context of the Abortion Act 1967 permits delegation to nurses of some acts which form part of the process. This includes acts that have a direct abortifacient effect.
4. The process must be initiated by a registered medical practitioner, and must be under his control throughout, in the sense that anything done other than by him must be done pursuant to his instructions.
5. What amounts to acceptable delegation may be determined by “accepted medical practice.”

One of the judges in the majority, Lord Keith, expressly regarded the decision as one on its own facts. He said: “...it remains to consider whether, on the facts of this case the termination can properly be regarded as being “by a registered medical practitioner” [emphasis my own]. This means that when considering an abortion procedure, unless one is dealing with procedures that the RCN case considered, it cannot be asserted that a majority of the House of Lords says that the procedure falls within Section 1(1), of the Abortion Act 1967. But the RCN case is an important statement of the meaning of Section 1(1), it leaves some important questions unanswered.

It is plain that “accepted medical practice” itself cannot be the correct test, unless it is to be read as “medical practice accepted by the courts.” The main difficulty with making “accepted medical practice” the touchscreen of appropriate delegation is that the Act itself puts obvious limits on the use of that idea. Suppose that it became the majority opinion amongst gynaecologists that abortion should be performed by medical practitioners. In other words, that “accepted medical practice” means what is acceptable, not vice versa. Any test that requires the law to defer entirely to medical practice in determining the correct construction of the Act would be a wrong test. Although other areas of the law (notably clinical negligence), the law has great respect for the views of responsible medical practitioners, and is importantly (and often decisively) informed by those views, it has long been one of the pillars of medical law that the courts, not the profession, set the standard. If that is true of standard setting in the common law, still more should it be true of statutory construction.

So what must have been meant was “legally acceptable” medical practice. On the facts considered in the RCN case, it was found that the medical induction procedure was acceptable and accordingly fell within the boundaries of Section 1(1).

If it is legitimate to use accepted (or acceptable) medical practice as the arbiter of legality, it is strongly arguable that the relevant medical practice for the purposes of determining合法性 is the known about or envisaged by Parliament at the time of the enactment.

As Lord Denning pointed out in the Court of Appeal, had Parliament intended to make the standard move with shifting medical practice, there were plenty of expressions available which would have had that effect. Surgical termination using modern methods was not amongst the procedures envisaged, and it was certainly not foreseen by Parliament that the Act might be interpreted to suggest that nurses might be significant operators in such procedures.

The dissenting views cannot merely be discounted. Powerfully, the need for great caution in the construction of the statute, and in particular the need for judges to be careful not to usurp the function of Parliament and engage in legal misconceptions.

The RCN case draws no distinction in principle between medical and surgical abortion. But that distinction means that all acts which are done or is envisaged might be done by nurses in the performance of surgical abortions fall within the boundaries of appropriate delegation.

That is the basic error into which Argent and Pavey fall.

So: does the RCN case say that it is lawful for nurses to perform surgical abortion? No, it does not. It does not, effectively, on the involvement of nurses in procedures other than that specifically considered in the RCN case is wholly unclear. It would be very unsafe for anyone to undertake the procedure without the advice of the surgeon and Argent and Pavey article. If it is seriously proposed that nurses should perform surgical abortions then the matter should be considered again by Parliament. Arguing on the facts of this case, the court lower than the House of Lords is unlikely to give an answer sufficiently definitive to lay to rest the doubts of those affected by the issue.

Charles Foster, MA(Cantab), MRCVS
Barrister, Outer Temple Chambers, London, UK.
E-mail: charles.foster@outerTemple.com
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Reply

Charles Foster’s critique is useful and agrees that abortion laws and their implementation are crucial. The Abortion Act 1967 does not reflect the realities of current clinical practice and the increasing role of nurses in the provision of abortion care.

The statute could be changed but a test case in the House of Lords or even a ruling from the Department of Health would suffice. Pro-choice and anti-abortion groups hold opposing views on how the law should be changed but it is important that a new approach reflects modern clinical need.

Foster states that the RCN case draws no distinction between surgical and medical abortion and this is, in fact, the hub of our argument. In other jurisdictions, nurses and other providers are already providing a safe surgical service but making the increasing importance in the UK where the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists has recognised doctors’ relative disinterest in providing this essential service to women.

Foster considers that accepted medical practice should be judged by the courts but we know that sensible judges do take a pragmatic view based on modern medical practice.

The Abortion Act was designed to remove the mischief of unsafe abortion and it is now clear that a safe service can be run by nurses who are part of a team under the overall supervision of a medical practitioner.

