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Mr. Chairman, the Federal Trade Commission thanks you and the members of the Committee for inviting us again this year to present the Commission’s views on a proposed antitrust exemption to allow physicians and other health care professionals to engage in collective bargaining with health plans. The basic effect of this year’s bill is the same as last year’s proposal: to grant independent health care practitioners the right to agree on the fees and other terms that they will accept from insurers, employers, and other third party payers, and to boycott payers who refuse to accept their demands. This year’s version, however, makes clear that the immunity would apply not just to doctors, but also to pharmacists and others who supply health care products or services. The Commission continues to believe that such an exemption would be bad medicine for consumers. The issues that have been raised regarding patient protection are vitally important, but this proposal is not the way to address them.

H.R. 1304 would create a broad antitrust exemption that would, for example, allow all of the physicians in a particular medical specialty in an area to demand a 20% increase in fees and to refuse to contract with any insurer who refused to pay those rates. The example mentioned above is not a mere hypothetical. The Commission’s staff currently has an investigation into just such conduct. Nor is this an isolated case. The Commission has brought numerous actions challenging similar activities.²

The bill, while appealing in its apparent simplicity, threatens to
cause serious harm to consumers, to employers, and to federal, state, and local governments:

* Doctors and other health care professionals could join together to demand substantially higher fees.
* Pharmacists could insist on higher payments for filling prescriptions. The bill apparently would permit even large chain pharmacies, such as CVS and Rite Aid, to get together and demand higher prices.
* Consumers and employers, including government employers, would face higher insurance premiums.
* Consumers would pay more out-of-pocket and could see their benefits reduced.
* Medicaid programs that provide services through managed care plans could be forced to increase their budgets or reduce services.
* The number of uninsured Americans, and the costs borne by state and local governments in providing for their care, could increase significantly.

Supporters of the bill argue that giving this kind of unrestrained power to private competitors is needed because of concerns about the changes taking place in our nation's health care system. That significant changes are occurring is beyond dispute. Efforts by private employers and government health care programs to address rapidly increasing health care costs have transformed health service markets. Many doctors are concerned about their ability to care for their patients in the way they believe is best. Many patients are dissatisfied with the services they have received from their health plans; others are worried about the availability and quality of services should they become seriously ill. Press reports of apparent abusive practices by some health plans abound. But even though there are serious problems concerning the relationship of HMOs and other health plans to doctors and patients that deserve to be addressed, this proposal is the wrong approach.

What do we mean by this? An across-the-board antitrust exemption would allow all doctors in a community or all members of a particular specialty - for example, specialists already compensated at $150,000 to $200,000 a year, not to mention pharmacists who work for large corporate pharmacies — to band together and insist that they be paid an additional 10 or 20%. Although H.R. 1304 is presented as an extension of the antitrust immunity granted to labor organizations, the circumstances here are surely very different from the context in which the labor exemption was originally adopted by Congress.

The Commission's opposition to the proposed exemption is not
based on any policy preference for HMOs over fee-for-service medicine, or on an assumption that the market, if left alone, will cure all problems. Nor does it reflect a lack of concern about the special characteristics of health care markets, or disregard for the strong sense of responsibility that medical practitioners feel for the welfare of their patients. Rather, our opposition is based on the Commission’s experience investigating the impact on consumers of numerous instances of collective bargaining by independent health care practitioners.

The bill’s stated purpose is to promote the quality of patient care. Collective bargaining by health care professionals, however, does not ensure better care for patients. Two broad-based commissions recently studied changes in the health care system and recommended numerous measures to protect consumers and promote quality. But neither suggested that antitrust immunity was appropriate or desirable. The Commission believes that measures designed to increase the power of consumer choice will serve patients, and our nation as a whole, far better than giving providers the collective power to dictate what choices — and, significantly, what prices — will be available in the marketplace. Government can play an important role in creating the conditions for effective competition in health care markets, and in addressing specific abuses through targeted regulation.

