- 1 NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
- 2 RPTS TOBY WALTER
- 3 HIF037140
- 4 [Correct title in bold below]
- 5 Texas v. U.S.: The Republican Lawsuit and Its Impacts on Americans
- 6 with Pre-Existing Conditions
- 7 [Wrong title below; Appropriations Subcommittee hearing title]
- 8 IMPACT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES
- 9 AFFECTING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT
- 10 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2019
- 11 House of Representatives
- 12 Subcommittee on Health
- 13 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 14 Washington, D.C.
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:16 a.m., in
- 19 Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Anna Eshoo [chairman
- 20 of the subcommittee] presiding.
- 21 Members present: Representatives Eshoo, Butterfield,
- 22 Matsui, Castor, Lujan, Schrader, Cardenas, Ruiz, Veasey, Kuster,
- 23 Kelly, Barragan, Blunt Rochester, O'Halleran, Rush, Pallone [ex
- officio], Burgess, Upton, Guthrie, Griffith, Bilirakis, Bucshon,

NEAL R. GROSS		
COURT REPORTER	RS AND TRANSCRIBERS	
1323 RHODE I	ISLAND AVE., N.W.	
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON	N, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com	

25 Brooks, Mullin, Hudson, Carter, and Walden [ex officio].

26 Staff present: Jeff Carroll, Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, Office Manager; Waverly Gordon, Deputy Chief Counsel; Zach 27 28 Kahan, Outreach and Member Service Coordinator; Saha Khatezai, 29 Professional Staff Member; Una Lee, Senior Health Counsel; 30 Kaitlyn Peel, Digital Director; Tim Robinson, Chief Counsel; Samantha Satchell, Professional Staff Member; Andrew Souvall, 31 32 Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services; C.J. 33 Young, Press Secretary; Adam Buckalew, Minority Director of 34 Coalitions and Deputy Chief Counsel, Health; Margaret Tucker 35 Fogarty, Minority Staff Assistant; Caleb Graff, Minority 36 Professional Staff Member, Health; Peter Kielty, Minority General 37 Counsel; Ryan Long, Minority Deputy Staff Director; James 38 Paluskiewicz, Minority Chief Counsel, Health; Kristen Shatynski, 39 Minority Professional Staff Member, Health; Danielle Steele, 40 Minority Counsel, Health.

Ms. Eshoo. The Subcommittee on Health will now come to order. The chair recognizes herself for five minutes for an opening statement, and the first thing that I would like to say is welcome.

45 Welcome back the 116th Congress under the new majority and 46 I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for supporting me to 47 do this work, to chair the Subcommittee.

It is an enormous honor and it is -- what is contained in the Committee, of course, are some of the most important issues that the American people expressed at the polls in the midterm elections.

52 To our Republican colleagues, I know that there are areas 53 where we can really work together. In some areas, we are going 54 to have to stretch. But know that I look forward to working with 55 all of you and to those that are new members of the subcommittee, 56 welcome to each one of you.

57 I know that you are going to bring great ideas and really 58 be instructive to the rest of us, so welcome to you.

As I said, health care was the single most important issue to voters in the midterm elections and it is a rarity that there would be one issue that would be the top issue in every single congressional district across the country. So this subcommittee

63 is front and center.

64

We are beginning the Health Subcommittee's work by

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

65 discussing the Texas v. Unites States lawsuit and its implications

66 for the entire health care system both public and private.

For over a hundred years, presidents, including Teddy
Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Richard Nixon, and others attempted to
reform our nation's health insurance system and provide access
to affordable health insurance for all Americans.

In 2010, through the efforts that began in this committee,
the Affordable Care Act was signed into law and bold reforms to
our public and private insurance programs were made.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, over 20 million Americans have gained health insurance that is required to cover preexisting conditions. The law disallows charging sick consumers more, it allows children to stay on their parents' health insurance policy to the age of 26, and provides coverage for preventive health services with no cost sharing.

Last February, 20 attorneys general and governors sued the federal government to challenge the constitutionality of that law. They claimed that after the individual mandate was repealed by the Republicans' tax plan the rest of the Affordable Care Act had to go, too.

The Trump administration's Department of Justice has refused to defend the Affordable Care Act in court and in December Judge Reed O'Connor of the Northern District of Texas declared the entire ACA invalid.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

89 Twenty attorneys general, led by the attorney general from 90 California, our former colleague, Javier Becerra, have appealed 91 Judge O'Connor's ruling.

92 For those enrolled in the Affordable Care Act, if the 93 Republican lawsuit is successful, the 13 million Americans who 94 gained health insurance through the Medicaid expansion will lose 95 their health insurance.

96 The 9 million Americans who rely on tax credits to help them 97 afford the insurance plan will no longer be able to afford their 98 insurance and health insurance costs will skyrocket across the 99 country when healthy people leave the marketplace for what I call 100 junk insurance plans that won't cover them when they get sick 101 -- another implication leaving the sick and the most expensive patients in the individual market, driving up premiums for so 102 103 many.

104 The insurance reforms of the ACA protect every American, 105 including those who get their health insurance through their 106 employer. Every insurance plan today is required to cover 10 107 basic essential health benefits.

108 No longer are there lifetime limits. The 130 million 109 patients with preexisting conditions cannot be denied coverage 110 or charged more and women can no longer be charged more because 111 they are females.

112 I am going to stop here and I am going to yield the rest

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

113 of my time to Mr. Butterfield.

Mr. Butterfield. Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo, for holding this very important hearing the absolute importance of the Affordable Care Act and thank you for giving us an opportunity to expose the poorly written Texas case.

I want to talk a few seconds about sickle cell disease. More than one out of every 370 African Americans born with sickle cell disease and more than 100,000 Americans have this disease, including many in my state.

122 The disease creates intense pain that patients usually must 123 be hospitalized to receive their care. Without preexisting 124 condition protections, tens of thousands of Americans with sickle 125 cell could be charged more for insurance, they could be dropped 126 from their plans, and be prevented from enrolling in insurance 127 plans altogether.

128 Republicans have tried and tried and tried to repeal the 129 ACA more than 70 times. We, in this majority, have been sent 130 here to protect the Affordable Care Act.

131 Thank you for the time. I yield back.

132 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

133 Next week -- I just want to announce this -- our subcommittee

134 is going to explore specific legislation to reverse the

135 administration's actions to expand the skinny plans -- the junk 136 insurance plans -- and we are also going to discuss legislation

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 137 that would restore outreach in enrollment funding that has been
- 138 slashed by the administration so we can ensure that health care
- is more affordable and accessible for all Americans.

We want to thank the witnesses that are here today. Welcome to you. We look forward to hearing your testimony, and now I would like to recognize Dr. Burgess, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, for five minutes for his opening

144 statement.

145 Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo.

Let me just take a moment to congratulate you. As you are quickly finding out, you now occupy the most important subcommittee chair in the entire United States House of

149 Representatives and I know this from firsthand experience.

We were the most active subcommittee in the United States House of Representatives in the last Congress. Hundreds of hours in hearings on health policy and certainly look forward to that continuing through this term as well.

I want to thank our witnesses all for joining us this morning. We are here to discuss the issue of protecting access to health care for individuals with preexisting medical conditions in addition to the *Texas v. Azar* case.

So I think you heard the president say this last night in the State of the Union Address. There is broad bipartisan support for providing protections for patients with preexisting

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

161 conditions.

I am glad we are holding our first hearing of the year. It is the end of the first week of February. So it is high time that we do this. It is unfortunate we are having a hearing that actually doesn't move toward the development of any policies that actually would improve health care for Americans.

To that effect, there are numerous options that you could bring before us that could moot the *Texas v. Azar* case. But the subcommittee apparently has chosen not to do so. For example, the bill to repeal the individual mandate is one that I have introduced previously.

You can join me on that effort, and if the individual mandate were repealed the case would probably -- would probably not exist.

174

You could reestablish the tax in the individual mandate, which would certainly be your right to do so and, again, that would remove most of the argument for the court case as it exists today.

You know, I hear from constituents in north Texas about -concerned about not having access to affordable health care. In the district that I represent, because of the phenomenon known as silver loading, as the benchmark silver plans' premiums continue to increase, well, if you are getting a subsidy, what, me worry -- no problem -- I got a subsidy so I am going okay.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

185

But in the district that I represent a school teacher and a policeman couple with two children are going to be covered in the individual market and they are going to be outside the subsidy window.

So they buy a bronze plan because, like everybody, they buy on price so that is the least expensive thing that is available to them and then they are scared to death that they will have to use it because the deductible is so high.

194 If you get a kidney stone in the middle of the night and, 195 guess what, that \$4,500 emergency room bill is all yours. So 196 I take meetings with families who are suffering from high health 197 care and prescription drugs costs and, unfortunately, we are not 198 doing anything to address that today.

We could be using this time to discuss something upon -to develop policies to help those individuals and families. But, again, we are discussing something upon which we all agreed but we are taking no substantive action to address.

203Look, if you believe in Medicare for all, if you believe204in a single-payer government-run one-size-fits-all health

205 system, let us have a hearing right here in this subcommittee.

206 We are the authorizing committee. That is our job.

207 Instead, we have the House Budget Committee holding those 208 hearings and Democrats on that committee are introducing

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 209 legislation. But these bills belong in the jurisdiction of the 210 Energy and Commerce Committee, and yet we have not scheduled a 211 hearing to discuss this agenda.
- 212 Do I agree with the policy or think it would be a good idea

213 for the American people to have Medicare for all or

one-size-fits-all health plan? No, I do not, and I would gladly engage in a meaningful dialogue about what such a policy would

216 mean for the American people.

217 Single-payer healthcare would be another failed attempt at 218 a one-size-fits-all approach. Americans are all different and 219 a universal health care plan that does not meet the varying needs 220 of each and every individual at different stages of their life 221 will probably not be successful.

Today, we should be focusing on the parts of the health insurance market that are working for Americans. Seventy-one percent of Americans are satisfied with employer-sponsored health insurance, which provides robust protections for individuals with preexisting conditions.

227 Quite simply, the success of employer-sponsored insurance 228 markets, it is not worth wiping that out with the single-payer 229 health care policy. Yet, the bill that was introduced last term 230 that is exactly what it did.

But today, there are a greater percentage of Americans in employer health coverage than at any time since the year 2000.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

233 Since President Trump took office, the number of Americans 234 in employer health coverage has increased by over 22 million. 235 Given that the United States economy added more than 300,000 236 jobs in January, the number of individuals and families covered 237 by employer-sponsored plans is likely even greater still.

Instead of building upon the success of our existing health insurance framework, radical single-payer government-run Medicare would tear it down. It would eliminate the employer-sponsored health insurance, private health insurance, Indian health insurance, and make inroads against taking away the VA.

Again, I appreciate that we have organized and we are holding our first hearing. I believe we could be using our time much more productively. There is bipartisan support for protecting patients with preexisting conditions. I certainly look forward to hearing the testimony of our witnesses.

249 Thank you, I yield back.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the ranking member, and let me just add a few points. You raised the issue of employer-sponsored health care. Our employer is the federal government and we are covered by the Affordable Care Act.

Number two, we, on our side, support universal coverage and so but what the committee is going to be taking up is, and you pointed out some of the -- some of the chinks in the armor of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

257 the Affordable Care Act.

We want to strengthen it and what you described relative to your constituents certainly applies to many of us on our side as well. So we plan to examine that and we will.

261 Mr. Burgess. Will the gentlelady yield on the point on 262 employer coverage for members of Congress?

263 Ms. Eshoo. Mm-hmm.

Mr. Burgess. I actually rejected the special deal that members of Congress got several years ago when we were required to take insurance under the Affordable Care Act and we all were required to join the D.C. exchange.

But we were given a large tax-free monthly subsidy to walk into that exchange. I thought that was illegal under the law. I did not take that. I bought a bronze plan -- an unsubsidized bronze plan at healthcare.gov, the most miserable experience I have ever been through in my life.

273 And just like constituents in my district, I was scared to 274 use my health insurance because the deductible was so high.

275 I yield back.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman. It would be interesting to see how many members have accepted the ACA, they and their families being covered by it.

279 And now I would like to recognize the chairman of the full 280 committee, Mr. Pallone, who asked -- who requested that this

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- hearing be the first one to be taken up by the subcommittee on
- 282 Texas -- the Texas law case, and I call on the gentleman to make
- 283 his statement.
- 284 Good morning to you.
- 285 The Chairman. Thank you.

286 Ms. Eshoo. You just shut it off.

- 287 The Chairman. I did.
- 288 Ms. Eshoo. There you go.

289 The Chairman. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for

all you have done over the years to help people get health

insurance, to expand insurance, to address the price of

292 prescription drugs and so many other things and is glad to see 293 you in the chair of this subcommittee hearing.

Now, I was going to try to be nice today. But after I listened to Mr. Burgess I can't be. You know, and I am sure this is -- he is going to see this as personal but I don't mean it that way.

But I just have to -- I have to speak out, Mr. Burgess. Look, you were the chairman of this subcommittee the whole time that the Republicans tried unsuccessfully to repeal the

301 Affordable Care Act.

I have had so many meetings where I saw you come in and take out your copy of the hearings on the Affordable Care Act and repeatedly tell us that the Affordable Care Act was bad law,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

305 terrible law, it needs to be repealed.

I saw no effort at all in the time that you were the chairman to try to work towards solutions and improving the Affordable Care Act. What I saw were constant efforts to join with President Trump to sabotage it.

And the reason that this hearing is important because the ultimate sabotage would be to have the courts rule that the ACA is unconstitutional, which is totally bogus.

You found this, you know, right-wing judge somewhere in Texas -- I love the state of Texas but I don't know where you found him -- and he -- and you did forum shopping to find him, and we know his opinion is going to be overturned.

But we still had to join a suit to say that his opinion was wrong and it wasn't based in any facts or any real analysis of the Constitution, and the reason we are having this hearing today is because we need to make the point that the Republicans are still trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

They are not looking to work with us to improve it. There were many opportunities when the senators -- Senator Lamar Alexander and others -- were trying to do things to improve the Affordable Care Act, to deal with the cost sharing that was thrown out by the president, to deal with reinsurance to make the market more competitive, and at no point was that brought up in this subcommittee under your leadership.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

329 You know, you talk about the employer-sponsored system.
330 Sure, we all agree 60 percent of the people get their insurance
331 through the employer.

But those anti-discrimination provisions that you said are protected with employer-sponsored plans they came through actions of the Democrats and the Affordable Care Act that said that you could not discriminate -- that you could not discriminate for preexisting conditions -- that you had to have an essential benefit package. Those are a consequence of the ACA.

338 So don't tell us that, you know, somehow that appeared 339 miraculously in the private insurance market. That is not true 340 at all.

Talk about Medicaid expansion, your state and so many other Republican states blocked Medicaid expansion. So there is so many people now that could have insurance that don't because they refuse to do it for ideological reasons.

You talk -- you mentioned the Indian Health Service. I love the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma had that Indian health care task force. Thank you. I appreciate that.

348 But I asked so many times in this subcommittee to have a 349 hearing on the Indian Health Care Improvement Act which, again, 350 was in the Affordable Care Act, otherwise it would never have 351 passed, and that never happened.

