

MEDCHI, THE MARYLAND STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY
HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Resolution 8-20

INTRODUCED BY: MedChi’s Task Force to Study the Implications of Implementing
New Payment Systems in Maryland

SUBJECT: Final Report of MedChi’s Task Force to Study the Implications of
Implementing New Payment Systems in Maryland

1 Whereas, At the Fall 2018 MedChi House of Delegates, Resolution 30-18 was passed
2 establishing a Task Force to “study the implications of implementing new payment systems in
3 Maryland, including, but not limited to, a single payer health care system and a Maryland public
4 option. The payment systems task force shall report to the Fall 2019 MedChi House of
5 Delegates meeting its findings and recommendations;”
6

7 Whereas, The concept of payment systems for health care in the United States is complex. In the
8 1930s and 1940s, payments for health insurance premiums were included in workers’ contracts
9 with large employers as a means of increasing effective compensation without actually having to
10 increase take-home pay. As time went on, this system of employer financed health care became
11 ubiquitous and entrenched. Many employers eventually found this system to be too expensive,
12 and began decreasing (or eliminating) these payments to shift some or all of the health care costs
13 to their employees, especially with the decrease in the power and effectiveness of the workers’
14 unions; and
15

16 Whereas, Many other countries in the Europe took a different approach, deciding that health care
17 is a right of all citizens, and centralized the payment systems within government. Even still,
18 there developed multiple variations on the theme, from fully funded government systems
19 (England) to combinations of private-public partnerships (Germany); and
20

21 Whereas, In recent years, due to the ever-increasing burden of health care payments on
22 government and industry budgets, various groups have undertaken overhauls of the system to
23 provide better health care at a reduced price to the system. This culminated in President
24 Obama’s signature health care program, the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”) which set out to
25 reduce health care expenditures, enroll non-insured people into an insurance program, and
26 standardize the “essential health benefits” that all Americans would enjoy. This was met by
27 fierce opposition by conservative and industry groups in efforts to weaken or eliminate some or
28 all of its provisions. In a landmark Supreme Court case, *National Federation of Independent*
29 *Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012), the Court ruled that the concept or requiring people to
30 purchase insurance was valid, but the current administration has reduced the fine involved to be
31 0. Other legal challenges continue, most notably *Texas v. US*, in which several State Attorney
32 Generals are attempting to invalidate the entire ACA; and
33

34 Whereas, Into this mix, the election of 2016 saw the rise of the voice of Senator Bernie Sanders,
35 proposing a system of “Medicare For All”, in which the government would assume the bulk, if
36 not all, of health care spending and thus be able to control costs and ensure quality care.
37 Needless to say, this proposal caused significant controversy, both for and against. Other
38 variations have emerged, which are currently in the public sphere; and
39

40 Whereas, Maryland has long participated in the debate for controlling health care costs, firstly by
41 its participation in the decades long system of the “Medicare Waiver” or Total Cost of Care
42 System. This attempts to limit the growth of spending by hospital systems in providing inpatient
43 care, and, by extension, some of the outpatient care. In addition, the State Legislature
44 established a Maryland Health Insurance Coverage Protection Commission (MHICPC), chaired
45 by Senator Brian Feldman and Delegate Joselyn Pena-Melnyk. The MHICPC recommended,
46 and the State Legislature passed, many changes to Maryland law to allow the State to offer many
47 of the benefits offered by the ACA, including subsidies for premiums for insurance products
48 offered through the Maryland Health Exchange, guaranteed coverage, and alternatives to fines
49 for non-coverage. These provisions had some funding through 2024, but further funding past
50 that date would need to be identified. It is to be noted that the MHICPC did not promulgate a
51 plan that would provide comprehensive insurance coverage for all residents of the state; and
52

53 Whereas, In recent years, great pressure has been placed upon the ACA by the administration of
54 President Trump, resulting in a piecemeal dismantling of its provisions. The current iteration of
55 this process is the case brought by a number of State Attorneys General, led by Texas, and
56 opposed by California, to completely invalidate the law altogether (California v. Texas, formerly
57 known as Texas v. United States). This case will be heard in the fall of 2020, and possibly
58 decided in 2021. MedChi will continue to monitor the situation. Some members of our task
59 force are strongly in favor of comprehensive coverage for all, and others were strongly opposed.
60 The financial outlook does not seem in favor of that being a likely scenario in the near future;
61 therefore be it
62

63 Resolved, that the MedChi Task Force to Study the Implications of Implementing New Payment
64 Models in Maryland be disbanded and that the Legislative Council and the Board of Trustees
65 monitor and address future issues and concerns related to payment systems in Maryland.
66

67
68 Fiscal Note: No significant fiscal impact.