I. The Bill Would Grant Broad Antitrust Immunity For Price Fixing, Boycotts, And Other Anticompetitive Conduct

H.R. 1304, like the proposal before the Committee last year, would create a broad antitrust exemption for price fixing and boycotts by physicians, dentists, pharmacists, and other health care professionals. To understand the types of activity that this bill would legalize, one need only refer to the record of antitrust law enforcement over the past two decades. The Commission, the Department of Justice, and state attorneys general have brought numerous actions challenging price fixing and boycotts by health care professionals who sought to obtain higher fees or more favorable reimbursement terms from third party payers. For example, the Commission’s early case against the Michigan State Medical Society challenged the Society’s formation of a “negotiating committee” that orchestrated boycotts of the state Blue Shield plan and the state Medicaid program in order to promote the reimbursement policies that the Society preferred. Among other things, the Society opposed vision and hearing care benefits plans negotiated by the United Auto Workers union, because these programs provided for different reimbursement levels for participating and nonparticipat-
ing providers.5

More recently, the Commission issued a consent order settling charges that a group of physicians in Danville, Virginia, agreed on reimbursement rates and other terms of dealing with third-party payers, agreed to boycott payers that did not meet those terms, and thereby succeeded in obstructing the entry of new health care plans into its area.6 One of the victims of the boycott was a health plan established by Virginia to cover state employees. The Commonwealth of Virginia jointly investigated the case with FTC staff, and collected $170,000 in penalties and damages for the increased costs it had to bear in providing health benefits to its employees.7

The Commission’s most recent challenge to providers’ collective negotiation with health plans involved a group of independent physicians that included between 70 and 80% of the doctors in the Lake Tahoe area. According to the complaint, the doctors negotiated collectively with all health plans in the area, and forced the plans to either accept rates much higher than those paid in other parts of California or Nevada, or abandon plans to contract with doctors in the area. The physicians asked Blue Shield of California to raise its premiums to fund increased payments to doctors, and concertedly terminated their participation agreements with Blue Shield when it did not comply with their demands.8

These are just a few examples of actions antitrust enforcers have blocked - actions that meant higher prices for consumers without any guarantee of improved patient care. There are many more.9 The immediate effect of H.R. 1304 would be to allow such anticompetitive conduct to proceed unchallenged, and it may encourage health care professionals to undertake such actions.

The bill also could permit physicians to collectively demand terms from health plans that would disadvantage allied health care providers or other alternatives to prevailing modes of medical practice. The collective judgment of health care professionals concerning what patients should want can differ markedly from what patients themselves are asking for in the marketplace. The Commission has taken enforcement action in cases in which provider groups sought to impede practice by competing alternatives by, for example, denying, delaying, or limiting hospital privileges of non-physician providers10 or physicians providing services through innovative arrangements, such as the Cleveland Clinic’s integrated multi-specialty group practice.11 Other cases illustrate how groups of professionals have attempted to secure health plan payment policies that disadvantage their competitors.12 Although it was suggested at last year’s hearing that the
legislation would not grant antitrust immunity to agreements between doctors and health plans that disadvantaged competing providers, but would protect only agreements among physicians on what terms they will accept from plans, it is not clear that the courts would interpret the law in that way.\textsuperscript{13}

The differences between this year's bill and last year's do nothing to reduce the Commission's concerns about the potential harm to consumers. Indeed, the changes primarily broaden rather than limit the bill's scope. The current version includes an expansive definition of "health care professional" that appears designed to encompass a sweeping array of individuals who provide health care products or services. This year's bill also makes clear that state, as well as federal, antitrust enforcement would be displaced. In addition, although the current bill excludes the "collective cessation of service to patients" from its protections, this limitation takes virtually nothing away from the coercive power the bill grants to providers. The bill continues to permit physicians and others to collectively refuse to deal with a health plan that refuses their demands for higher fees. If a plan failed to accede to those demands, and the group refused to contract, the plan could be forced from the market,\textsuperscript{14} or patients would be left to pay their medical bills out of their own pockets.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, although providers could not collectively refuse to treat patients, their collective refusal to contract with a plan could impose formidable financial obstacles to patients seeking care.

Although styled as a labor exemption, the antitrust immunity that H.R. 1304 would confer has little to do with established labor law and policy. The labor exemption already applies to health care professionals under the same standards that apply in other sectors of the economy; that is, physicians who are employees (for example, of hospitals) are already covered by the labor exemption under current law. The labor exemption, however, is limited to the employer-employee context, and it does not protect combinations of independent business people.\textsuperscript{16} H.R. 1304 is designed to override the distinction Congress drew in the labor laws between employees and independent contractors, and to allow some independent contractors — doctors and other health care professionals operating as independent businesses — to collectively exert economic pressure on health plans to gain higher fees and other, more favorable, terms of dealing.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, it grants the exemption without providing for any oversight of the collective bargaining process by the National Labor Relations Board.