352 We will do that. But talk about the Indian Health service

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

-- you did nothing to improve the Indian Health Service. And
I am not -- am I not suggesting that wasn't true for the gentleman
of Oklahoma. He was very sympathetic.

But, in general, we did not have the hearing and we would not have had the Indian Health Service Improvement Act but for the ACA.

And finally, Medicare for all -- who are you kidding? You are saying to us that you want to repeal the ACA and then you want to have a hearing on Medicare for all. You sent me a letter asking for a hearing on Medicare for all.

When do -- when does a member of Congress, let alone the chairman or the ranking member, I guess, in this case, ask for a hearing on something that they oppose? I ask for hearings on things that I wanted to happen, like climate change and addressing climate change.

I don't ask for hearings on things that I oppose. I get a letter saying, oh, we should have a hearing on Medicare for all but, by the way, we are totally opposed to it. It is a terrible idea. It will destroy the country.

Oh, sure. We will have a hearing on something that you think is going to destroy the country. Now, don't get me wrong. We will address that issue. I am not suggesting we shouldn't.

375 But the cynicism of it all -- the cynicism of coming here 376 and suggesting that somehow you want -- you have solutions? You

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- have no solutions. I am more than willing to work with you.
 I am sure the ranking -- that Chairman Eshoo is willing to as
- 379 well.

But don't tell us that you had solutions. You did not and you continue not to have solutions. And I am sorry to begin the day this way but I have no choice after what you said. I mean,

it is just not -- it is just not -- it is disingenuous.

384 Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

385 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.

386 And now I will recognize the ranking member. Good morning.

387 Mr. Walden. Good morning.

388 Ms. Eshoo. The ranking member of the full committee, my 389 friend, Mr. Walden.

390 Mr. Walden. Thank you, Madam Chair. Congratulations on 391 taking over the subcommittee.

392 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

393 Mr. Walden. I always enjoyed working with you on

394 telecommunications issues and I know you will do a fine job leading

395 this subcommittee.

- 396 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.
- 397 Mr. Walden. I look forward to working with you. As we --

398 I cannot help but respond a bit. I do wish we were meeting to

399 pass bipartisan legislation and protect Americans with

400 preexisting health conditions from losing their coverage, given

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

401 the pending court case, and let me speak on behalf of Republicans 402 because we fully support protecting Americans with preexisting 403 conditions.

We have said this repeatedly, we have acted accordingly, and we mean it completely. We could and should inject certainty into the system by passing legislation to protect those with preexisting conditions, period.

On the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a powerful but simple measure to the floor that called on this body to legislate on what we all agree needs to be done, and that is to lock in protections for patients with preexisting conditions.

Unfortunately, that went down on a party line vote. Our amendment was consistent with our long-held views with respect to the American Health Care Act, which our Democratic colleagues, frankly, in some cases, continued to misrepresent.

We provided protections <u>forto</u> those with preexisting conditions under the A<u>H</u>CA. Insurance companies were prohibited from denying or not renewing coverage due to a preexisting condition, period.

Insurance companies were banned from rescinding coverage based on a preexisting condition, period. Insurance companies were banned from <u>excludingrescinding</u> benefits based on a preexisting condition, period.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

425 Insurance companies were banned from excluding benefits 426 based on a preexisting condition, period. Insurance companies were prevented from raising premiums on individuals with 427 428 preexisting conditions who maintain continuous coverage, period. 429 The fact is this is something we all agree on and we should 430 and could work together to expeditiously guarantee preexisting 431 condition protections for all Americans and do so in a manner 432 that can withstand judicial scrutiny. That is something I think 433 we could find common ground on.

And while a status check on the ACA lawsuit is interesting and important, the ruling has been stayed. The attorneys general across the country have filed appeals. Speaker Pelosi has moved to intervene in the case I think three times and Americans' premiums and coverage for this year are not affected.

But what really does affect American consumers is out of control costs of health care. That is what they would like Congress to focus on and something I think we need to tackle as well.

The fact of the matter is that for too many Americans health insurance coverage exists solely on paper because health care costs and these new high deductibles are putting family budgets in peril.

447 When the Affordable Care Act passed, Democrats promised 448 people that their insurance premiums would go down \$2,500.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

449 Unfortunately, the exact opposite has occurred for many 450 Americans, and not only have premiums gone up, not down, but think of what out-of-pocket costs have done. They have skyrocketed. 451 452 The latest solution from my friends on the other side of 453 the aisle is some sort of Medicare for all proposal. And ves, 454 we did ask for a hearing on it because I think it's something 455 that Democrats ran on, believe in fully, and we should take time 456 to understand it.

We know this plan would take away private health insurance from more than 150 million Americans. We are told it would end Medicare as we know it and would rack up more than \$32 trillion in costs, not to mention delays in accessing health services.

So, Madam Chairwoman, other committees in this body have announced plans to have hearings on Medicare for all. Speaker Pelosi has said she is supportive of holding hearings on this plan, and Madam Chairwoman, I think I read you yourself said such hearings would be important to have.

A majority of House Democrats supported Medicare for all in the last Congress. In fact, two-thirds of the committee --Democrats' 20 members, 11 whom are on this subcommittee -- have cosponsored the plan.

I think it is important for the American people to fully understand what this huge new government intervention to health care means for consumers if it were to become law.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

473 Yesterday, Dr. Burgess and I did send you and Chairman 474 Pallone a letter asking for a hearing on Medicare for all and 475 we think, as the committee of primary jurisdiction, that just 476 makes sense.

477 So as you're organizing your agenda for the future, we 478 thought it was important to put that on it. The American people need to fully understand how Medicare for all is not Medicare 479 480 at all but actually just government-run single payer health care. 481 They need to know about the 32 trillion price tag for such 482 a plan and how you pay for it. They need to know that it ends 483 employer-sponsored health care, at least some versions of it do, 484 forcing the 158 million Americans who get their health insurance 485 through their job or through their union into a one-size-fits-all 486 government-run plan.

So if you like waiting in line at the DMV, wait until the government completely takes over health care. Seniors needs to fully understand how this plan will affect the Medicare trust fund that they've paid into their entire lives and the impacts on access to their care.

Our tribes need to understand how this plan could impact the Indian Health Service and our veterans deserve to know how this plan could pave the way to closing VA health services.

495 So the question is when will we see the bill and when we 496 will have a hearing on the legislation. Meanwhile, we need to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

497 work together to help states stabilize health markets damaged498 by the ACA.

Cut out-of-pocket costs, promote access to preventive
services, encourage participation in private health insurance,
and increase the number of options available through the market.
And I want to thank Mr. Pallone for raising the issue
involving <u>SenatorSenate</u> Lamar Alexander. He and I and Susan
Collins worked very well together to try and come up with a plan
we could move through to deal with some of these issues.

506 Unfortunately, we could not get that done. So let us work 507 together to lock in preexisting condition protections. Let's-508 us tackle the ever-rising health care costs and help our states 509 offer consumers more affordable health insurance and if you are 510 going to move forward on a Medicare for all plan, we would like 511 to make sure we have a hearing on it before the bill moves forward. 512 So with that, Madam Chair, thank you and congratulations 513 again, and I yield back.

514 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the ranking member of the full committee 515 -- for his remarks. Several parts of it I don't agree with but 516 I thank him nonetheless.

517 Now we will go to the witnesses and their opening statements. 518 We will start top -- from the left to Ms. Christen Linke Young, 519 a fellow, USC-Brookings Schaeffer, Initiative for Health Policy.

520

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

521 Welcome to you, and you have five minutes and I think you 522 know what the lights mean. The green light will be on, then the 523 yellow light comes on, which means one minute left, and then the 524 red light.

525 So I would like all the witnesses to stick to that so that 526 we can get to your questions -- our questions of you, expert as 527 you are. So welcome to each on of you and thank you and you are 528 recognized.

529 STATEMENTS OF CHRISTEN LINKE YOUNG, FELLOW, USC-BROOKINGS

530 SCHAEFFER, INITIATIVE FOR HEALTH POLICY; AVIK S.A. ROY,

531 PRESIDENT, THE FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY;

532 ELENA HUNG, CO-FOUNDER, LITTLE LOBBYISTS; THOMAS P. MILLER,

533 RESIDENT FELLOW, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE; SIMON LAZARUS,

534 CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYER AND WRITER

535

536 STATEMENT OF MS. YOUNG

537 Ms. Young. Good morning. Thank you. Thank you,

538 Chairwoman Eshoo.

539 Ms. Eshoo. Get a little closer to the microphone. Thank 540 you.

541 Ms. Young. How is that? Good morning, Chairwoman Eshoo, 542 Ranking Member Burgess, members of the committee. Thank you for 543 the opportunity to testify today.

I am Christen Linke Young, a fellow with the USC-Brookings Schaeffer Initiative on Health Policy. My testimony today reflects my personal views.

547 The Affordable Care Act has brought health coverage to 548 millions of Americans. Since the law was passed, the uninsured 549 rate has been cut nearly in half. The ACA's marketplaces are 550 functioning well and offering millions of people comprehensive

551 insurance.

552 Ms. Eshoo. Do you have the -- excuse me, do you have the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 553 button pushed? Is it on? The microphone.
- 554 Ms. Young. It looks like it.
- 555 Ms. Eshoo. Maybe bring it a little closer.
- 556 Ms. Young. Is that any better?

557 Ms. Eshoo. That is better. Thank you.

558 Ms. Young. Wonderful. Thirty-seven states have expanded 559 Medicaid and many of the remaining states are considering 560 expansion proposals. Beyond its core coverage provisions, the 561 ACA has become interwoven with the American health care system.

As just a few examples, the law put in place new consumer protections in employer-provided insurance, closed Medicare's prescription drug donut hole, changed Medicare reimbursement policies, reauthorized the Indian Health Service, authorized biosimilar drugs, and even required employers to provided space for nursing mothers.

568One of the core goals of the ACA was to provide health care569for Americans with preexisting conditions and I would like to570spend a few minutes discussing how the law achieves the objective.571By some estimates, as many as half of nonelderly Americans572have a preexisting condition and the protections the law offers573to this group cannot be accomplished in a single provision or574legislative proclamation.

575 Instead, it requires a variety of interlocking and 576 complementary reforms threaded throughout the law. At the center

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

577 are three critical reforms.

578 Consumers have a right to buy and renew a policy regardless 579 of their health needs, have that policy cover needed care, and 580 be charged the same price. Further, the ACA prohibits lifetime 581 limits on care received and requires most insurers to cap copays 582 and deductibles.

583 Crucially, the law ensures that insurance for the healthy 584 and insurance for the sick are part of the single risk pool and 585 it provides financial assistance tied to income to help make 586 insurance affordable.

587 However, a recent lawsuit threatened this system of 588 protections. In *Texas v. United States*, a group of states argue 589 that changes made to the ACA's individual mandate in 2017 rendered 590 that provision unconstitutional.

591 Therefore, they puzzlingly argue that the entire ACA should 592 be invalidated, stripping away protections for people with 593 preexisting conditions and everything else in the law.

The Trump administration's Department of Justice has agreed with the claim of a constitutional deficiency and they further agree that central pillars of the preexisting condition

597 protection should be eliminated.

598 But unlike the states, DOJ argues that the weakened remainder 599 of the law should be left to stand. Other scholars can discuss 600 the weakness of this legal argument. I would like to discuss

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

601 its impacts on the health care system.

DOJ's position, that the law's core protections for people with preexisting conditions should be removed, would leave Americans with health needs without a reliable way to access coverage in the individual market.

Insurers would be able to deny coverage and charge more based on health status. In many ways, the market would look like it did before the ACA. Components of the law would formally remain in place but it is unclear how some of those provisions would continue to work.

The state's position would wreak even greater havoc and fully return us to the markets that predated the ACA. In addition to removing central protections for those with preexisting conditions, the financial assistance for families purchasing coverage, and the ACA's funding for Medicaid expansion would disappear.

617 The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the repeal 618 of the ACA would result in as many as 24 million additional 619 uninsured Americans and similar results could be expected here. 620 In addition, consumer protections for employer-based 621 coverage would be eliminated. Changes to Medicare would be 622 undone. The Indian Health Service would not be reauthorized. 623 The FDA couldn't approve biosimilar drugs.

624 Indeed, these are just some of the many and far-reaching

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

625 effects of eliminating a law that is deeply integrated into our 626 health care system.

Before I close, I would like to briefly note that *Texas v*. *United States* is not the only recent development that threatens Americans with preexisting conditions. Recent policy actions by the Trump administration also attempted to change the law in ways that undermine the ACA.

As just a few examples, guidance under Section 1332 of the ACA purports to let states weaken protections for those with health needs. Nationwide, efforts to promote short-term coverage in association health plans seeks to give healthy people options not available to the sick and drive up costs for those with health care needs.

Additionally, new waivers in the Medicaid programs allows states to place administrative burdens in front of those trying to access care.

To summarize, the Affordable Care Act has resulted in significant coverage gains and meaningful protections for people with preexisting conditions. *Texas v. U.S.* threatens those advances and could take us back to the pre-ACA individual market where a person's health status was a barrier to coverage and care.

647The lawsuit would also damage other health care policies648and this litigation coincides with administrative attempts to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 049 undermine the ACA's protections for people with preexisting
- 650 conditions.
- 651 Thank you.
- [The prepared statement of Ms. Young follows:]
- 653
- 654 ******** INSERT 1 *********

- 655 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much.
- 656 Next, Mr. Avik Roy, president of the Foundation for Research
- 657 and Equal Opportunity. Welcome.

658 STATEMENT OF MR. ROY

659

660 Mr. Roy. Chairwoman Eshoo, Ranking Member Burgess, and 661 members of the Health Subcommittee of the House Energy and 662 Commerce Committee, thanks for inviting me to speak with you 663 today.

I am Avik Roy and I am the president of the Foundation for Research on Equal Opportunity, a nonpartisan nonprofit think tank focussed on expanding economic opportunity to those who least have it.

668 When we launched in 2016, our first white paper showed how 669 universal coverage done the right way can advance both the 670 progressive and conservative values at the same time, expanding 671 access while reducing federal spending and burdensome 672 regulations.

In my oral remarks, I am going to focus on a core problem that, respectfully, Congress has failed to solve -- how to protect Americans with preexisting conditions while also ensuring that every American has access to affordable health insurance.

677 Thirty-two million U.S. residents go without coverage today.
678 Fewer than half of those eligible for subsidies in the ACA
679 exchanges have enrolled in ACA-based coverage.

This failure is the result of the flawed theory firstarticulated by MIT economist Jonathan Gruber underlying Title

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

682 1 of the Affordable Care Act -- that if Congress requires that 683 insurers offer coverage to those with preexisting conditions and 684 if Congress forces insurers to overcharge the healthy to 685 undercharge the sick, Congress must also enact an individual 686 mandate to prevent people from jumping in and out of the insurance 687 market.

We should all know by now that Professor Gruber is not omniscient. After all, in 2009, Gruber said, what we know for sure about the ACA is that it will, quote, "lower the cost of buying nongroup health insurance."

In reality, premiums have more than doubled in the ACA's
first four years and the ACA subsidies only offset those increases
for those with incomes near the poverty line.

There are two flaws with Gruber's theory, sometimes called the three-legged stool theory. First, the two ACA provisions that have had the largest impact on premiums have nothing to do with preexisting conditions.

