

Directors:

Wade Dahood
 Director Emeritus
 Lawrence A. Anderson
 Roberta Anner-Hughes
 Daniel P. Buckley
 Michael D. Cok
 E. Craig Daue
 Karl J. Englund
 Michael J. George
 Gene R. Jarussi
 Micheal F. Lamb
 Sydney E. McKenna
 James Manley
 James P. Molloy
 Jim Ragain
 John J. Richardson
 Michael P. Sand
 Roger Sullivan Jr.
 Terry N. Trieweiler

Montana Trial Lawyers ASSOCIATION

Executive Office:

Al Smith, Executive Director
 32 S. Ewing, Suite 306
 P.O. Box 838, Helena, Montana 59624
 Tel: (406) 443-3124
 Fax: (406) 449-6943
 E-mail: mtl@mt.net
 Website: www.monttla.com

2
 2-7-05
 SB 21, SB 352
 Officers:

Micheal F. Lamb
 President
 Lawrence A. Anderson
 President-Elect
 James Manley
 Vice President
 Michael P. Sand
 Secretary-Treasurer

ATLA Representatives:

Lawrence A. Anderson
 ATLA Governor
 William A. Rossbach
 ATLA Governor
 Joe R. Bottomly
 ATLA State Delegate
 Kurt M. Jackson
 ATLA State Delegate

February 7, 2005

TO: Senate Judiciary Committee
 RE: SB 21, SB 352

Thank you for the opportunity to present our perspective to the Committee. Before I specifically address the issues before you, I'd like to offer a couple of general comments.

Please keep in mind that there is a continuing need for malpractice insurance because Montanans will be the victims of preventable medical injuries - and all those citizens are not here to speak for themselves, simply because those people do not yet know that they will be injured. The Subcommittee heard from a couple of victims - people who have lost loved ones due to preventable medical injuries - please keep in mind that changes to the system that limit the legal rights of malpractice victims affect all potential malpractice cases, those the Subcommittee heard testimony on and those that might be filed in the future.

In Montana this debate is not about so-called "frivolous lawsuits" or an explosion in the number of malpractice cases, there is just no empirical evidence for any of those assertions.

Liability insurance rates have not increased dramatically over the past decade, they were stable or even decreased for much of the past decade. In the short term, premiums have spiked in the last couple of years, especially for some high risk specialties and for small rural hospitals. But premiums over the last 15 years have averaged 6.5% increase per year.

The SJR 32 Subcommittee heard testimony from healthcare providers who testified that they had never been sued or had been sued once years ago, yet their premiums were going up and up. If the evidence is predominately that there are no or few lawsuits, the cause for premium increases cannot logically be attributed solely or mainly to lawsuits - **and** therefore any 'reforms' of the legal system will not be a meaningful solution that brings lower and more stable premiums.

The "crisis" is in the insurance industry. It is well documented that over the past 30 years the insurance industry, including medical liability to general liability insurance, has gone through cycles of so-called "crisis" and each time has responded by dramatically increasing rates and

calling for "tort reforms" - restrictions of citizens' rights to hold legally accountable and responsible those that harm them. *Premium Deceit* (*Premium Deceit* is one of several reports and studies provided to the Subcommittee during its deliberations, and they are identified herein in *italics*.)

In the past few years we have had declining investment income for insurance companies - insurance companies make money by investing the premiums they collect, and both the bond and stock markets have declined. The investment problems were aggravated by the devastating effect of the 9/11 attacks on the reinsurance market, which helped trigger increasing rates in all lines of insurance. Those two factors have combined with poor business decisions by insurers in the 1990's to hit the medical malpractice insurance business particularly hard.

Throughout the 1990's many insurers tried to expand their market share in medical malpractice premiums, in part because they perceived the market to be very profitable based upon the returns of industry main stays like St. Paul. Those favorable returns, however, were due to previously charging more for premiums than they eventually needed for claims, building up much larger reserves than were necessary. In St. Paul's case, from 1992 to 1997 over \$1 billion of those reserves became net income - not premium dividends paid back to physicians, not lower premiums, but profit.