Vincent Argent, FRCOG, LLB
Consultant Obstetrician and Gynaecologist (Lead in Sexual Health), Addenbrooke’s Cambridge University Teaching Hospital, Cambridge, UK. E-mail: Vargent1@aol.com

Lin Pavey, RGN
Member of RCN Nurses Working in Termination of Pregnancy Network

Unsafe abortion in Nigeria

Each minute of every day, nearly 40 women undergo dangerous procedures in an attempt to reduce the morbidity and mortality from unsafe abortions. In developing countries, unsafe abortions are often performed by unskilled providers or under unhygienic condition or both. Estimates based on figures for 2000 indicate that 19.4 million unsafe abortions occurred in that year and an estimated 68,000 women die as consequences of unsafe abortion, and almost all occur in developing countries.

In Nigeria, as is also the case in most developing countries, unsafe abortion has assumed a serious public health problem, and induced unsafe abortion has been established as an important contributor to maternal morbidity and mortality. In Nigeria, induced abortion is a criminal offence both for the seeker and the provider. The penalty is 14 and 7 years jail sentences, respectively against the provider and client. These penalties notwithstanding, induced unsafe abortions are still performed on a daily basis both by skilled and unskilled personnel. There are approximately 610,000 abortions performed in Nigeria annually with an abortion rate of 25.4 per 1000; of these, 60% are thought to be unsafe.

In Nigeria, unsafe abortion contributes up to 20% of maternal mortality, and those women that survive are faced with complications such as sepsis, vesicovaginal fistula, anaemia, ruptured uterus (sometimes ending in hysterectomy), amongst others.

Factors associated with this high morbidity and mortality from unsafe abortion in Nigeria include restrictive abortion law, activity of quacks and untrained providers, poor health-seeking behaviour of women, poor and inadequate post-abortion care facilities in health institutions, inadequate access to family planning counselling, information and services and poor socioeconomic status of Nigerian women.

This suffering and these deaths are preventable and the solution is available, practical and cost-effective, but they are too often neglected because of political and social constraints. The abortion law in force in Nigeria today is still that of the British colonial government of 1861. No reasonable amendment or modification has been made to keep pace with time. The existing abortion law presents a threat to institutionalisation of safe abortion practices and drives abortion underground, thereby encouraging the use of quacks and unqualified providers, who cause distress and suffering to the women concerned. It also restricts counselling and training of health professionals on abortion-related issues.

Counselling and abortion is an unfortunately neglected vital tool of the reproductive health care package for Nigerian women, should be seriously revisited, revitalised and promoted in Nigeria as a very important intervention strategy to deal with complications arising from unsafe abortions. Women who have unintended pregnancies should have ready access to reliable information and contraceptive counselling. In all cases, women should have access to quality services for the management of complications of abortion. Where the law permits, there should be provision of quality standards for abortion providers.

The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, Egypt, at which Nigeria was a participant, agreed that in developing countries, unsafe abortions are often performed by unskilled providers or under unhygienic condition or both. Estimates based on figures for 2000 indicate that 19.4 million unsafe abortions occurred in that year and an estimated 68,000 women die as consequences of unsafe abortion, and almost all occur in developing countries.

In Nigeria, as is also the case in most developing countries, unsafe abortion has assumed a serious public health problem, and induced unsafe abortion has been established as an important contributor to maternal morbidity and mortality. In Nigeria, induced abortion is a criminal offence both for the seeker and the provider. The penalty is 14 and 7 years jail sentences, respectively against the provider and client. These penalties notwithstanding, induced unsafe abortions are still performed on a daily basis both by skilled and unskilled personnel. There are approximately 610,000 abortions performed in Nigeria annually with an abortion rate of 25.4 per 1000; of these, 60% are thought to be unsafe.

In Nigeria, unsafe abortion contributes up to 20% of maternal mortality, and those women that survive are faced with complications such as sepsis, vesicovaginal fistula, anaemia, ruptured uterus (sometimes ending in hysterectomy), amongst others.

Factors associated with this high morbidity and mortality from unsafe abortion in Nigeria include restrictive abortion law, activity of quacks and untrained providers, poor health-seeking behaviour of women, poor and inadequate post-abortion care facilities in health institutions, inadequate access to family planning counselling, information and services and poor socioeconomic status of Nigerian women.