Second, the ACA's individual mandate was so weak with so many loopholes that its impact on the market was negligible. Guaranteeing offers of coverage for those with preexisting conditions has no impact on premiums because the ACA limits the

703 enrollment period for guaranteed issue plans to six weeks in the

fall or winter.

705

The limited enrollment period, not the mandate, ensures that **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

people can't game the system by dropping in and out. While community rating by health status does cause some adverse selection by overcharging healthy people who buy coverage, thereby discouraging healthy people from signing up, among enrollees of the same age this is not an actuarially significant problem.

The largest impact is from the ACA's three to one age bans which on their own double the cost of insurance for Americans in their 20s and 30s, forcing many to drop out of the market because younger people consume one-sixth of the health care that older people do.

717 In the court cases consolidated as NFIB v. Sebelius,
718 President Obama's solicitor general, Neal Katyal, repeatedly
719 argued that if the individual mandate were ruled to be
720 unconstitutional, much of the ACA should remain but that the ACA's
721 guaranteed issue and health status community rating provisions,
722 the ones that impact those with preexisting conditions, should
723 also be struck from the law.

The Trump Justice Department has merely echoed this belief. Both administrations are more correct than the district judge in *Texas v. Azar*, who, in an egregious case of judicial activism, argued that the entirety of the ACA was inseparable from the mandate.

However, it is clear that both Justice Departments are also

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

730 wrong. The zeroing out of the mandate penalty has not blown up731 the insurance market. Indeed, it has had no effect.

To be clear, it is not just ACA enthusiasts who have bought 732 733 into Gruber's flawed theories. Many conservatives have as well. 734 A number of conservative think tank scholars have argued that 735 because they oppose the individual mandate we should also repeal the ACA's protections for those with preexisting conditions --736 737 that is, guaranteed issue and community rating by health status. 738 These scholars have argued that a better way to cover those 739 with preexisting conditions is to place them in a separate 740 insurance pool for high-risk individuals.

741 I want to state this very clearly. Those scholars are wrong.
742 The most market-based approach for covering those with
743 preexisting conditions is not to repeal the ACA's guaranteed issue
744 and health status provisions but to preserve them and to integrate
745 the principles of a high-risk pool into a single insurance market
746 through reinsurance.

I have been pleased to see Republicans in Congress support
legislation that would ensure the continuity of preexisting
condition protections irrespective of the legal outcome in *Texas*v. U.S. I hope both parties can work together to achieve this.
Both parties can further improve the affordability of
individual insurance by enacting a robust program of reinsurance
and restoring five-to-one age bans.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 754On these and other matters, I look forward to working with755all members of this committee both today and in the future to756ensure that no American is forced into bankruptcy by high medical757bills.758Thank you.759[The prepared statement of Mr. Roy follows:]760
- 761 ********* INSERT 2 **********

762 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much, Mr. Roy.

You have testified here before and we appreciate you being here again today. I would like to just suggest that for the benefit of members that you get your testimony to us much earlier, all right?

767 Mr. Roy. I apologize.

768 Ms. Eshoo. Yes.

Mr. Roy. I was, of course, officially invited to testify before this committee on Monday. I had some personal and professional obligations that limited my ability to get the -qet the testimony in a timely fashion.

773 Ms. Eshoo. Yes.

774 Mr. Roy. I will be happy to brief any members of this 775 committee or their staffs at another time.

Ms. Eshoo. Well, we thank you. I just -- I have a bad habit and I read everything and it wasn't there. So but I heard today and then we will all ask you our questions. Thank you.

779 The next witness is Ms. Hung and she is the cofounder of 780 Little Lobbyists. You are recognized for five minutes, and 781 welcome.

782 STATEMENT OF MS. HUNG

783

784 Ms. Hung. Thank you. Good morning.

Thank you, Chairwoman, Ranking Member, and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to tell my story and share my concerns with you today.

My name is Elena Hung and I am a mom. I am a proud mom of an amazing four-year-old. My daughter, Xiomara, is a happy child. She is kind and smart and funny and a little bit naughty. She is the greatest joy of my life.

792 She is at home right now, getting ready to go to school.
793 She attends an inclusive special education pre-K program, and
794 I asked her if she wanted to come here today. She said she wanted
795 to go to school instead.

The second se

She uses a tracheostomy tube to breathe and a ventilator for additional respiratory support. She relies on a feeding tube for all of her nutrition. She participates in weekly therapies to help her learn how to walk and talk. But I am thrilled to tell you that Xiomara is thriving today.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

805 This past year was her best year yet healthwise and,

(202) 234-4433

ironically, it was also when her access to health care has been the most threatened. I sit before you today because families like mine -- families with medically complex children -- are terrified of what this lawsuit may mean for our kids.

You see, our lives are already filled with uncertainty -uncertainty about diagnoses, uncertainty about the effects of medications and the outcomes of surgeries. The one certainty we have is the Affordable Care Act and the health care coverage protection it provides.

815 We don't know what Xiomara's future holds, but with the ACA's 816 protections in place we know this. We know Xiomara's 10 817 preexisting conditions will be covered without penalty, even if 818 we switch insurance plans or employers.

We know a ban on lifetime caps means that insurance companies cannot decide that her life isn't worth the cost and cut her off care just because she met some arbitrary dollar amount.

We know we won't have to worry about losing our home as a result of an unexpected hospitalization or emergency. We know Medicaid will provide the therapies and long-term services and supports that enable her independence.

I sit before you today on behalf of families like mine who fear that the only certainty we know could be taken away, pending the outcome of this lawsuit -- this lawsuit that seeks to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions -- and if that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

happens our children's lives will then depend on Congress where every so-called replacement plan proposed over the last two years has offered far less protection for our kids than the ACA does. I sit here before you today on behalf of Isaac Crawley, who lost his insurance in 2010 after he met his lifetime limit just a few weeks after his first birthday, but got it back after the ACA became law;

Myka Eilers, who was born with a preexisting congenital heart defect and was able to obtain health insurance again when her dad reopened his own business after being laid off;

Timmy Morrison, who spends part of his childhood in hospitals, both inpatient and outpatient, because his insurance plan covers what is essential to his care;

Claire Smith, who has a personal care attendant and is able to live at home with her family and be included in her community, thanks to Medicaid;

846 Simon Hatcher, who needs daily medications to prevent

847 life-threatening seizures, medications which would cost over

848 \$6,000 without insurance;

Colton Prifogle, who passed away on Sunday and was able to spend his final days pain-free with dignity, surrounded by love, because of the Hospice care he received.

These are my friends, my friends that I love. These are Xiomara's friends. This is our life. I co-founded the Little

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Lobbyists, this group of families with medically complex

855 children, some of -- some of whom are here today, because these 856 are stories that desperately need to be told and heard alongside 857 the data and numbers and policy analysis.

There are children like Xiomara in every state. That's millions of children with preexisting conditions and disabilities across the country. I sit before you today on the eve of another trip to the Children's Hospital.

Tomorrow I will hold my daughter's hand as I walk her to the OR for her procedure, and as I have done every time before, I know I will drown in worry as a mother does.

But the thing that has always given me comfort is knowing that my government believes my daughter's life has value and that the cost of medical care she needs to survive and thrive should not financially bankrupt us.

It is my plea for that to always be true.

870 Thank you.

871 [The prepared statement of Ms. Hung follows:]

872

873 ******** INSERT 3 *********

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

874 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Elena. Beautiful testimony.

- 875 Beautiful testimony. I wish Xiomara were here. Maybe we can
- 876 provide a tape so that when she gets older she can hear her mother's
- 877 testimony in the Congress of the United States. Thank you.
- I now would like to recognize Mr. Thomas Miller, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Welcome, and thank you. You have five minutes.

881 STATEMENT OF MR. MILLER

882

883 Mr. Miller. Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo. The mortifying 884 silent C in my written testimony in your name must have been due 885 to the speed with which I delivered the testimony on time. But 886 I apologize for that.

887 Thank you also, Ranking Member Burgess and members of the 888 subcommittee. Now let us all take a deep breath and get to it. 889 The Texas case remains in its relatively early stages. Its 890 ultimate fate is as much as another 16 months away. The 891 probability of a Supreme Court ruling that would overturn the 892 entire ACA remains very, very low just by last December's decision at the federal district court level. 893

894 Any formal enforcement action to carry out that decision 895 has been stayed while the case continues on appeal. We have been 896 here before. Two longer-term trends in health policy persist 897 -- our over reliance on outsourcing personal health care decisions 898 to third party political intermediaries and then our chronic 899 inability to reach compromises and resolve health policy issues through legislative mechanisms. They have fuelled a further 900 901 explosion in extending health policy battles to our courts. 902 So welcome back to Groundhog Day, ACA litigation version. 903 The plaintiff's overall case is not frivolous but it does rely heavily on taking the actual text of the ACA literally and thereby 904

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

905 limiting judicial scrutiny to what the Congress that enacted 906 appeared on the limited record of that time to intend by what 907 it did.

908 The plaintiffs are attempting to reverse engineer and 909 leverage the unusually contorted Supreme Court opinion of Chief 910 Justice Roberts in *NFIB v. Sebelius*.

911Now, come critics insist that the 115th Congress that zeroed912out the mandate tax also expressed a clear intent to retain all913other ACA provisions. This ignores the limited scope of what914that Congress had power to do through the vehicle of budget915reconciliation in the tax-cutting Jobs Act. All that its members916actually voted into law was a change regarding individual mandate.

917

It did not and could not extend to the ACA's other nonbudgetary regulatory provisions nor did it change the findings of facts still in statutory law first made by the 111th Congress that insisted the individual mandate was essential to the functioning of several other ACA provisions, notably, guaranteed issue and adjusted community rating.

The plaintiffs are not out of bounds in trying to hold Congress to its past word. It happens once in a while. And in building on the similar reasoning used by other Supreme Court majorities to strike down earlier ACA legal challenges.

928 Since that's the story for ACA defenders they should have

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

929 to stick to it, at least until a subsequent Congress actually 930 votes to eliminate or revise those past findings of fact already 931 in permanent law.

But even if appellate courts had -- also find some form of constitutional injury in what remains of the ACA's individual mandate as a tax-free regulatory command, the severability stage of such proceedings will become far more uphill for the plaintiffs.

937 Most of the time the primary test is functionality in the 938 sense of ascertaining how much of the remaining law with the 939 Congress enacting it believe could be retained and still operate 940 as it envisioned.

941 Given the murkiness of divining or rewriting legislative 942 intent in harder cases like this one, it remains all about certain 943 that an ultimate Supreme Court ruling would, at a minimum, follow 944 up previous inclinations revealed in the 2012 and 2015 ACA 945 challenges and try to save as much of the law as possible.

946Even appellate judges in the Fifth Circuit will note947carefully the passage of time, the substantial embedded reliance948costs, and the sheer administrative and political complexity of949unwinding even a handful of ACA provisions on short notice.950So don't bet on more than a narrow finding that could sever951whatever remains of an unconstitutional individual mandate

952 without much remaining practical impact from the rest of the law.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

953 On the health policy front, we might try to remember that 954 when congressional action produces as flawed legislative product

955 justified in large part by mistaken premises and

956 misrepresentations, it won't work well.

957 The ACA's architects and proponents oversold the 958 effectiveness and attractiveness of the individual mandate, 959 claiming it could hold the law's insurance coverage provisions 960 together while keeping official budgetary costs and coverage 961 estimates within the bounds of CBO's scoring.

But what worked to launch the ACA and keep it viable in theory and politics did not work well in practice and, to be blunt, one of the primary ways that the Obama administration sold its proposals for health policy overhaul was to exaggerate the size, scope, and nature of the potential population facing coverage problems due to preexisting health conditions.

968 Of course public policy should address remaining problems. 969 It could and should be improved in other less prescriptive and 970 more transparent ways than the ACA attempted.

971 My written testimony suggests a number of option available 972 to lawmakers if some of the ACA's current over broad regulatory 973 provisions were stricken down in court in the near future. 974 However, we are not back in 2012 or 2010 or even 2017 anymore,

975 at least outside of our court system. Changes in popular

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

976 expectations and health industry practices since 2010 are

(202) 234-4433

- 977 substantial breaks on even well-structured proposals for serious reform. But that is where the real work needs to be restarted. 978 It is often said with apocryphal attribution that God takes 979 980 care of children, drunks, or fools, and the United States of 981 Well, let's not press our luck. America. 982 To produce better lawsuits, fewer lawsuits, let us try to 983 write and enact better laws. 984 Thank you. 985 [The prepared statement of Mr. Miller follows:] 986
- 987 ******** INSERT 4 *********

- 988 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.
- And now our last witness, Mr. Thomas Miller, resident fellow
- 990 -- I am sorry -- Mr. Simon Lazarus, constitutional --
- 991 Mr. Miller. I think he's younger than I am.
- 992 Ms. Eshoo. -- constitutional lawyer and writer. Welcome.
- It is lovely to see you and thank you for being here to be a
- 994 witness and be instructive to us.
- 995 You have five minutes.

996 STATEMENT OF MR. LAZARUS

997

998 Mr. Lazarus. Thank you, Chair Eshoo, and Ranking Member 999 Burgess and members of the subcommittee. My name is Simon 1000 Lazarus. I am a lawyer and writer on constitutional and legal 1001 issues relating to, among other things, the ACA.

I have had the privilege of testifying before this subcommittee and other congressional committees numerous times. I am currently retired and the views that I express here are my own and cannot be attributed to any of the organizations for which I previously worked or other organizations.

I have to say that I am not sure how important my task is because I think all of the witnesses have pretty much agreed with the bottom line and that includes the witnesses invited by the minority, and that is that this decision to invalidate the entire ACA is, in significant respects and I think many of us agree that in all respects, completely baseless legally and has close to zero chances of being upheld on appeal.

And in light of all of that, Tom, I have to -- I am puzzled by your assertion that the lawsuit is not frivolous because that sounds to me like the definition of frivolousness in a lawsuit. In any event, I think it should be underscored that it is not a coincidence that even the minority witnesses think very little of this lawsuit because as soon as the decision came down

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1020 it was attacked in extremely strong terms across the political 1021 spectrum.

As the Wall Street Journal editorialized, while no one opposes Obamacare more than we do, Judge O'Connor's decision is likely to be overturned on appeal. Legal experts, including prominent anti-ACA conservatives, have blistered Judge

1026 O'Connor's result.

For example, Phillip Klein, the editor -- executive editor of the Washington Examiner, called the decision an assault on the rule of law. Professor Jonathan Adler, who is an architect of the second fundamental legal challenge to the ACA -- that's King v. Burwell -- which I think the idea for which was hatched at a meeting that you probably hosted --

1033 Mr. Miller. I have been here before.

Mr. Lazarus. Okay. And that effort to kill the ACA was rejected by the Supreme Court in 2015. In any event, Professor Adler called the decision, quote, "an exercise of raw judicial power unmoored from the relevant doctrines concerning when judges may strike down a whole law because of a single alleged legal infirmity buried within it."