Moreover, this extension of the labor exemption is being offered as a way to remedy matters that collective bargaining was never in-
tended to address. The stated goal of this bill is to promote the quality of patient care. The labor exemption, however, was not created to solve issues regarding the ultimate quality of products or services that consumers receive. Collective bargaining rights are designed to raise the incomes and improve working conditions of union members. The law protects the United Auto Workers' right to bargain for higher wages and better working conditions, but we do not rely on the UAW to bargain for safer cars. Congress addressed those concerns in other ways. The patient care issues raised by supporters of the bill deserve serious attention, but an ill-fitting labor exemption is the wrong approach.

II. The Exemption Would Harm Consumers

It is undisputed that the immediate effect of H.R. 1304 would be to permit all doctors in a community — indeed, all health care professionals - to bargain collectively with all health plans that contract with independent health practitioners. It would permit those practitioners to demand much higher fees for their services, and to refuse collectively to contract with plans that did not meet those demands. What is disputed is the impact the bill would have on consumers.

At last year's hearing, there was much discussion about hypotheticals and theoretically-possible results. The Commission believes, however, that past experience is a more reliable guide to what is likely to happen when health care practitioners collectively bargain with health plans. That experience suggests that the proposed exemption presents substantial risks of harm to consumers, private and governmental purchasers of health care, and taxpayers who ultimately foot the bill for government-sponsored health care programs.

A. The Exemption Would Raise Costs And Threatens To Reduce Access To Care

Without antitrust enforcement to block price fixing and boycotts designed to increase health plan payments to health care professionals, we can expect prices for health care services to rise substantially. Health plans would have few alternatives to accepting the collective demands of health care providers for higher fees. The effect of the bill, however, would not simply be on the health plans and employers that are forced to pay higher prices to health care practitioners, but can be expected to extend to various parties, and in various ways, throughout the health care system:
Consumers and employers would face higher prices for health insurance coverage.

Consumers also would face higher out-of-pocket expenses as copayments and other unreimbursed expenses increased.

Consumers might face a reduction in benefits as costs increased.

Senior citizens participating in Medicare HMOs would face reduced benefits, because Medicare pays these HMOs a fixed amount per enrollee. Higher fees for professional services means health plans would have fewer dollars available to pay for prescription drug coverage and other benefits that are not available under traditional Medicare but currently are provided by many Medicare HMOs.

The federal government would pay more for health coverage for its employees through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and military health programs.

State and local governments would incur higher costs to provide health benefits to their employees.

State Medicaid programs attempting to use managed care strategies to serve their beneficiaries could have to increase their budgets, cut optional benefits, or reduce the number of beneficiaries covered.

State and local programs providing care for the uninsured would be further strained, because, by making health insurance coverage more costly, the bill threatens to increase the already sizable portion of the population that is uninsured.

These widespread effects are not simply theoretical possibilities. The record of antitrust law enforcement sets forth the impact of collective “negotiations” on the public. For example, as described in the Commission’s complaints, collective bargaining by anesthesiologists in Rochester, New York, and by obstetricians in Jacksonville, Florida, forced health plans to raise their reimbursement, and the result was increased premiums for the HMOs’ subscribers. Other cases have challenged actions by associations of pharmacists who succeeded in forcing state and local governments to raise reimbursement levels paid under their employee prescription drug plans. In one such case, an administrative law judge found that the collective fee demands of pharmacists cost the State of New York an estimated $7 million.

By raising health care costs and making health insurance less affordable, the exemption threatens to increase the number of uninsured and thus reduce access to care. A 1997 report by the General Accounting Office concluded that a major reason for declining private health coverage is the rising cost of health insurance. Higher insurance costs
affect employers' decisions whether to offer health benefits and employees' decisions whether to purchase coverage. In a country where 43.4 million people did not have health insurance in 1997 (1.7 million more than in 1996), any development that threatens to increase the proportion of the population that is uninsured is cause for serious concern.