In order to get in on such profits, many insurers aggressively sold policies by moving into new geographic regions and undercutting the premium prices of established insurers in those markets. By 1995, many insurers were offering policies for less than the amount needed to cover malpractice claims. This trend was able to continue through 2000 because insurers were able to make up the difference with investment income. But, as investments went down insurers began dramatically raising rates, decreasing their numbers of policies and tightening their underwriting standards, and some insurers began withdrawing from the malpractice line all together. The result - fewer insurers, tighter underwriting standards, fewer policies being written, higher premiums - is our current "crisis."

There is a wealth of evidence that insurance industry practices - from rate setting to investments to profit taking - are the primary culprits in the medical liability insurance "crisis." Resources and studies available to demonstrate the problems with the insurance industry - *GAO Reports*, *Premium Deceit Report*, *Weiss Report*, *FTCR Reports*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Business Week* - are just a few of the resources that demonstrate that insurance reform is needed. It is worth noting that the profits of the 13 largest insurers were up 30% last year - the industry is coming out of it's hard market, without 'tort reforms.' The best evidence that insurance practices are the problem is the testimony of the Billings Deaconess representative - they went with a captive insurer alternative and **decreased** premiums last year and they expected a **decrease** again this year. They also took aggressive risk management steps to **decrease** the chances of preventable medical injuries taking place

Insurance Reform Is Necessary: Insurance reform is the only answer that will actually keep premium rates in check, now and in the future. It is quite clear that the rates have remained relatively stable in California in large part because of insurance reforms passed in 1988 as Proposition 103. *FTCR Report, How Insurance Reform Lowered Doctors Medical Malpractice Rates in California*. That was again proven, when a consumer challenge to a proposed medical

malpractice insurance premium rate hike in California resulted in a **36% decrease** in the rate hike requested by the insurer. *FTCR News Release, September 3, 2003*

Insurance reforms such as those passed in California make sense, especially the provisions that: insurers have the burden to justify rate increases, or decreases, **before** they are instituted; and, that any individual has standing to challenge an insurers rate increase request. Such reforms would limit price gouging and it would also serve to protect insurers from their own propensities to ignore sound actuarial standards in favor of quick profits

Additionally, encouraging or aiding captive insurance arrangements, cooperative purchasing and other alternatives to purchasing insurance from private carriers should be considered by the committee - remember, Billings Deaconess **decreased** their rates.

What The Legislature Should Not Do

Further Limit Victims' Compensation: We already have a non-economic (amputation, disfigurement, permanent disability, loss of fertility, pain and suffering, etc) damages cap of \$250,000 in Montana. Such caps disproportionately limit the amount of damages awarded to women, children and the elderly. If caps that are the lowest in the nation have not worked, let's try something else, like insurance reforms, rather than further limiting the rights of victims.

Blame Malpractice Costs For Increasing Health Care Costs Contrary to current political posturing, the costs of malpractice suits **are not** a significant factor in overall health care costs. If all malpractice claims were eliminated - no verdicts, no settlements, no premiums paid - that would amount to less than 2% of total health care costs in Montana. *Diagnosing The Ailment*, pp 88-92.

Conclusion

The reality is that malpractice premiums should increase, just as all other costs increase. For example, a major component of most malpractice cases is future medical care, so it logically follows that as medical costs increase, so will malpractice awards. In Montana, premiums have increased an average of about 5% over the past decade, the problem for health care providers is that the bulk of that increase has occurred in the past couple years, after years of little or no increases. There is not an easy direct correlation between malpractice premiums collected and claims paid. So long as insurers are allowed to reap the profits when investments are productive, and then be relieved from the consequences of their bad business decisions - by charging higher premiums or limiting the damages awarded to injured people - when investment markets have soured, we will be on this continual merry-go-round of insurance "crisis." Malpractice premiums have gone up across the country - in states like Montana and California that have "tort reform" and in states without "tort reforms." It's time to address the real problem - the insurance industry - by regulation and by utilizing viable alternatives.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Al Smith', written in a cursive style.