1040And on the courts, if one is going to be a prognosticator,1041just look at the basic facts. Chief Justice John Roberts'

1042 pertinent opinions nearly ensure at least a 5-4 Supreme Court

1043 majority to reverse Judge O'Connor and, moreover, it should be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1044 noted that Justice Brett Kavanaugh, looking at his prior decisions

1045 as a D.C. circuit judge, also looks very likely to join a larger 1046 majority to reverse Judge O'Connor.

1047 So my job here is just to try to explain what the legal reasons 1048 are for this negative judgment on O'Connor's decision so I am 1049 going to try to briefly do that.

To begin with, the court could well dismiss the case for lack of standing to sue on the part of any of the plaintiffs who brought the case. The state government plaintiffs barely pretend to have a colorable standing argument.

1054 The two individual plaintiffs complain that though it is 1055 enforceable the mandate nonetheless imposes a legal obligation 1056 to buy insurance and they would feel uncomfortable violating that 1057 obligation.

The problem with this is that Chief Justice Roberts in his 2012 NFIB v. Sebelius decision, which upheld the mandate, expressly ruled that and based his decision, really, on the determination that if individuals did not buy insurance, thus, quote, "choosing to pay the penalty rather than obtain insurance" they will have fully complied with the law.

Now, post-TCJA -- the Tax Cut and Jobs Act -- a nonpurchaser will still not be in violation of the law simply because Congress reduced to zero the financial incentive to choose the purchase option.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1068 So no one is compelled the buy insurance in order to avoid 1069 a penalty since none exists nor to follow the law because he will 1070 be following or she will be following the law.

1071 So there is no injury period, no standing to sue. That is 1072 a very likely result, even in the Fifth Circuit, I would say.

1073 Ms. Eshoo. Mr. Lazarus, can you just summarize --

1074 Mr. Lazarus. Okay. I am sorry.

Well, in addition, I would just say on the merits the ACA's mandate provision remains a valid exercise of the tax power and that is pretty much for the same reasoning that there is no standing and that is because Congress's determination after the original ACA passed to drop the penalty to zero did not strip Congress of its constitutional power under the -- under the tax authority.

1082 And nor can its subsequent determination sensibly mean that it was no longer using that power. And finally, I would just 1083 1084 want to add really to what other people have said and some of 1085 the members of the subcommittee have eloquently said, that to 1086 take the further leap that if the -- if the mandate provision is unconstitutional after the passage of -- after the reduction 1087 1088 of the penalty to zero, which it really should not be found, but if it is there is absolutely no basis whatsoever for holding --1089 1090 for striking down the rest of the ACA.

1091 [The prepared statement of Mr. Lazarus follows:]

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1092

1093 ******** INSERT 5 *********

1094 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much.

1095 All right. I am going to -- we have how concluded the 1096 statements of our witnesses. We thank you again for them. Each 1097 member will have five minutes to ask questions of the witnesses 1098 and I will start by recognizing myself for five minutes.

1099 I appreciate the discussion about the legalities and, of 1100 course, we are discussing *Texas v*. *United States* today. But the 1101 issue of preexisting conditions keeps coming up and I would like 1102 Ms. Young and anyone else to chime in.

This issue of what our Republican colleagues say that they are for, and I listen to C-SPAN a lot and especially during the days running up to the election and they covered Senate races and House races, and I heard Republicans over and over and over again in those debates with their opponents saying, I am for preexisting conditions.

1109 Now, can anyone address how you extract that out of what 1110 we have now, the Affordable Care Act, and have standalone

iiio we have now, the arrorable care act, and have standarone

1111 insurance policies? Where is the guarantee about what the price

- 1112 would be for that policy?
- 1113 Would you like to --
- 1114 Ms. Young. The Affordable Care Act -- absolutely.
- 1115 Ms. Eshoo. Uh-huh.
- 1116 Ms. Young. Can you hear me okay?
- 1117 Ms. Eshoo. Uh-huh.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1118 Ms. Young. Great. The Affordable Care Act requires that 1119 all insurance plans charge consumers the same price regardless 1120 of --

Ms. Eshoo. That I understand. That's what we put in. But the -- but the minority is saying that they are for preexisting conditions except they have voted against the ACA countless times. So if you were to extract just that one issue and write a bill on it, where is the guarantee that -- on what the price would be for that standalone policy?

1127 Ms. Young. In my view, it is very difficult to put together 1128 a system of protections for people with preexisting conditions 1129 that doesn't include a panoply of reforms similar to many of the 1130 reforms that were included in the Affordable Care Act.

1131 So you need to ensure people can buy a policy. You need 1132 to ensure that that policy doesn't exclude coverage for their 1133 particular health care needs.

You need to ensure that they are able to purchase at a fair price and you needed to surround that with reforms that really create a functioning insurance market by providing financial assistance, stable risk adjustment, and other associated

1138 provisions like that.

1139 Ms. Eshoo. I want to get to something that is out there 1140 and that is what I refer to in my opening statement. I refer 1141 to them as junk plans. It is my understanding that many of these

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 1142 plans exclude coverage for prescription drugs, for mental health
- 1143 and substance use disorders.
- 1144 Who would like to address this? Is this correct?

1145 Ms. Young. I can address that.

1146 Ms. Eshoo. Uh-huh. Go ahead.

1147 Ms. Young. I believe you are referring to short-term

1148 limited duration coverage.

1149 Ms. Eshoo. Right. Mm-hmm.

1150 Ms. Young. Those plans are not required to cover any

1151 particular benefit and many of them can and likely will exclude

1152 coverage for benefits like prescription drugs, maternity care,

1153 substance use and mental health services, things like that.

1154 Ms. Eshoo. Now, are these plans medically underwritten?1155 Ms. Young. Many of them are, yes.

1156 Ms. Eshoo. And how does that differ from the process by 1157 which Americans get health insurance on the individual market 1158 today?

Ms. Young. Medical underwriting refers to a process where insurance companies require individuals to fill out a detailed health history questionnaire and then use the resulted of that to determine if the individual can purchase a policy and if so on what terms.

1164That was a common practice in the individual market before1165the Affordable Care Act. It is permitted for short-term limited

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1166 duration plans today.

In contrast, in the ACA -- compliant individual market, insurers are not prohibited to medically underwrite. Consumers sign up for a policy based only on information about their age and their income if they are seeking tax credits with no health history screening.

1172 Ms. Eshoo. I see. Mr. Lazarus --

1173 Mr. Miller. Chairwoman Eshoo, could you ask the rest of 1174 the panel and we are getting a one-sided view of this. The ACA's 1175 protections are --

1176 Ms. Eshoo. I didn't call on you. I would like to call on 1177 Mr. Lazarus. Are you giving us comfort that the lawsuit is not 1178 going to go anywhere? Is that what you believe?

Mr. Lazarus. I think all of the witnesses have basically said that, at least with respect to the notion that if the mandate provision is now found to be unconstitutional, which I don't think it will be or should be, the quantum leap that the Republican attorneys general and Judge O'Connor took to then say the whole law has to go, I don't think any member of the panel thinks that there is much chance of that occurring.

1186 So I don't know whether that answers your -- that doesn't 1187 mean, however, that the -- that the fact that there is this dagger 1188 pointed at the heart of our health care system is out there causing 1189 uncertainty, that it was -- basically, opponents of the ACA have

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

outsourced to a judge, which Chairman Pallone correctly said was forum -- was a target of forum shopping who has a widespread reputation of, one article said, tossing out Democratic policies that Republican opponents don't like.

1194 Ms. Eshoo. I think my time has more than expired. Thank 1195 you.

1196 I now would like to recognize the ranking member of the 1197 subcommittee, Dr. Burgess.

1198 Mr. Burgess. I thank you for the recognition.

1199 Mr. Miller, let me just give you an opportunity. You were 1200 trying to respond with something about the ACA protections.

1201 Mr. Miller. Sure. It is a complex issue, but we need to 1202 remember that in the best of the world, the ACA left a lot of 1203 other folks unprotected. If you didn't comply with the 1204 individual mandate you didn't get coverage. You got fined. You

1205 got insult on top of injury and there is no coverage to it.

1206 So there are breakdowns in any imagined perfect system. 1207 There are other approaches which can also fill that hole. You 1208 are going to have to put some money in. You are going to have 1209 to resolve.

1210I don't think the Republicans did a good job of it in 20171211in explaining and defining what that meant. They began

1212 backfilling as they went along with reinsurance. There are ways 1213 to extend HIPAA over to the individual market.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1214 Those are all thoughtful alternative approaches, and if you 1215 don't have an individual mandate you should come up with something 1216 else and we are not going to have an individual mandate. That 1217 appears to be the case.

So you are leaving a hole there and there are other ways to provide stronger incentives and it requires some robust protections where if you went into something like a high-risk pool or an invisible risk pool you could requalify for that full-scale portability after 18 months.

So there are ways to connect the dots. It is heavier lifting and it is more work than just waving your arms and saying, we mandated it -- it must work, even though it doesn't.

1226 Mr. Burgess. And I thank you for that clarification and 1227 just continuous coverage was part of the bill that we worked on 1228 two years ago.

1229 Mr. Miller. A number of options. Yes.

1230 Mr. Burgess. Which, of course, is what exists in Medicare. 1231 I mean, if you do not purchase Medicare within three months of 1232 your sixty-fifth birthday, guess what? You get an assessment

1233 for the rest of your life that -- in Part B of Medicare.

So, Mr. Miller, I actually agree with you and I guess other witnesses. My expectation is that this case will not be successful on appeal and I base that on the fact that I have been

1237 wrong about every assumption I have made about the Affordable

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1238 Care Act ever since its inception in 2009.

1239 So perhaps I can be wrong about that assumption but I do 1240 assume that it will not -- that it will not survive on appeal. 1241 Let me just ask you, because I have had difficulty finding 1242 this information -- you may have some sense -- how much money 1243 has been collected under the individual mandate? The fines that 1244 have been paid -- do we have an idea what that dollar figure is? 1245 Mr. Miller. Yes. I did that a couple years ago in the Ways 1246 I knew it was going to come up today. I can supply and Means. 1247 it for you.

1248 Mr. Burgess. Great.

1249 Mr. Miller. This is -- with a bit of a lag it ends up being 1250 calculated. Not a lot, and it's somewhat randomly distributed. 1251 It tends to be the lower income people who didn't know how to 1252 get out of the individual mandate who ended up paying it,

1253 surprisingly enough. But it did not amount to a large amount

1254 and it didn't have a lot of coverage effects.

1255 Mr. Burgess. So, basically, the effect of the Tax and Jobs 1256 Act of 2017 was current law because no one behaved as if it was 1257 a real thing anyway.

1258 Mr. Miller. Well, it had some other ripple consequences. 1259 But in that practical consequences were not as significant as 1260 is often said.

1261 Mr. Burgess. Well, let me ask you this. I mentioned in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1262 my opening statement that perhaps ways to end this lawsuit would 1263 be to either repeal the individual mandate outright or reestablish 1264 the tax within the individual mandate. Do you agree that that 1265 is -- either of those activities would --

1266 Mr. Miller. That requires actually legislating, which is 1267 a hard thing to do these days on Capitol Hill.

1268 Mr. Burgess. I think -- yes, sir. But it would achieve 1269 the goal of breaking the lawsuit.

1270 Mr. Miller. Sure. And there is lots of other things. I 1271 mean, states could pay us their own individual mandate. As I 1272 said, you could also just rescind your findings of fact in the 1273 old Congress and say, we were wrong -- we are sorry.

1274 Mr. Burgess. I don't think that is going to happen.

1275 Let me -- let me just ask you. I mentioned the phenomenon 1276 of silver loading in my opening statement. Would you walk us 1277 through, for people who are not familiar with that as a technical 1278 term --

1279 Mr. Miller. Sure.

1280 Mr. Burgess. -- the phenomenon of silver loading?

1281 Mr. Miller. It is a bit of a ripple of the other litigation 1282 over the cost-sharing reduction subsidies and that has got a 1283 tangled web in itself.

But, cleverly, a number of states, insurance regulators, and insurers figured out a way to game the system, which is how

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1286 do you get bigger tax credits for insurance by increasing your 1287 premiums.

1288 There was also worry about what those market were doing, 1289 which fueled some of that increase, and a lot of spikes in the 1290 individual market over the previous two years as a result of that 1291 and the silver loading embellished that.

1292 Now, that was great for folks who were already covered where, 1293 because of the comprehensiveness of their subsidy income related, 1294 they weren't out any extra dollars as those premiums went up.

But the folks in the rest of the individual market -- and Avik can talk to this as well -- that is where we had our coverage losses and that is where you got the damage being done. Those are the victims -- the by-products of doing good on one hand and it spills over into other people.

1300 Mr. Burgess. That's the teacher and policeman that I 1301 referenced in my district who have two children. They are outside 1302 the subsidy window.

1303 Mr. Roy, could you just briefly comment on the effect of 1304 a Medicare-for-all policy on what union members receive as their 1305 -- as their health insurance?

1306 Mr. Roy. Well, I mean, of course, there are many different 1307 definitions of Medicare for all but if we define it as the 1308 elimination of private insurance then, obviously, union members 1309 who have either Taft-Hartley-based plans or employer-sponsored

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

insurance that would be replaced by a public option or something

1311 like that. I assume that is what you mean.

1312 Mr. Burgess. Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you for being 1313 here.

1314 I yield back.

1315 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Ranking Member.

And who are we going to? To recognize the gentlewoman from the great state of California and its capital, Sacramento -- Ms. Matsui.

1319 Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1320 Thank you all for joining us today. The topic of this 1321 hearing is incredibly important to me and my constituents and 1322 all Americans whose lives have been changed by the Affordable 1323 Care Act.

A special thank you to Ms. Hung for sharing her daughter's story and for your incredible advocacy work on behalf of children and families everywhere.

When we started writing the ACA nine years ago, I consulted with a full range of health care leaders in my district in Sacramento. They called together the hospitals, the health plans, the community health centers, the patients, and all those who contribute to our health care systems and all those who use it also.

1333 Everything was carefully constructed. We tried to think

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

about everything but, obviously, you can't think of everything.
But we consulted as widely as possible because we also knew that
each policy would affect the next and the system as a whole.

You simply cannot consider radical changes to the law in a vacuum yet that is exactly what this ruling of the lawsuit does. By using the repeal of the individual mandate in the GOP tax bill as justification of this suit, the court has declared the entire Affordable Care Act invalid.

Millions of Californians and Americans stand to lose critical health protections including protections for people especially with preexisting conditions. Vital protections for Medicare beneficiaries including expanded preventive services and closing the prescription drug donut hole will be thrown into chaos.

I was pleased to join my colleagues to vote for the House of Representatives to intervene in this lawsuit and defend the ACA in our continued fight to protect people with preexisting conditions and for the health care of all Americans and I think you know that that is something that all Americans care about when you think about preexisting conditions. Everybody has some sort of pre-existing conditions.

For me, the potential consequences of the lawsuit are too great to not fully consider, especially for the impact on people confronting mental illness and substance abuse.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

The passage of the ACA was a monumental step forward in our fight to confront the mental health and substance abuse crisis in this country and led to the largest coverage gains for the mental health in a generation through the expansion of Medicaid.

1362 Ms. Linke Young, can you briefly discuss why the consumer 1363 protections of the ACA are so important to individuals struggling 1364 with mental illness or substance abuse?