B. There Is No Support For Claims That Consumer Costs Would Not Increase

In last year's hearing there was acknowledgment that passage of the bill could result in higher payments to health professionals. There has been a suggestion that fee increases imposed on health plans might not be passed on to consumers, but could simply reduce health plan profits. Such a result is unlikely. Fees for professional services account for almost one-half of private insurance payments for health services and supplies. If these costs increase significantly, the most logical assumption is that costs to consumers would go up substantially. Relying on an assumption that higher costs will not be passed on to consumers puts consumers at risk of serious harm. Economic theory predicts that a significant industry-wide increase in input costs will ordinarily raise the price of the final product. Moreover, as noted above, our enforcement actions provide numerous examples in which health care professionals' collective demands for higher fees resulted in higher costs to consumers and to government purchasers.

Arguments that consumers would not be harmed by an antitrust exemption for collective bargaining by independent health care professionals appear to rest on assertions that the bill would balance the bargaining power between health care professionals and health plans. These assertions, however, are incorrect. The bill would permit doctors to create monopolies. On the health plan side of the ledger, the evidence does not support the suggestion that most (or even many) areas have only one or two health plans. A November 1998 letter to Chairman Hyde from Chairman Pitofsky discussed in greater length than is possible here the available information on the extent to which health plans have market power in individual geographic areas. That information indicates that health plan markets vary widely, and simply does not support suggestions that most markets have little or no health plan competition. For example, individual HMOs typically face considerable competition from other HMOs. Data on HMO penetration published in June 1998 show that areas in which HMOs as a group have the largest collective market share tend to have a larger number
of individual HMOs in operation and more competitive HMO markets. Of course, HMOs also face competition from other types of health plans, such as preferred provider organizations ("PPOs").

Nor does the recent number of highly publicized mergers among commercial health plans suggest that most markets are likely to have only one or two health plans in the future. The Commission and the Department of Justice review these transactions, and we have investigated those that appeared to raise competitive concerns. The Commission is committed to preserving competition in the market for health plans, as in all markets, and if a proposed transaction appeared likely to create market power, we would challenge it.

Arguments about equalizing bargaining power also rest on unsupported assertions that the McCarran-Ferguson Act gives insurance companies leverage in bargaining with health care professionals. Although McCarran-Ferguson protects certain types of activities by insurers (to the extent that such activity is regulated by state law), the Supreme Court has held an insurance company’s agreements with providers on the fees they will be paid are not “the business of insurance” and thus are not covered by the McCarran-Ferguson immunity. It seems clear, therefore, that collusion among insurers on such agreements likewise would not be protected by the Act. In fact, complaints about health plans wielding power over doctors appear to have nothing to do with McCarran-Ferguson or with any statutorily-protected collusion among insurers. We know of no evidence of insurers colluding in setting fees or other terms of dealing with providers, and the Commission does not believe that McCarran would protect such conduct. Rather, the complaints revolve around the size and power of individual insurers relative to individual health professionals.

There is undoubtedly a bargaining imbalance between an individual physician in solo practice and an insurance company. Bargaining imbalances between parties to a commercial transaction are not uncommon in our economy. But the suggestion that this bill would not impose higher costs on consumers and others — on the ground that the exemption would merely create a countervailing monopoly — is premised on theoretical arguments about market conditions that do not describe most health care markets. These speculative arguments provide no assurance that the bill’s effect would not be a dramatic inflation in health care costs.
C. No Antitrust Exemption Is Needed To Allow Professional Societies And Others To Discuss Their Concerns About Actions By Health Plans

In the debate over this proposed exemption, we frequently hear arguments that the antitrust laws prevent physicians from being effective advocates for their patients. Indeed, it is often suggested that any effort by physicians to talk among themselves or with plans about concerns regarding health plans' practices would violate the antitrust laws. That is simply not the case. Health care professionals can and do engage in collective advocacy, both to promote the interests of their patients and to express their opinions about other issues, such as payment delays, dispute resolution procedures, and other matters. Health care associations have traditionally played an active role in lobbying legislatures and regulatory bodies, such as state insurance commissions, and presenting issues to the media and the public.