This suffering and these deaths are preventable and the solution is available, practical and cost-effective, but they are too often neglected because of political and social constraints. The abortion law in force in Nigeria today is still that of the British colonial government of 1861. No reasonable amendment or modification has been made to keep pace with time. The existing abortion law presents a threat to institutionalisation of safe abortion practices and drives abortion underground, thereby encouraging the use of quacks and unqualified providers, who cause distress and suffering to the women concerned. It also restricts counselling and training of health professionals on abortion-related issues.

Counselling and abortion is an unfortunately neglected vital tool of the reproductive health care package for Nigerian women, should be seriously revisited, revitalised and promoted in Nigeria as a very important intervention strategy to deal with complications arising from unsafe abortions. Women who have unintended pregnancies should have ready access to reliable information and contraceptive counselling. In all cases, women should have access to quality services for the management of complications of abortion. Where the law permits, there should be provision of quality standards for abortion providers.
unsafe abortion, improved and expanded family planning services must be given the highest priority. Twelve years after the Cairo conference, the contraceptive prevalence in Nigeria is 73%. This is worse for adolescents and unmarried women who are frequently excluded from contraceptive services. In many developing countries, lack of information on sexuality and contraception, the adolescent population has often translated into a high prevalence of unwanted pregnancy. Thus, there is great need for the establishment of accessible and affordable youth-friendly centres, different from a hospital setting, where these vulnerable groups can go for care. Such centres should be equipped to offer services on family planning counselling and information, education on reproductive physiology and overall safer sex, and should be able to provide post-abortion care services. Also, regulations, policies and/or laws that restrict adolescents’ access to such services should be revised.

In conclusion, the contribution of unsafe abortion to maternal mortality will be drastically reduced if not completely eliminated if specific and goal-directed actions are taken. Such actions include promoting women’s rights, status and health; ensuring access to contraception; providing guidance on family planning services, including putting referral systems in place to decriminalising abortion and changing laws where they are restrictive. All relevant agencies are called upon to initiate authentic programmes that will curb this carnage from unsafe abortion as part of the overall strategy for achieving the millennium development goal, not only in Nigeria but also in most developing countries of the world.

Perpetus Chudi Ikebe, MBBS, FWCAC
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faw Hall University Teaching Hospital, Abakaliki, Nigeria. E-mail: drogoperrp@yahoo.com
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Cerazette and HRT
A general practitioner (GP) wrote into our recent column to ask if Cerazette® could be used as the progesterone part of hormone replacement therapy (HRT). I would be interested in the views of other Faculty members about this. The progesterone-only pill (POP) has been used traditionally as part of HRT regimens, although is not licensed for this indication. It has always been postulated that from the perspective of contraception, as the additional oestrogen in the HRT, might ‘undo’ the mucus thickening effect of the POP, that when used as part of HRT the effect of POP should be doubled (or trebled). As the newer POP, Cerazette works by inhibiting ovulation in almost all cases, this should not be the case with Cerazette as part of an HRT regimen.

In addition, I believe there have been studies of desogestrel as part of the HRT regimen, but these were halted as a result of the 1995 pill scare and the venous thromboembolism risk. Two third-generation progestogens. A 1996 study by Saure et al. was a randomised double-blind multicentre study of 310 women, comparing the effects of two sequential HRT preparations, containing either norethisterone or estradiol and desogestrel. Both regimens successfully alleviated menopausal symptoms, and there was no significant difference in bleeding patterns with the two combinations. There was no endometrial hyperplasia or atypia identified during the study.

My own view is that using Cerazette as the progestogen part of an HRT regimen should be acceptable practice. However, women of perimenopausal age do have much reduced fertility, and some would say that Cerazette, whilst it offers an additional choice of POP, could be regarded as ‘contraceptive overkill’. I cannot, however, get away from the fact that the 12-hour rule for daily administration with Cerazette makes it considerably easier to take.

The question remains as to whether Implanon® could be used as part of an HRT regimen. I feel it is unlikely this would be the case, but would be interested in readers’ views on this subject.

Deborah J Lee, MBBS, MRCPG
Associate Specialist in Reproductive Health, Lead for Maternal and Child Training, Lead for Unplanned Pregnancy, Southampton Contraception & Sexual Health Service, The Quay to Health, Southampton. E-mail: debbie.lee@scpt.nhs.uk

Cytology sampling using brushes
I read with interest the letter from Dr D N Lee in the April 2007 issue of the Journal. I would like to question the technique of collecting a cervical cytology sample using the new liquid-based cytology (LBC) Cervex-Brush® described by the author. The National Health Service Cervical Screening Programme (NHSCSP) guidelines on efficiency of LBC sampling and efficiency symptoms. Maturitas 1996; 24(1–2); 111–118.
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