Ms. Young. Absolutely. Preexisting law -- law that existed prior to 2009 established a baseline protection for people with mental illness that said that if their insurance plan covered mental illness -- mental health needs -- then it had to do so on the same terms that it covered -- it covered their physical treatment.

But it didn't require any insurance product to include coverage of mental health benefits. And so it was typical for coverage in the individual market to exclude -- to exclude mental health benefits completely.

With the Affordable Care Act, plans were required to include coverage for mental health and substance use disorder services and to do so at parity on the same terms as they include -- as they include coverage for physical health benefits and that brought mental health benefits to tens of millions or -- about 10 million Americans who wouldn't have otherwise had it.

1381 In addition, the Medicaid expansion in the 37 states and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

D.C. and that have taken that option has enabled many, many people with serious mental health needs including substance use disorder to access treatment that they would not otherwise have been able to access.

Ms. Matsui. So this would be very serious and I am thinking about the 37 states that did expand Medicaid if this decision was upheld.

I just really feel, frankly, that it is difficult enough when you have mental illness or someone in your family goes the stigma that is attached to it, whereas with the Medicaid expansion lelieve that most people will seek the treatment that they really need.

1394 And what do you foresee with the loss of this expansion if 1395 it were to happen?

Ms. Young. If federal funding for Medicaid expansion was no longer available then the states that have expansion in place would need to choose whether to find state funding to fill that gap or to scale back their expansion or cut benefits or reduce provider rates or some combination of those policies.

1401The Congressional Budget Office and most experts expect that1402many states would retract the expansion and move those residents1403that were covered through expansion off the Medicaid rolls and1404most of them are likely to become uninsured and would not continue

1405 to have access to mental health and substance use disorder

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1406 coverage.

1407 Ms. Matsui. So, in essence, we will be going backwards then

1408 once again. Okay.

1409 Thank you very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

1410 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Ms. Matsui.

1411 I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky,

1412 Mr. Guthrie.

1413 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you very much, and again,

1414 congratulations on your --

1415 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.

1416 Mr. Guthrie. -- on being the chair. I enjoyed being vice 1417 chair -- vice a couple of times and learned a lot about the health 1418 care system and moving forward.

1419 And I know today the title is how does the Texas case affect 1420 preexisting conditions and I think we are hearing from everybody 1421 that it would probably be near unanimous if we did a legislative 1422 fix to preexisting conditions regardless of where the case goes 1423 and so I was listening to Dr. Burgess talk earlier about having 1424 a hearing for Medicare for all, and I think the chair of the full committee said that, well, why would you want to have a hearing 1425 1426 for a piece of legislation you say you're not for.

1427 I think it is important for us to talk about and the issues 1428 that would come because there are, I think, at least four or five 1429 presidential candidates that already said they were for it.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1430 So it is not just some obscure bill that somebody files every 1431 year. It has now gotten into the public space that we need to 1432 discuss.

And Ms. Hung, I appreciate your testimony. I have nothing compared to your issues with your child but I had a son that had some issues when he was a boy. He is 23 now, and so about a month of just what is going to happen.

So I understand the preexisting conditions, and then another year and a half, maybe two years, in and out of children's hospitals. But we got the best words a parent can hear when a physician walks in, we know what the problem is now and we can fix it.

1442 Matter of fact, just last fall he thought he was having some 1443 problems -- so he lives in Chicago, west of Chicago. Went to 1444 see a -- to a doctor with him and the doctor said, hey, it is 1445 something else -- it is something routine we can treat. He goes, 1446 by the way, you had a really great surgeon when he was eight. 1447 So we were just reinforced with it. So everything kind of works. 1448 And so what has kind of impressed me, and I guess I am going to just talk a little bit instead of ask questions, but what has 1449 1450 always impressed me about the care -- Vanderbilt Children's 1451 Hospital is where we were -- that he has received and just the

1452 innovation our health care system is producing.

1453 It is absolutely amazing innovation coming out in our health

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1454 care system. The artificial pancreas is real now. People can
1455 have it now. You can cure hepatitis C with a pill. It is just
1456 amazing what is happening in some people -- with some people,
1457 not a lot. It is not universal but stage four melanoma is being
1458 cured with precision medicine.

I mean, those things are happening in our health care system. They are expensive, and my biggest concern if we go to a government-run that we just lose that health care. We innovate and the world, and President Trump talked about it a little last night, is living off our investment in innovation. But if we don't invest and innovate, who is going to do it and who is going to have the care that we have?

As a matter of fact, we are investing and innovating so quickly, this committee spent an awful lot of time over the last couple of years to put 21st Century Cures in place so the government regulatory structure can keep up with the vast investment.

1471 I know we spent a lot of time in the last couple years doing 1472 oversight. I hope we will continue to do oversight of 1473 implementation of 21st Century Cures.

1474 So my only point is, and I will yield back in just a couple 1475 seconds, is that it is important when we look at such massive 1476 changes to our health care system the way people get health 1477 insurance.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1478You know, most people still get it through their employer.1479Is that going to go away? People get it through -- we talked1480about the Indian Health Services. Is that going to go away?

1481 Is it a road to get rid of the VA?

Just there is so much change that is proposed in what people boil down to one -- a bumper sticker, Medicare for All -- that it has implications for everybody. It has implications for the whole country, and universal coverage is a positive thing.

But if you get to the -- I tell you, if you get to the Medicare reimbursements throughout the entire health care system, I am convinced we won't have the innovation that completely -- my son is completely healed -- that had some innovative surgeries -for his privacy I won't say -- but 15 years ago that now are probably completely different on what you see.

My cousin is a NICU doctor and the stuff that -- the babies that he now sees that are surviving, and we have a colleague here that had a daughter born without kidneys who I guess -- Abby must be about five or six now.

And so it is just -- that is a concern and I think that when we are going to have a piece of legislation that has kind of been boiled down to a bumper sticker but it is going to have impact on everybody living in this country and everybody throughout the world because I wish the world would help subsidize some of the innovations that we are producing -- that it is worthy for us

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 1502 to have serious discussions and not just dismiss it as we are 1503 not being serious.
- So and I can tell you I am, I know Dr. Burgess is and I think the rest of the committee would be, and I appreciate you guys all being here and sharing your stories.
- 1507 But we can fix preexisting conditions. I think we are all 1508 on board with that, and Madam Chair, I yield back.
- 1509 Ms. Eshoo. I thank you, Mr. Burgess. Always a gentleman.

1510 Let us see. Who is next? The chairman of the full

- 1511 committee, Mr. Pallone.
- 1512 The Chairman. Thank you.
- I wanted to ask Ms. Young a couple questions -- really, one question. On the day of the Texas district court's ruling, President Trump immediately praised Judge O'Connor's decision to strike down protections for preexisting conditions.
- 1517The next day he referred to the ruling as, quote, "great1518news for America," and just last week in an interview with the1519New York Times, President Trump boaested that the Texas lawsuit1520will terminate the ACA and referred to the ruling as a victory.
- 1521 In his testimony, Mr. Roy claims that President Trump 1522 supports protecting people with preexisting conditions. I think 1523 that could not be further from the truth. The truth is President 1524 Trump has sought to undermine and unravel protections for more 1525 than 130 million Americans living with preexisting conditions

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1526 and, understandably, that is not a record that Republicans want 1527 to promote.

But I also want to remind folks that since this is not a fact that my colleagues on the other side seem to want to acknowledge and that is that the Republican lawsuit brought by Republican attorneys general, who asked the district court to strike down the entire ACA.

So the fact that my colleagues and our minority witnesses today are trying to disassociate themselves from Judge O'Connor's ruling which did exactly what the Republican AGs asked for, I think is guite extraordinary.

1537 Mr. Roy asserts in his written testimony that Congress should 1538 pass a simple bill reiterating guaranteed issue and community 1539 rating in the event that the district court's decision is upheld 1540 by the Supreme Court.

So and then we have this GOP bill or motion during the rules package where they said that, you know, they would do legislation that would only include guaranteed issue and community rating and that would ensure sufficient protections for preexisting conditions, whatever the courts decide.

So, basically, Ms. Young, I have one question. Can you explain why what Mr. Roy is asserting -- that reinstating only these two provisions on guaranteeing issue and community rating -- is insufficient to protect individuals with a preexisting

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1550 condition and the same, of course, is with the House GOP bill 1551 that would do that.

1552 Why is this not going to work to actually guarantee 1553 protection for individuals with preexisting conditions? 1554 Ms. Young. The district court's opinion, as you note, 1555 struck down the entirety of the ACA. So not just its protections 1556 for people with preexisting conditions but the financial assistance available to buy marketplace coverage, funding for 1557 1558 Medicaid expansion, a host of provisions in Medicare, protections 1559 through the employer insurance and associated reforms.

1560 So a standalone action that reinstated two preexisting 1561 conditions protections without wrapping that in the financial 1562 assistance and the risk adjustment and the Medicaid expansion 1563 and the other components of the ACA that are, in my view, important 1564 to make the system function, would not restore the system that 1565 we have today where people with preexisting conditions have access 1566 to a functioning market where they can buy coverage that meets their health needs. 1567

In fact, there have been some efforts by the Congressional Budget Office to score various proposals that keep some types of preexisting condition protections in place but eliminate the financial assistance, and the Congressional Budget Office, under some scenarios actually find that those lead to even greater coverage losses than simply repealing the Affordable Care Act.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

So implementing those two provisions on their own without financial assistance and other protections would be insufficient. The Chairman. I mean, I think this is so important because, you know, the -- you know, again, Mr. Roy and he is just reiterating what some of my Republican colleagues say. They just neglect all these other things that are so important for people with preexisting conditions.

You didn't mention junk plans. I mean, my intuition tells me, and I am not -- you know, I talk to people about it in my district -- you know, that if you start selling these junk plans that don't provide certain coverage, one of the things it is important for people with preexisting conditions to have a robust plan that provides coverage for a lot of things that didn't exist before the ACA.

1588 I mean, that is, again, important -- the fact that you have 1589 a robust essential benefits is also important for people with 1590 preexisting conditions, too, right?

1591 Ms. Young. Those are both critical protections. In 1592 particular, the ACA seeks to ensure that insurance for the healthy 1593 and insurance for the sick are part of a single combined risk 1594 pool.

1595 Efforts to promote short-term plans or other policies that 1596 don't comply with the ACA protections siphon healthy people out 1597 of the central market and drive up costs for those with preexisting

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1598 conditions and anyone else seeking --

1599 The Chairman. Yes. So you are pointing out the very fact 1600 that you have a larger insurance pool, which has resulted from 1601 the ACA in itself, is important for people with preexisting 1602 conditions and if you take out the healthier or the wealthier 1603 because they -- because you don't have a mandate anymore that 1604 hurts them too, correct?

1605 Ms. Young. Efforts to move healthier people out of the 1606 individual market will increase premiums for those that remain 1607 in complaint coverage, yes.

1608 The Chairman. All right. Thank you so much.

1609 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Pallone.

1610 And now I want to recognize the ranking member of the full 1611 committee, Mr. Walden.

1612 Mr. Walden. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I want to thank 1613 all of our witnesses. We have another hearing -- an important 1614 one -- going on downstairs. That is why some of us are bouncing 1615 back and forth between climate change and health care.

And I want to -- I want to again say thank you for being here and reiterate that as Republicans we believe strongly in providing preexisting condition protection for all consumers and if you go back to 1996 when HIPAA was passed under Republicans we provided for continuous coverage protection for people with pre-ex.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I mean, this is something we believe in before ACA and something I believe in personally and deeply and something that we are ready to legislate on, and I think at least giving that guarantee and certainty to people would make a huge level of comfort for them.

1627 And I just -- you know, I know -- I didn't mean to shake 1628 things up this morning but asking for a hearing on Medicare for 1629 all was something I thought was appropriate, given that other 1630 committees are already announcing their hearings, and that going 1631 back to when ACA was shoved through here and then Speaker Pelosi 1632 saying we had to pass it so you could find out what is in it, 1633 we don't want to repeat that. We need to know what is in it. 1634 We need thoughtful consideration. I think this committee is 1635 the place to have that. So I still think that is important.

1636 I want to thank both Tom and Avik for being here -- Mr. Roy 1637 for being here on short notice. You said, Mr. Roy, that Congress 1638 should pass a simple standalone measure guaranteeing that

1639 insurers offer coverage in the individual health insurance market 1640 to anyone regardless of prior health status.

1641 Mr. Roy. Yes, I did.

1642 Mr. Walden. And do you want to respond? You didn't get 1643 a chance to kind of respond here. So do you want to respond to 1644 what was asked of the other witnesses around you?

1645 Mr. Roy. Well, thank you, Mr. Walden. I appreciate the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1646 opportunity to actually explain my written testimony --

1647 Mr. Walden. Go ahead.

1648 Mr. Roy. -- in this setting. The key here is that

1649 three-fourths of the variation of the premiums in health insurance

1650 in a fully underwritten market are associated with age, not health

1651 status or gender or anything else -- preexisting conditions.

1652 Mr. Walden. Okay.

Mr. Roy. So the point is if everybody of the same age -all 27-year-olds, all 50-year-olds, all 45-year-olds -- if all 45-year-olds are charged the same premium, the variation in premium is between the healthy paying a little more and the sick paying a little less is not that big of a difference. It doesn't cause a lot of adverse selection.

1659 What drives adverse selection in the ACA is the fact that 1660 younger people are forced to pay, effectively, double or triple 1661 what they were paying before --

1662 Mr. Walden. Right.

Mr. Roy. -- to allegedly subsidize the premiums for older people. So revising age bands would be a huge step in moving in the right direction. Reinsurance, which is effectively a high-risk pool within a single risk pool, would help basically also reduce the premiums that healthy people pay so that people with preexisting conditions could get better coverage.

1669 So you can have a standalone bill that would ensure that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1670 people have -- with preexisting conditions have access to

1671 affordable coverage.

Mr. Walden. I would hope so. I think it is really important. I mean, we were for preexisting protections. I was for getting rid of the insurance caps before ACA. I thought they were discriminatory against those who through no fault of their own had a consequence of -- consequential health issues that could have blown through their lifetime caps.

1678 And so I think there are things we could still find common 1679 ground on and I wonder if you want to address the Medicare for 1680 all proposal as well.

Now, we haven't seen it spelled out. I know the Budget Committee is, I guess, having it scored and hearings on it. But I am concerned about the impacts it may have on delay in terms of getting health care. I am concerned about what it might do to the Medicare trust fund.

1686 Do you have -- do you want to opine on that while you are 1687 here?

1688 Mr. Roy. Well, I have written a lot at Forbes and elsewhere 1689 about how Medicare for all from a fiscal standpoint is unworkable 1690 because of the gigantic transfers it would assign to the federal 1691 government.

1692It would increase federal spending by somewhere between \$281693trillion and \$33 trillion over a 10-year period, which would be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1694 an increase in overall federal spending of 71 percent.

1695 Now, that is not if -- that excludes the impact of cutting 1696 what you pay hospitals and doctors and drug companies by 50 1697 percent, which is what you would have to do to effectively make 1698 the numbers work.

I do want to urge you, Mr. Walden, and your colleagues that while Medicare for all is unworkable and I think most people know that, the status quo is unacceptable, too.