Moreover, the antitrust laws do not prohibit medical societies and other groups from engaging in collective discussions with health plans regarding issues of patient care. Among other things, physicians may collectively explain to a health plan why they think a particular policy or practice is medically unsound, and may present medical or scientific data to support their views. In fact, physician groups have presented their views on a number of issues to payers. For example, the American Medical Association has issued a Model Medical Services Agreement that explains its views on appropriate contract terms and on why other contract terms are inappropriate or harmful. Recent press reports indicate that Aetna U.S. Healthcare has altered some of its contract terms in response to communications from the American Medical Association concerning physician dissatisfaction with the contracts. The Commission has never brought a case based on physicians' collective advocacy with a health plan on an issue involving patient care. Our cases have addressed instances in which physician groups (1) negotiated collectively on fee levels or other price-related issues, or (2) collectively refused to contract with plans, either to gain acceptance of their price-related demands or to prevent or delay market entry by managed care plans generally. In all such cases, the Commission has been very careful to make sure that its orders do not interfere with the legitimate exchange of information and views between health plans and health care practitioners. Indeed, in the Commission's first litigated case involving collective negotiations by physicians - Michigan State Medical Society - the opinion emphasized that the antitrust laws do not prohibit health care providers' collective provision of information and views to health plans. Specific language was inserted in that
order, and in subsequent orders, to make it clear that bans on anticompetitive agreements among competing providers do not prohibit the provision of information and views to health plans concerning any issue, including reimbursement.  

III. There Are Better Ways To Protect Consumers

For all the reasons set forth above, the Commission believes the proposed antitrust exemption is the wrong approach to solving concerns about patient care, and that it threatens serious harm to consumers. The Commission recognizes the serious concerns that have been raised regarding the current operation of health care markets. We do not suggest that the market is performing as well as it could, or that the market can or will cure all of the problems that concern this Committee. But recent efforts to examine health care markets, such as the President’s Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, have produced a variety of concrete proposals for reform. As antitrust enforcers, we do not seek to endorse any specific proposal. We note, however, that these studies recommend a number of ways to improve quality and protect consumers, and they do not recommend antitrust immunity or collective bargaining rights for providers. Proposals for reform include:

A. Increasing Consumers’ Ability To Choose Their Health Plan.

A fundamental concern expressed by health policymakers — and by members of this Committee at last year’s hearing — is that many consumers lack a choice among different types of health plans. Most consumers obtain health care coverage as a benefit of employment, and many employers offer only one plan. Consumers have different views about many aspects of health care service delivery, including the types of settings in which they want to receive health care, the kinds of services and health practitioners to which they want access, how much they are willing to pay for health insurance, and the value they attach to broader choices among providers. Offering consumers a choice can help make health plans more responsive to consumer preferences. Consumer choice can be increased, for example, by regulatory changes making it easier for small employers to participate in purchasing pools that can offer individuals a choice of health plans.

Increased consumer choice among health plans also would be good for doctors. Patients who can choose among plans are less likely
to have to switch doctors when the employer changes the health plan that is offered, with the result that doctors likely would feel less pressure to participate in a large number of plans in order to retain access to their patients.

B. Improving Consumer Information.

Several proposals would require health plans to disclose various kinds of information, including limits on coverage, use of drug formularies, how procedures and drugs are deemed experimental, and the types and extent of dispute resolution procedures. In addition, work also is underway to develop ways of presenting consumers with comprehensive comparative quality and performance information about health plans, to better inform their decision-making.34

The Commission’s Bureau of Consumer Protection has been active in efforts to improve the information available to consumers through a federal interagency task force on health care quality (the Quality Interagency Coordinating Task Force). The consumer information committee of this group is working on ways to improve the information that federal health care plans disclose to consumers, and is considering the types of information that should be disclosed, the way the information should be communicated, and development of a common terminology.35 The Commission’s staff is considering other ways that the Commission can help improve the quantity and quality of information about health plans available to consumers.

C. Regulation of Plan Behavior.

Targeted regulation of certain aspects of health plan behavior may be appropriate in some cases to protect consumers. Numerous bills addressing such things as patients’ access to appeal and review mechanisms are under consideration at both the state and federal levels.