1702 Mr. Walden. Right.

1703 Mr. Roy. And I think it is extremely important for this 1704 committee in particular to tackle the high cost of hospital care, 1705 the high cost of drug prices.

That was -- if I had stayed on as chair 1706 Mr. Walden. Yes. 1707 that was going to be our big priority this cycle. Surprise 1708 billing -- I mean, you go in. You have a procedure. You have 1709 played by all the rules and it turns out the anesthesiologist that put you under wasn't in your program and you get billed. 1710 1711 That is wrong. That is just -- I think we can find common ground

1712 on that one.

We took on the issue of getting generic drugs into market and under the change in the law we passed last year, Dr. Gottlieb now has set a record for getting new generics in the market and driving both choice and innovation but also price down, and this administration -- I have been in the meetings with the president

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

and CEOs of the pharmaceutical companies. He is serious about getting costs down on drugs and getting to the middle part of this, too.

We need to look from one end to the other and, Madam Chair, I722 I think we can find common ground here to do that and get transparency, accountability so consumers can have choice and so we can drive down costs.

1725 I have used up my time and I thank our witnesses again. 1726 Madam Chair, I yield back.

1727 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the ranking member.

We plan to examine all of that and I think -- I hope that we can find common ground on it because these are issues that impact all of our constituents and they need to be addressed.

And on the surprise billing, I know that the Senate is trying

1732 to deal with it and we should hear as well. I think that your 1733 clock is not working at the witness table.

1734 Mr. Roy. That is correct.

1731

1735 Ms. Eshoo. But it is working up here, okay. So maybe you 1736 can refer to that one.

1737 Now I would like to call on the gentlewoman from Florida,1738 Ms. Castor.

Ms. Castor. Thank you, Madam Chair. Witnesses, thank you very much for being here and, colleagues, thank you for all of your attention here.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I just think it is so wrong for the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress to continue to try to rip affordable health care away from American families, especially our neighbors with preexisting conditions.

This lawsuit is just a continuation of their efforts to do that. When they couldn't pass the bill here in the Congress -in the last Congress, despite Republican majorities, and I am sorry to say that my home state of Florida under Rick Scott's administration joined that federal lawsuit.

Thirteen Democratic members of the Florida delegation have written to our new governor and attorney general, asking -- urging them to remove the state of Florida from the federal lawsuit that would kill the Affordable Care Act and rip health coverage away from American families including individuals with preexisting health conditions.

1757 This follows the letter we sent to Rick Scott as well and 1758 I would like to ask unanimous consent that these letters be 1759 admitted into the record of this hearing.

1760 [The information follows:]

1761

1762 ********COMMITTEE INSERT 6 ********

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Ms. Castor. American families are -- they are simply tired of the assault on affordable health care and, Chairwoman Eshoo, you raised the point about the skimpy junk insurance plans because one way that the Trump administration and Republicans are trying to undermine affordable care are these junk health plans that do not provide fundamental coverage.

When you pay your hard-earned copayment and premiums, you should actually get a meaningful health insurance policy, not some skimpy plan that is just going to subject you to huge costs.

1772 These sub-par and deceptive junk plans exclude coverage for 1773 preexisting conditions. They discriminate based on age and 1774 health status and your gender.

Consumers are tricked into buying these junk plans, mistakenly believing that they are the comprehensive ACA plan but then they are faced with huge out-of-pocket costs. For example, in a recent Bloomberg article Dawn Jones from Atlanta was enrolled in a short-term junk plan when she was diagnosed with breast cancer. Her insurer refused to pay for her cancer treatment, leaving her with a \$400,000 bill.

Another patient in Pennsylvania faced a \$250,000 bill -in unpaid medical bills because her junk short-term policy did not provide for prescription drug coverage and other basic services.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1786 The Trump administration now is actively promoting these

(202) 234-4433

junk plans and I want American families and consumers across the country to be on alert. Don't buy in to these false promises. Ms. Young, you have talked a little bit about this but will you go deeper into this? Help us educate families across the country. I understand that these plans often impose lifetime and annual limits. Is that correct?

1793 Ms. Young. It is, yes.

1794 Ms. Castor. And that is something the Affordable Care Act 1795 outlawed?

1796 Ms. Young. Correct.

1797Ms. Castor. Can you describe what these plans typically1798look like and what kind of coverage they purport to provide?1799Ms. Young. Short-term limited duration insurance is not1800regulated at the federal level. None of the federal consumer1801protections apply. Some state law protections may apply or --1802Ms. Castor. Consumer protections -- name them.

1803 The requirement that plans cover essential Ms. Young. 1804 health benefits, the prohibition on annual and lifetime limits, 1805 the requirement that the insurance company impose a cap on the 1806 total copays and deductibles an individual can face over the year, 1807 requirements to cover preventive services, to not exclude -- to 1808 not exclude coverage for preexisting conditions and other --1809 Ms. Castor. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I have heard

1810 some of my Republican colleagues say they are all in favor of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1811 that. But can you be in favor of preexisting condition protection 1812 on the one hand and then say, oh, yeah, we believe these junk 1813 insurance plans are the answer, like the Trump administration 1814 and Republicans in Congress are promoting?

1815 Ms. Young. Short-term limited duration plans do not have 1816 to comply with the requirements about preexisting conditions. 1817 That is correct.

Can you describe why an individual who is 1818 Ms. Castor. 1819 healthy when they sign up for one of these junk plans could still 1820 be subject to hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical bills? 1821 There is no requirement that short-term plans Ms. Young. 1822 cover any particular health care cost. So an individual who 1823 doesn't read the fine print behind their policy might discover, 1824 for example, that the plan only covers hospital stays of a few 1825 days and individuals are on the hook for all additional hospital 1826 expenses.

They may find that the plan has a very low annual limit so that once they have spent \$10,000 or \$20,000 they are responsible for bearing the full cost or any variation like that where they simply discover when they need to access the health care system that the plan doesn't include the coverage that they had -- that they had hoped to purchase.

1833 Ms. Castor. Thank you very much, and we will be working 1834 to ensure that consumers are protected and when they pay their

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 1835 premiums and copays they actually get a meaningful health
- 1836 insurance policy.
- 1837 Thank you, and I yield back.
- 1838 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentlewoman.

1839 I now would like to call on Mr. Griffith from Virginia.

1840 You are recognized for five minutes.

1841 Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I

1842 appreciate it.

Here is the dilemma that we have. In my district, which is financially stressed in many parts of it -- I represent 29 jurisdictions in rural southwest -- always put the pause in there -- Virginia.

So when ACA came in so many of my people immediately came to me, long before the Trump administration came in, and in their minds the ACA was junk insurance, because when they were promised that their premiums would go down they now had premiums that were financially crippling.

1852 When they were promised that they would have better access, 1853 they now found that they had high deductibles and they now found 1854 that their copays had gone through the roof.

So there is no question -- I never argued -- that the preexisting condition was a problem that should have been dealt with long before the ACA, and I understand the concerns and the frustration that people had who had preexisting conditions and

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1859 we need to take care of that and we will take care of that. 1860 I don't see anybody who would argue at this point that we 1861 shouldn't deal with people with preexisting conditions and make 1862 sure they have access to affordable health care, which is why 1863 I supported our attempts to get an amendment put in on day one 1864 of this Congress that would say get the -- the committees of 1865 jurisdiction.

1866 In fact, it referenced the Energy and Commerce Committee 1867 -- this committee -- and the Ways and Means Committee to report 1868 out a bill that took care of all of the concerns we have heard 1869 today and said it quarantees no American citizen can be denied 1870 health insurance coverage as the result of a previous illness 1871 or health status and guarantees no American citizen can be charged 1872 higher premiums or cost sharing as the result of previous -- of 1873 a previous illness or health status, thus ensuring affordable 1874 health coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

1875 That is where we are. That is what we stand for. So, you 1876 know, I find it interesting that this debate has become -- you 1877 know, and I am hearing about junk insurance and how, you know, 1878 Republicans are evil that they want junk insurance.

1879 I hear it on a regular basis that my people think that what 1880 they have got now is junk. It is all they can afford and it is 1881 costing them a fortune.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1882 So, Mr. Roy, what do you have to say about that?

(202) 234-4433

1883 Mr. Roy. I have found the conversation we have been having 1884 about so-called junk insurance interesting because nobody seems 1885 to be asking the question as to why people are voluntarily buying 1886 so-called junk insurance.

1887 They are buying it because the premiums are half or a third 1888 or a quarter of what the premiums are for the Affordable Care 1889 Act for them.

1890 Mr. Griffith. And if you can't afford something else you 1891 are going to buy something that you can afford. Isn't that 1892 correct?

1893 Mr. Roy. A hundred percent. So a plan that has all the 1894 bells and whistles but it is unaffordable to you is, effectively, 1895 worthless whereas a plan that may not have all the bells and 1896 whistles but at least provides you some coverage is.

And the great tragedy of the Affordable Care Act is that we did not have to have that dichotomy. We could have had plans that had robust coverage for people with preexisting conditions and protections for people regardless of health status and yet were still affordable.

1902 I have outlined it both in my written testimony, in my oral 1903 testimony, and many, many other documents that I have presented 1904 to this committee in the past how we could achieve that.

1905 Mr. Griffith. Now, you would agree with me for those people 1906 who may have bought the junk insurance without knowing what they

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

were getting into that we probably ought to pass something that says that the things that aren't going to be covered -- if you're only getting \$20,000 worth of care and then you have to take the full bill after that, as Ms. Castor talked about.

1911 We should have that in bold language on the front of the 1912 policy. You would agree that we should put some consumer 1913 protection in that and make sure there is transparency so people

1914 are well-advised of what they are getting or not getting. Isn't 1915 that true?

1916 Mr. Roy. I have no problem with robust disclosure about 1917 what is in a short-term limited duration plan versus an 1918 ACA-compliant plan. To a degree, we already have that in the 1919 sense if you are buying off the ACA plan I think most consumers 1920 know that those plans have fewer protections but more disclosure

and more clarity in disclosure would be a good thing.

1922 Mr. Griffith. Absolutely. I agree with that.

1923 You know, what is interesting is everybody seems to have 1924 gone after Judge O'Connor. I don't know him. I haven't studied 1925 his opinions.

But I do find this interesting. I thought it was the right thing to do. He put a stay on his ruling so it didn't create a national catastrophe or suddenly people are having to scramble to figure out what to do.

1930 Mr. Miller, isn't that a little unusual in this day -- I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1931 mean, people have accused him of being biased or having a political 1932 bent and using his power. But I seem to recall all kinds of 1933 opinions by judges that I thought were coming from a slightly 1934 different philosophical bent but who went out there on a limb, 1935 stretched -- pushed the envelope of the law.

But instead of saying, now, let us wait until the appeal is over and make sure this is right before we affect the average citizen they just let it go into effect. But Judge O'Connor said, no, in case this is overturned I want to make sure nobody is adversely impacted and put a stay on his own ruling.

1941 Isn't that unusual and wasn't that the right thing to do? 1942 Mr. Miller. No, it is not -- it is hopscotch. We have had 1943 some federal judges who have had nationwide injunctions reaching 1944 way beyond what you would think would be the normal process.

1945 Mr. Griffith. Yes. I have noticed that.

1946 Mr. Miller. I think all the parties understood what 1947 practically was going on here. I would just point out on the

1948 legalities of this, just to clean up the record, one of the things 1949 about --

1950 Ms. Eshoo. Just summarize quickly because your time is up.

1951 Mr. Miller. My time is up. Okay.

1952 Mr. Griffith. You could summarize, she said.

1953 Ms. Eshoo. Quickly.

(202) 234-4433

1954 Mr. Miller. I will just say, real fast, we left out the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1955 argument about tax guardrails, which was in Chief Justice Roberts'

1956 opinion and Si is exaggerating what is there and isn't there.

1957 The problem is that when you take it apart there is nothing

1958 left behind.

1959 Ms. Eshoo. Okay. I think your time is expired.

1960 Mr. Miller. It was his testimony was that this tax didn't

1961 exist anymore.

1962 Ms. Eshoo. All right. We are now going to go to and 1963 recognize Dr. Ruiz from California.

1964 Mr. Ruiz. Thank you. It is so wonderful to be on this 1965 committee finally. So thank you to all --

1966 [Laughter.]

1967 Ms. Eshoo. He hasn't stopped celebrating.

1968 Mr. Ruiz. Thank you to all the witnesses for joining us 1969 today. We have over 130 million Americans that have preexisting 1970 conditions. The ACA defended full protections for people with 1971 preexisting conditions and those are three components.

One is that insurance companies cannot deny insurance to people with preexisting conditions; two, they cannot deny coverage of specific treatments related to the preexisting condition illness; and three, they cannot discriminate by increasing the prices towards people who have a preexisting

1977 condition.

1978 Let me give you some examples of some of the benefits and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1979 hardships that people would face if this lawsuit is completed.
1980 My district is home to Desert AIDS Project, an FQHC that was
1981 founded in 1984 to address the AIDS crisis.

1982 It is the Coachella Valley's primary nonprofit resource for 1983 individuals living with HIV/AIDS. They have grown to become one 1984 of the leading nonprofits and effective HIV/AIDS treatment in 1985 the nation.

And the folks at Desert AIDS Project know how to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Basically, you need prevention and you need treatment. They told me that the ACA has been critical in providing treatment to the HIV -- in order to get the HIV viral load at an uninfectious low level.

So the problems before the ACA was that insurance companies didn't used to have to pay for HIV tests, for example, or individuals with HIV couldn't get Medicaid coverage until they were really sick on full-blown AIDS, many already on their death beds.

1996 Now, because of the ACA insurance companies must cover 1997 essential health benefits like HIV tests and anti-viral 1998 medications which, by the way, the folks on the other side have 1999 attempted to repeal.

2000 Because of the ACA and the Medicaid expansion many 2001 HIV-infected middle class families now have health insurance for 2002 the very first time. Unfortunately, I can't say that for HIV

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2003 patients throughout our country including in states like Texas 2004 that didn't expand the Medicaid coverage.

And, by the way, this is another example of ACA that those on the other side attempted to repeal. Before the passage of the ACA, 90 percent of Desert AIDS Project clients did not have health insurance and now, with the ACA, 99.9 percent of clients have health insurance coverage in Desert AIDS Project.

Let me repeat that statistic. Insurance coverage for these patients from only 10 percent to 99.9 percent because of the ACA. And yet, the president, while claiming to be committed to eliminating the HIV/AIDS epidemic in 10 years, is actively taking measures to take away these protections of this very population by rolling back the Medicaid expansion and weakening and undermining preexisting conditions protections.

2017 This would be devastating to Desert AIDS Project clients 2018 and patients and, yet, this is just one example of the devastation 2019 that repeal of the ACA would cause on individuals with preexisting 2020 conditions.

2021 Ms. Young, could you discuss the potential impact of the 2022 lawsuit on individuals with preexisting conditions if the 2023 district court's decision is upheld?

2024 Ms. Young. If the district court decision were to be upheld 2025 as written, it would disrupt the coverage for people with 2026 preexisting condition in all segments of the insurance market.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2027 So we talked a lot about the individual market. The core 2028 protections in the individual market today would be eliminated 2029 along with the financial assistance that enables them to afford 2030 coverage and make those markets stable.

In employer coverage, people with preexisting conditions would also face the loss of certain protections. They would once again be exposed to lifetime or annual limits and they could -they could face unlimited copays.

2035 Mr. Ruiz. Let me get to another point because, you know, 2036 we are hearing a lot of political trickery here in the 2037 conversations. A number of the folks on the other side have 2038 introduced bills that will pick and choose which one of these 2039 three components that make up full protections for preexisting 2040 conditions that they want to have in certain bills.

For example, one bill says, we want guaranteed issue and community rating which will help keep the costs low for everybody

2043 but don't include the prohibition on preexisting coverage

2044 exclusions.

2045 Another bill excludes -- includes guaranteed issue and the 2046 ban on preexisting coverage exclusion but does not include the 2047 community rating, saying, well, let us charge people with

2048 preexisting more than other folks.

2049 So they claim these bills are adequate to protect consumers 2050 with preexisting conditions. Can you explain why these bills

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2051 are inadequate to protect individuals with preexisting

2052 conditions?

2053 Ms. Young. Very briefly. Requiring insurance companies 2054 to sell a policy but allow preexisting condition exclusions 2055 requires them to sell something but it doesn't have to have 2056 anything in it. It is a little bit like selling a car without 2057 an engine.

2058 And allowing unlimited preexisting condition rate-ups it 2059 tells the consumer that they can buy a car but they could be charged 2060 Tesla prices even if they are buying a Toyota Camry. That is 2061 not what the Affordable Care Act does. It puts in place a 2062 comprehensive series of protections.

2063 Mr. Ruiz. Thank you.

2064 Ms. Eshoo. Your time has expired. I thank the gentleman.

2065 I now would like to recognize Dr. Bucshon from Indiana.

2066 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, and congratulations on your

2067 chairmanship. Look forward to working with you.

I am a physician. I was a heart surgeon before I was in Congress and we all support protections for preexisting conditions. Look, I had a couple of patients over the years who I did heart surgery on who had -- one had had Hodgkin's disease in his 20s and his entire life after that he could not afford health coverage, and that is just plain wrong. We all know that. I had an employee of mine whose wife met her lifetime cap

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2075 because of a serious heart condition and had to ultimately go 2076 onto Medicaid. That is not right.

2077 So I think Republicans have -- for many years have supported 2078 protecting people with preexisting conditions. I think we are 2079 in a policy discussion about the most appropriate way to do that.

2080

And so I really think what we should be focusing on is to make sure that people actually have coverage that they can afford -- quality affordable health coverage, and under the ACA, as was previously described, the deductibles can be very high. You couldn't keep your doctor and your hospital, as everyone said that supported the ACA and so we are not meeting that goal.

And now we have heard from the Democrats about Medicare for all and their bill in the last Congress, H.R. 676, would have made it illegal for private physician practices to participate in a government health care program. And by the way, Medicare for all doesn't even solve the main problem we have in health care, which is the huge cost.

I keep telling people if you continue to debate how to pay for a product that is too expensive, you are not going to catch up. It doesn't matter who is paying for it. It doesn't matter if the government is paying for it or a partial hybrid system like we have now.

2098

So I am hoping we can have some hearings on how we get the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2099 cost down, and the insurance problem kind of almost can solve 2100 itself if we can do that.

We should be talking about the fact that people with 2101 2102 preexisting conditions really don't have protections and it 2103 doesn't work if you don't have actual access to a physician. 2104 So Mr. Miller and Mr. Roy -- I will start with Mr. Roy --2105 can you talk about what could happen in the U.S. if private 2106 physician practices were not allowed to participate in a single 2107 payer program, hypothetically, and would that create access 2108 issues for patients?

2109 Mr. Roy. Well, we already have access issues for patients 2110 in the Medicaid program. A lot of physicians don't accept

2111 Medicaid --

2112 Mr. Bucshon. That is correct.

2113 Mr. Roy. -- even though they theoretically participate 2114 in the Medicaid program. That is also an increasing problem in 2115 Medicare because there are disparities in the reimbursement rates 2116 between private insurers, Medicare, and especially Medicaid.

2117 And this is one of the other flaws in the ACA is it relied 2118 on a program with very poor provider access to expand coverage. 2119 I think the exchanges at least have the virtue of using private 2120 insurers to expand coverage rather than the Medicaid program with

2121 its much lower reimbursement rates.

2122 Mr. Bucshon. So I would argue that, you know, then if you

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

go to a Medicare for all you have access issues on steroids,

2124 potentially, and especially if you -- if you don't allow private

2125 practice physicians -- what I am saying nonhospital or

government-employed physicians, which is what we would all be

2127 -- to participate in the program, which is actually not what other

2128 countries do.

2129 In England, for example, you can have your private practice 2130 and also participate in the National Health Service.

2131 Mr. --

2132 Mr. Miller. [Speaking off mic]

2133 Mr. Bucshon. I think -- can you turn on your mic, Mr. Miller?

2134 Mr. Miller. Oh, I thought I had it on. It looks like --

2135 Mr. Bucshon. There it is.

2136 Mr. Miller. Okay. You are more likely to have Medicaid 2137 for all than Medicare for all until you solve the -- and say stop, 2138 we can't deal with that. The problem is we would love to give 2139 away all kinds of stuff. We just don't want to pay for it.

2140 Now, we can shovel it off into ways in which you get less 2141 than what was promised and say we have done our job. We did that 2142 to an extent with the ACA. You find the lowest cost way to make 2143 people think they are getting something that is less than what 2144 they actually received.

2145 That is why the individual market as a whole has shrunk in 2146 recent years. It is because those people who are not

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2147 well-subsidized in the exchanges are finding out they can't afford 2148 coverage anymore.

2149 Mr. Bucshon. So, I mean, and I will stick with you, Mr. 2150 Miller. I mean, do you think if the iteration of Medicare for 2151 all bans private practice physicians not to be able to participate 2152 that we would put ourselves at risk of creating a two-tiered system 2153 where the haves can have private coverage and there can be private 2154 hospitals as there is in other countries?

2155 Mr. Miller. Well, we have got -- already we have got plenty 2156 of tiers in our system to begin with. It would exacerbate those 2157 problems and I don't think we would live with it politically, 2158 which is why we would probably short circuit.

2159 But it is at least a danger when people believe in the theory 2160 of what seems easy but the reality is very different.

2161 Mr. Bucshon. Yes. I mean, I would have an ethical problem 2162 as a physician treating patients differently based on whether 2163 or not they are wealthy or whether or not they are subjected to 2164 a Medicare for all system, right.

2165 So, ethically, I can tell you physicians would have a 2166 substantial problem with that. Other countries kind of do that 2167 because that is just the way it is there and I think in many 2168 respects their citizens don't have a problem with it because that 2169 is just what they have always lived with.

2170 But I would agree with you that in the United States there

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2171 would be some issues.

2172 Mr. Roy, do you have any comments on that?

I would just like to add that at the 2173 Mr. Rov. I do. 2174 Foundation for Research on Equal Opportunity we put together a 2175 detailed proposal for private insurance for all where everyone 2176 buys their own health insurance with robust protections for 2177 preexisting conditions and health status and robust financial 2178 assistance for people who otherwise can't afford coverage in a 2179 way that is affordable, that would actually reduce federal 2180 spending by \$10 trillion over three decades but would ensure 12 2181 million more people have access to health insurance than do today 2182 under current law.

2183 So there are ways to address the problem of affordability 2184 and access of health insurance while also reducing the underlying 2185 cost of coverage and care and making the fiscal system more 2186 sustainable.

2187 Mr. Bucshon. Yes. I mean, I think we should be also putting 2188 focus on the cost of the product itself, right, and it is -- the 2189 reasons why it costs so much are multi-factorial. It is a free 2190 market system.

The other thing is is I told my local hospital administrators that if we get Medicare for all get ready to have a federal office in your private hospital that tells you how to run your business.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I yield back.

2194

- 2195 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the doctor.
- 2196 And last, but not least, Mr. Rush from Illinois is recognized
- 2197 for five minutes for question.
- 2198 Mr. Rush. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2199 Madam Chair, I also want to congratulate you for your

2200 becoming chair of the subcommittee and --

2201 Ms. Eshoo. I thank you very much.

2202 Mr. Rush. -- I have been a member of Congress for quite 2203 -- for, as you have, for over 26 years and this is my first time 2204 being a member of this subcommittee and I am looking forward to 2205 working with you and other members of the subcommittee.

I want to -- as I recall the -- when this Affordable Care Act was passed there were millions of Americans who were without health insurance totally. They were uninsured. They had no help at all, no assistance from anyone to deal with their illnesses and their disease.

2211 And since the act was passed, approximately 20 million 2212 Americans have gained health coverage including over a million 2213 in my state and I don't want to overlook that fact. I don't want to get that fact lost in other kind of -- in the minutia of what 2214 2215 we -- some of the -- of any one particular aspect of our discussion. 2216 In 2016, almost 14,000 of my constituents received health 2217 care subsidies to make their health care more affordable, and 2218 one aspect of the ACA that I like is insurance companies must

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2219 now spend at least 80 percent of their premium on actual health 2220 care as opposed to other kinds of pay for CEOs and also for an 2221 increase of their profits.

And the insurance rate has increased between -- the uninsured rate, rather, has increased between the years 2013 and 2017 -since 2017 in my state.

2225 Ms. Young, how many Americans would expect to lose coverage 2226 if this court decision in Texas were upheld?

Ms. Young. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that repeal of the Affordable Care Act against their 2016 baseline would result in 24 million additional uninsured Americans and upholding the district court's decision we could expect sort of broadly -- broadly similar results with adjustments for the new baseline.

2233 Mr.

Mr. Rush. Mm-hmm.

I want to ask Ms. Hung, you've been sitting here patiently, remarkably, listening to a lot of discussion between experts. But how do you feel about your daughter? How do you feel? What is your reaction to all of this as it relates to the looming problem

that you have if this case is upheld?

2239 Ms. Hung. Thank you. No one is going to sit here and say 2240 that they are not going to protect preexisting conditions, right. 2241 No one is going to say that. But that is what we have seen.

2242 That is what families like mine has seen -- repeal efforts,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2243 proposals that don't cover preexisting conditions or claim to 2244 give a freedom of choice to choose what kind of insurance we want. 2245 Well, the choice that I want is insurance that covers, that 2246 guarantees that these protections are in place. I don't want 2247 to sit in the NICU at my daughter's bedside wondering if she is 2248 going to make it and also then have to decide what kind of insurance 2249 I am going to buy and imagine what needs that she will have in 2250 order to cover that.

2251 So I sit here and say, well, what worked for me is that I 2252 got to spend 169 days at my daughter's bedside without worrying 2253 about whether we would go bankrupt or lose our home, and that 2254 is the guarantee that we need.

2255 Mr. Rush. Madam Chair, I yield back.

2256 Ms. Hung. Thank you.

2257 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

I now would like to call on another new member of the subcommittee and we welcome her, Ms. Blunt Rochester from the

2260 small but great state of Delaware.

2261 [Laughter.]

2262 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

2263 First of all, thank you so much for your leadership. It

is an honor for me to be on this subcommittee. And excuse me,

2265 I had competing committees for my first day of subcommittees and

so I have been running back and forth.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

But this is a very important topic and I want to acknowledge Ms. Hung. The last time I saw you we were at a press event with then Leader Pelosi highlighting the Little Lobbyists and the work that you do and have been doing, and just your support of protecting preexisting conditions for children across the country.

2273 And it is really admirable that you advocate not only for 2274 your child but for all children across the country and have been 2275 fighting for decades. And I was hoping that you could talk a 2276 little bit about the formation of the Little Lobbyists and who 2277 they are, what it is all about, how it formed.

Ms. Hung. Thank you, Congresswoman, and thank you for your support. I did not set out to start the Little Lobbyists. It kind of just happened. We were following the news with families like mine, families with children with complex medical needs and disabilities.

2283 We are very concerned. We are very worried and we decided 2284 to speak up and tell our stories, and I tell my story because 2285 I know that many have been fortunate to not experience the 2286 challenges and hardships that we have seen. I also know that 2287 many have not experienced the joy and gratitude that I had in 2288 being Xiomara's mother.

2289 So I feel a responsibility to uplift these stories that we 2290 weren't -- we weren't seeing being represented. Now, I have spent

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2291 my -- more than my fair share of time in the hospital. I have 2292 witnessed my baby on the brink of life and death one too many 2293 times.

I know what is possible with access to health care -- quality health care -- and I think I can say that I have a profound understanding, more than many Americans, how fragile life is and it is with that understanding that I have chosen to spend my time raising that awareness.

I acknowledge my privilege. I acknowledge my proximity to Washington, D.C. to come here. There are so many stories like mine across the country of families who are just fighting for their children, who want to spend that time on their kids and not worrying about filing for bankruptcy or losing their home or wondering if they can afford lifesaving medication.

2305 Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yes, that was going to be my next 2306 question. How does this uncertainty affect your family? How 2307 is it affecting individuals that you work and are talking to and 2308 other Little Lobbyists?

2309 It is everything. It is everything. Ms. Hung. So the uncertainty is not knowing. I mean, we don't know what the future 2310 2311 holds. None of us do. But to add this on top of what we are 2312 going through, on top of the NICU moms that I know that are 2313 worrying, who are trying to keep their jobs and trying to be there for their children, to add this level of uncertainty on top of 2314

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2315 it is just devastating.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. I wanted to have your voice heard. I know from hearing that we have a lot of great experts and a great panel here and I would like to bring it back to what this is all about. Maybe -- I don't know if I am the last one speaking or the last, but I wanted to bring it back to why we are doing this and why we are here.

I have served the state of Delaware in different capacities as our deputy secretary of health and social services. I have been in state personnel so I have seen health care from that perspective and also from advocacy perspective as CEO of the Urban League.

But hearing your story makes this real for us and is really one of the reasons why I wanted to be on this committee. So I thank you for your testimony. I thank the committee for your expert testimony and I yield back the balance of my time.

2331 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much.

2332 I don't see anyone else from the Republican side.

2333 Mr. Burgess. There's some people coming back, but proceed.

2334 Ms. Eshoo. Okay. All right. We will move on.

2335 I now would like to cal -- recognize the gentleman from

2336 California, Mr. Cardenas.

2337 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, and thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo 2338 and Ranking Member Burgess, for -- and all the staff for all the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

work that went into holding this hearing of this committee and I appreciate all the effort that has gone into all of the attention that we are putting forth to health care both at the staff level and at the member level and certainly for the advocates in the community as well.

Thank you so much for your diverse perspectives on what is important to the health and well-being of all Americans.

I think while the legal arguments and implications of this case are important, I want to take a few minutes to focus on the very personal threats posed by these attacks to the Affordable Care Act.

2350This ruling, if upheld, would take away health care for tens2351of millions of Americans, including our most vulnerable,

especially children and seniors. They are especially at risk and people with preexisting conditions, we would see them just be dropped from the ability to get health care.

For some of us, this is literally a death -- life and death situation and, as lawmakers, I hope that we don't lose sight of the fact of how critical this is, and as the lawmakers for this country I hope that we can move expeditiously with making sure that we can figure out a way to not allow the courts to determine the future and the fate of millions of Americans when it comes to their health care and health care access.