The Commission appreciates the desire to avoid detailed federal regulation of health plan behavior and to rely instead on the market. However, the proposed exemption would not let the market work. On the contrary, it would severely limit competition among health professionals and health plans, without any regulatory oversight or other mechanism to protect the public interest.
III. Conclusion

There are no easy solutions to the problems inherent in the simultaneous pursuit of cost effectiveness, high quality, and wider access to health care services. But allowing doctors and other health care practitioners to fix prices and other contract terms is not the answer. The Commission continues to believe that competition among health care providers and among health plans is an important tool for controlling costs, providing consumer choice, and promoting innovation and high quality. We counsel strongly against abandonment of competition as a mechanism for promoting a better health care system, and we urge that every effort be made to address concerns about quality and patient care while preserving and strengthening the benefits that competition can provide. The Commission stands ready to help in any way it can.

1. This written statement represents the views of the Federal Trade Commission. Chairman Pitofsky’s oral presentation and responses to questions are his own, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission or any other Commissioner.

2. An appendix describing these cases in more detail is provided at www.ftc.gov/os/1999/9906/healthcareappendix.htm.


5. Id. at 234-35.


11. See Medical Staff of Broward General Medical Center, 114 F.T.C. 542 (1991) (consent order); Medical Staff of Holy Cross Hospital, 114 F.T.C. 555 (1991) (consent order).

12. The Commission challenged an alleged boycott of a health plan by physiatrists (doctors specializing in rehabilitative medicine) that demanded not only higher fees, but also that the plan pay for physical therapy services only if the patient was referred by a physiatrist (rather than a doctor in another specialty). La Asociacion Medica de Puerto Rico, 119 F.T.C. 772 (1995) (consent order). See also Virginia Academy of Clinical Psychologists v. Blue Shield of Virginia, 624 F.2d 476 (4th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 916 (1981) (physicians used their control of Blue Shield to impose payment policies that disadvantaged competing clinical psychologists).

13. The courts have immunized certain agreements arising out of collective bargaining between employers and unions — the so-called “nonstatutory” or “implicit” labor exemption — precisely because it was necessary to effectuate the statutory exemption that protects the bargaining and related activities of unions and their members. See Brown v. Pro Football, Inc., 518 U.S. 231, 237 (1996). See also P. Areeda and H. Hovenkamp, IA Antitrust Law 255c at 173 (1997) (“There seems little warrant in labor law or policy for distinguishing most collective bargaining agreements from unilateral union activities to accomplish the same result”). Courts might well find similar logic supports immunizing many agreements arising from the collective bargaining protected by H.R. 1304, including not only agreements about wages, but also agreements that preserve the ability of physicians to work free from competition by nonphysicians.

14. Some types of plans are required as a condition of licensure to maintain a network of providers adequate to provide services to their enrollees; thus, the inability to establish a satisfactory network would force such a plan to leave the market (or prevent it from entering).
15. Enrollees of HMOs would have to pay out of pocket the full cost of services obtained from non-network providers. PPO enrollees who see non-network providers would have to pay any amount by which the providers' billed charges exceeded the plan's payment allowance. In addition, they likely would have to pay the full charge at the time of service, file a claim for payment, and wait to be reimbursed by the plan, instead of simply paying the copayment and relying on the doctor to collect the remainder of the fee directly from the insurance company.


17. This distinction between employees and independent contractors is fundamental to the labor relations scheme established by Congress. NLRA Section 2(3) gives the right to bargain collectively only to "employees." The 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments to the NLRA included a provision expressly stating that the term "employee" does not include "any individual having the status of an independent contractor." 29 U.S.C. § 152(3). The House Report accompanying the amendment stated:

   In the law, there always has been a difference, and a big difference, between "employees" and "independent contractors." "Employees" work for wages or salaries under direct supervision. "Independent contractors" undertake to do a job for a price, decide how the work will be done, usually hire others to do the work, and depend for their income not upon wages, but upon the difference between what they pay for goods, materials, and labor and what they receive for the end result, that is, upon profits.

H.R. Rep. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st Sess. 18 (1947). Just last month, the NLRB Regional Director in Philadelphia decided, after having held 14 days of hearings, that network doctors of a New Jersey HMO were independent contractors rather than employees within the meaning of the NLRA. AmeriHealth Inc./AmeriHealth HMO and United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Case 4-RC-19260 (NLRB 4th Region, May 24, 1999).


21. United States General Accounting Office, "Private Health Insurance: Continued Erosion of Coverage Linked to Cost Pressures" 2-3 (GAO/HEHS-97-122) (July 1997). A more recent study also concluded that the increase in the proportion of workers...
who are not covered by private health insurance, from 15.1% in 1979 to 23.3% in 1995, was due in large part to per capita health care spending rising much more rapidly than personal income during the period. (Per capita health spending divided by median income rose from 4.5% in 1979 to 7.3% in 1995.) Kronick & Gilmer, Explaining The Decline in Health Insurance Coverage, 1979-1995, 18:2 HEALTH AFFAIRS 30 (March/April 1999). Another study reported that in 1997, 2.5 million people refused to accept employer-sponsored health insurance coverage for which they were eligible, even though they had no other source of coverage. Sixty-eight percent of these employees reported that the high cost of health insurance was the reason they rejected the coverage. Thorpe & Florence, Why Are Workers Uninsured? Employer-Sponsored Health Insurance in 1997, 18:2 HEALTH AFFAIRS 213 (March/April 1999).

22. In 1997, private insurance paid $109.1 billion for physician services, and an additional $43.2 billion for dental and other professional services. This amounts to about 44% of total private insurance payments, and about 49% of private insurance payments for health services and supplies. National Health Expenditures 1997, Table 3 <www.hcfa.gov/stats/nhe-oact/tables/t11.htm>.

23. A study published last year concluded that, although health care costs and health insurance premiums did not increase at identical rates on a year-to-year basis in recent years, “over a slightly longer period, the dominant influence on premiums is underlying costs” of health care products and services. Ginsberg & Gabel, Tracking Health Care Costs: What’s New in 1998, 17:5 HEALTH AFFAIRS 141, 145 (Sept./Oct. 1998).

24. Information on HMOs’ market shares is most readily available.

25. See The InterStudy Competitive Edge, REGIONAL MARKET ANALYSIS 8.1 (June 1998).

26. Indeed, in 1997 the percentage of workers in traditional HMOs fell from 33 to 30%, while the percentage enrolled in PPOs and point of service plans rose. See Wall Street Verbatim; Wider Networks Need Not Drive New Cost Explosion, MEDICINE & HEALTH (June 22, 1998).


28. The statements of antitrust enforcement policy issued by the Commission and the Department of Justice create an antitrust safety zone for health care providers’ collective provision of non-fee-related information to health plans. See Statements of Antitrust Enforcement Policy in Health Care 40, 4 TRADE REG. REP. (CCH) ¶13,151(Aug.1996) <www.ftc.gov/reports/hlth3s.htm>.


30. 101 F.T.C. at 302-09.

31. Id. at 314; see also Southbank IPA, Inc., 114 F.T.C. 783 (1991) (consent order); Rochester Anesthesiologists, 110 F.T.C. 175 (1988) (consent order).
32. For example, a survey conducted by the Center for Studying Health System Change found large differences in Americans’ willingness to trade lower health care costs for limits on choice of providers available in the network, and that many people on both sides of the question had strongly held views. Data Bulletin Number 4 (Fall 1997).

33. Other observers have urged actions to make it possible for much greater numbers of consumers to choose their health plans directly, rather than having their range of choice defined by their employer. The AMA, for example, has proposed moving from an employment-based system of health insurance to a system of individually selected and owned health insurance coverage, in order to permit individuals with varying needs and preferences to choose the plan that suits them best. As the AMA recognizes, such a system depends on competition among various plans on price, plan features, and quality, that will place pressure on plans to operate efficiently and to lower the price of insurance, as well as to be responsive to individual patients’ concerns about quality. American Medical Association, Expanding Access to Insurance Coverage for Health Expenses (Nov. 1998); American Medical Association, Rethinking Health Insurance (Nov. 1998).

34. The Presidential Commission concluded that more active involvement by public and private group purchasers and by consumers in demanding high quality services would increase the industry’s ability and willingness to focus on quality improvement. To this end, it recommended development of core sets of quality measures for health plans, institutional providers, and individual practitioners, and making valid, reliable and comprehensive comparative quality information widely available. See supra note 3 at 3-4.

35. In addition, there are plans to use a government website as a gateway for consumers seeking information on health care quality.