Also, I want to thank everybody who is here today, and also

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

the court's ruling would ideologically and politically, you know, follow through with the motivation that I believe close to 70 times or so in this Congress there was an effort to end it, not mend it, when it comes to the Affordable Care Act and I think it is inappropriate for us to look at in such a black and white manner.

There are cause and effects should the Affordable Care Act 2369 2370 I happen to be personally one of those individuals that qo away. 2371 through a portion of my childhood did not have true access to 2372 health care and it's the kind of thing that no parent should go 2373 through and the kind of situation that no American should ever 2374 have to contemplate, waiting until that dire moment where you 2375 have to go to the emergency instead of just looking forward to 2376 the opportunity to, you know, sticking out your tongue and asking 2377 the doctor questions and they ask you questions and they find 2378 out what is or is not wrong, and that is the kind of America that 2379 used to be.

And since the Affordable Care Act, imperfect as it is, that is not the America of today. The America of today means that if a young child has asthma, that family can in fact find a way to get an equal policy of health care just like their neighbor who doesn't have a family member with a preexisting condition. So with that, I would like to, with the short balance of my time, ask Ms. Hung could you please expand on the uncertainty

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

that you have already described that your family would face should this court decision end the Affordable Care Act as we know it? And then also could you please share with us, are you speaking only for you and your family or is this something that perhaps hundreds of thousands if not more American families would suffer that fate that you are describing?

2393 Ms. Hung. Thank you. I am here on behalf of many families 2394 like mine. The Little Lobbyists families are families with --

2395 Mr. Cardenas. Dozens or thousands?

2396 Thousands, across the country. Families with Ms. Hunq. 2397 children with complex medical needs and disabilities, and these 2398 protections that we are talking about today they are not just They are for 2399 for these children. They are for everyone. 2400 everybody. Any one of us could suddenly become sick or disabled 2401 with no notice whatsoever. Any one of us could go suddenly from 2402 healthy to unhealthy with no notice and have a preexisting 2403 condition. An accident could happen, a cancer diagnosis, a sick 2404 child.

There is no shame in being sick. There is no shame in being disabled. Let us not penalize that. There is not shame in Xiomara needing a ventilator to breathe or needing a wheelchair to go to the playground.

2409 But there is shame in allowing insurance companies to charge 2410 her more money just because of it, more for her care, and there

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2411 is shame in allowing families like mine to file for bankruptcy 2412 because we can't afford to care for our children.

It is that uncertainty that is being taken away or at risk right now. Our families are constantly thinking about that while we are at our children's bedside.

2416 Mr. Cardenas. I just want to state with the balance of my 2417 time that this court case could be the most destructive thing 2418 that could have ever happened in American history when it comes 2419 to the life and well-being of American citizens.

2420 I yield back the balance of my time.

2421 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

2422 I now would like to recognize my friend from Florida, Mr.
2423 Bilirakis.

2424 Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Madam Chair, and congratulations 2425 on chairing the best subcommittee in Congress, that's for sure 2426 -- the most important.

2427 Ms. Eshoo. Oh, thank you.

2428 Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. Miller, the Texas court decision hinges 2429 on the individual mandate being reduced to zero in the law. Can

2430 you explain the court's reasoning in their decision?

2431 Mr. Miller. Well, I mean, we have to go back to a lot of 2432 convoluted reasoning in prior decisions in order to get there. 2433 So this is a legacy of trying to save the Affordable Care Act 2434 by any means possible and it gets you into a little bit of a bizarre

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2435 world.

But if you take the previous opinions at their face -- it was somewhat of a majority of one by Chief Justice Roberts -he basically saved the ACA, which otherwise would have gone down before any of this was implemented, by having a construction which said, I found out it is a tax after all, and he had three elements as to what that tax was.

The problem is once you put the percentage of zero and the dollar amount at zero, it is not a tax anymore. It is not bringing in revenue. You don't pay for it in the year you file your taxes. It is not calculated the way taxes are.

So that previous construction, if you just look in a literal way at the law, doesn't hold anymore. What we do about it is another issue beyond that. But on the merits, we have got a constitutional problem and in that sense that court decision was accurate. People then say, what do you -- where do you go next and that is the mess we are in.

2452 Mr. Bilirakis. Yes. Could legislation be passed that 2453 would address the court's concern such as reimposing the

2454 individual mandate?

2455 Mr. Miller. All kinds of legislation. You are open for 2456 business every day. But sometimes business doesn't get conducted 2457 successfully. There are a wide range of things that I can imagine 2458 and you can imagine that would deal with this in either direction.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

You have to pass something. What we are doing is we are passing the buck. We are trying to uphold some odd contraption, which is the only one we have got, as opposed to taking some new votes and saying, what are you in favor of and what are you against and be accountable for it and build a better system.

2464 Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you.

2465 Mr. Roy, you have written extensively on how to build a better 2466 health care system. The goal of the individual mandate, when 2467 the Democrats -- now the majority party -- passed the ACA, was 2468 to create a penalty to really force people to buy insurance.

2469Are there alternative ways to provide high-quality insurance2470at low prices without a punitive individual mandate?

Mr. Roy. Absolutely. So as we have discussed already and I know you haven't necessarily been here for some of that discussion, simply the fact that there is a limited open enrollment period in the ACA prevents the gaming of jumping in and out of the system and that is a standard practice with employer-based insurance. It is a standard practice in the

2477 private sector parts of Medicare. That is a key element.

Another key element is to reform the age bands -- the 3 to 1 age bands in the ACA -- because that actually is the primary driver of healthy and particularly younger people dropping out

2481 of the market.

2482

Another key piece is to actually lower, of course, the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2483 underlying cost of health care so that premiums will go down and 2484 making sure that the structure of the financial assistance that 2485 you provide to lower income people actually matches up with the 2486 premium costs that are affordable to them.

And a big part of it is, again, making the insurance product a little bit more flexible so plans have the room to innovate and make insurance coverage less expensive than it is today.

2490 Mr. Bilirakis. All right. Thank you very much.

I yield back, Madam Chair, the rest of my time.

2492 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Bilirakis.

I now would like to recognize the gentleman from Oregon,Mr. Schrader.

2495 Mr. Schrader. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate that. 2496 I think sometimes we forget that the ACA was a response to 2497 a bipartisan concern about the construction of the health are 2498 marketplace prior to the ACA.

It was a pretty universal opinion, not a partisan issue, that health care costs were completely out of control. Whether you were upper middle class or low income or extremely wealthy, it was -- it was unsustainable.

And the ACA may not be perfect but, as pointed out at the hearings, it gave millions of Americans health care that didn't have it before. It started to begin the discussion that we are talking about here -- how do you create universal access in an

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2507 affordable way to every American.

2508 Certainly, I am one of the folks that believe health care 2509 is a right, not a privilege, in the greatest country in the world. 2510 We are discussing about different ways to get at it.

I think one of the most important things that doesn't get talked about a lot is the importance of the essential health benefits. It gets demonized because, well, geez, I am not a woman so I shouldn't have to pay for maternity -- you know, I am invincible -- I am never really going to get sick so I don't need to pay for, you know, emergency health care.

Those things are ancillary. I guess, Ms. Young, talk to us a little bit about why the essential health benefits are part of the Affordable Care Act, and there have been some attempts by the administration and different members not, I think,

realizing how important they are with these often, you know,

2522 cheaper plans. Just get the cost down -- they are ignoring maybe

2523 the health aspects of that. Could you talk a little bit about

- 2524 that?
- 2525 Ms. Young. Absolutely.

2526 Prior to the Affordable Care Act, insurers could choose what 2527 benefits they were going to place in their -- in their benefit 2528 policies.

2529 The Affordable Care Act essential health benefit

2530 requirements require that all insurers in the individual and small

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2531 group markets cover a core set of 10 benefits -- things like 2532 hospitalizations and doctors visits as well as maternity care, 2533 mental health and substance use disorder, prescription drugs, 2534 outpatient services.

2535 So, really, ensuring that the insurance that people are 2536 buying offers a robust set of benefits that provides them 2537 meaningful protection if they get sick.

If you return to a universe where an issuer can choose what benefits they are going to put inside of a policy, you could have an insurance benefit that, for example, excludes coverage for cancer services and another policy that excludes coverage for mental health needs and one that excludes coverage for a

2543 particular kind of drug.

2544 Mr. Schrader. And that might be in the fine print and people 2545 may not realize that as they sign up for policies.

2546 Ms. Young. That is correct, yes. So it would require 2547 consumers to really pile through the insurance -- different 2548 policies to understand what they were buying.

It also provides a back door path to underwriting because insurers, for example, that exclude coverage for cancer from their benefit won't attract any consumers who have a history of cancer who need -- who have reason to believe that they may need cancer coverage.

2554

And so it really takes our insurance market from one that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2555 successfully pools together the healthy and the sick to one that 2556 becomes more fragmented.

2557 Mr. Schrader. Right. Well, and another piece of the 2558 Affordable Care Act that gets overlooked and, again, it has been 2559 alluded to by different members and some of you on the panel is 2560 the innovation, the flexibility -- I mean, the Center for Medical 2561 Innovation, the accountable care organizations.

Instead of -- you know, it seems to me we are focused just on cost -- how do I itemize this cost. We ask you guys these questions -- the rate bands and all that stuff. We should be concerned about health care.

I mean, the goal here is to provide better health. It's not to support the insurance industry or my veterinary office or whoever. The goal is to provide better health care and the way you do that is by, I think, you know, having the experts in different communities figure out what is the best health care delivery system.

2572 Do you need more dentists in one community? Need more mental 2573 health experts in another community?

I am very concerned that if the Affordable Care Act is undone that a lot of this innovation that has been spawned, the accountable care organizations that are going, you know, would begin to dissolve. There would be no framework for them to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2578 operate in.

(202) 234-4433

Just recently in Oregon, where I come from, we had a record number of organizations step up to participate in what we call our coordinated care organizations that deal with the Medicaid population and have over 24 different organizations vying for that book of business.

2584 Could you talk just real briefly -- I am sorry, time wise 2585 -- real briefly about, you know, what would happen if those all 2586 went away?

2587 Ms. Young. As you note, the Affordable Care Act introduced 2588 a number of reforms and how Medicare pays to incentivize more 2589 value-based and coordinated care.

2590 If the district court's decision were to be upheld then the 2591 legislative basis for some of those programs would disappear and 2592 there would really be chaos in Medicare payment if that decision 2593 were upheld.

2594 Mr. Schrader. Okay. Thank you, and I yield back, Madam 2595 Chair.

2596 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

2597 I can't help but think that this was a very important exchange 2598 in your expressed viewpoints and counterpoint to Mr. Miller's

2599 description of the ACA as a odd contraption.

2600 I now would like to --

2601 Mr. Miller. I would respond on that if I had the

2602 opportunity.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2603 Ms. Eshoo. I am sure you would.

Let us see who is next. Now I would like to recognize Mr. Carter from Georgia.

2606 Mr. Carter. Well, thank you, and thank all of you for being 2607 here. Very, very interesting subject matter that we have as our 2608 first hearing of the year. I find it very interesting.

2609 Mr. Miller, let me ask you, just to reiterate and make sure 2610 I understand. I am not a lawyer. I am a pharmacist, so I don't 2611 --

2612 Mr. Miller. Good for you.

2613 Mr. Carter. Yes. I don't know much about law or lawyers 2614 and --

2615 Mr. Miller. It is a dangerous weapon.

2616 Mr. Carter. Well, let me ask you something. Right now,

2617 this court case, how many patients is it impacting?

2618 Mr. Miller. Well, people hypothetically might react

2619 thinking it is real, but otherwise, nobody.

2620 Mr. Carter. But it is my understanding it is still in

2621 litigation.

2622 Mr. Miller. Correct. Correct. And it is going to take 2623 a while and it is going to end up differently than where it starts. 2624 But we are doing this, you know, make believe because it scores

a lot of points.

2626 Mr. Carter. Well, I -- make believe -- I mean, we are in

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2627 Congress. We are not supposed to be make believe.

2628 Mr. Miller. Well --

2629 Mr. Carter. I mean, I am trying to understand why this is 2630 the first hearing. When it -- when it is not impacting a single 2631 patient at this time, it is still in litigation, we don't know 2632 how it is going to turn out, we don't know how long it is going 2633 to take. Judging by other court cases that we have seen, it may 2634 take a long, long time.

2635 Mr. Miller. Well, to be fair, I used to run hearings in 2636 Congress on staff.

2637 Mr. Carter. Well --

2638 Mr. Miller. The majority can run any kind of hearing it 2639 wants to.

Mr. Carter. -- we are not here to be fair. So anyway, I am trying to figure out why this is the first hearing. I mean, you know, earlier the chairman of the full committee berates our Republican leader because he asked for a hearing on something that he is opposed to and that I am opposed to, and I am just trying to figure it out.

You know, one of the things that we do agree on is that preexisting conditions need to be covered. Isn't it possible for us to still be working on preexisting conditions now and legislating preexisting conditions while this is under

2650 litigation?

(202) 234-4433

2651 Mr. Miller. What you need are majorities who are willing 2652 to either spend money --

2653 Mr. Carter. Well --

2654 Mr. Miller. -- change rules and move things around. But 2655 that has been hard for Congress to do.

2656 Mr. Carter. Well, I think that the record will show that, 2657 you know, the first -- one of the first bills that the -- that 2658 we proposed in the Republican Party was in -- in the Republican 2659 conference was for preexisting conditions -- Chairman Walden.

2660 In fact, I know he did because I cosponsored it.

2661 Mr. Miller. Mm-hmm. Yes. It was one of the more thorough 2662 ones, actually.

2663 Mr. Carter. It is something that we have -- we have 2664 concentrated on that. So thank you for that. I just want to 2665 make sure.

2666 Mr. Roy, I want to ask you, didn't you -- did you testify 2667 before the Oversight Committee recently?

2668 Mr. Roy. Last week, yes.

2669 Mr. Carter. What were -- what were they talking about in

2670 the Oversight Committee? What were you testifying about?

2671 Mr. Roy. Prescription drug prices. The high cost of

2672 prescription drugs.

2673 Mr. Carter. Prescription drugs. Go figure. Here we are 2674 in the committee and the subcommittee with the most jurisdiction

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2675 over health care issues and Oversight has already addressed

2676 prescription drug pricing?

2677 Mr. Roy. Well, you have two years in this committee and 2678 I look forward to hopefully being invited to talk --

2679 Mr. Carter. Well, I do too. I am just baffled by the fact 2680 that, you know, drug pricing is one of the issues -- is the issue 2681 that most citizens when polled identify as being something that 2682 Congress needs to be active on and I am just trying to figure. 2683 In Oversight they have already addressed it.

2684 Mr. Roy. You know, one thing I will say about this topic, 2685 Mr. Carter, is that it is one of the real opportunities for 2686 bipartisan policy in this Congress. We have a Republican 2687 administration and a Democratic House where there has been a lot 2688 of interest in reducing the cost of prescription drugs and I am 2689 optimistic that we really have an opportunity here to get 2690 legislation through Congress.

2691 Mr. Carter. And I thank you for bringing that up because 2692 Representative Schrader and I have already cosponsored a bill 2693 to stop what I think is the gaming of the system of the generic 2694 manufacturers and the brand name manufacturers of what they are 2695 doing in delaying generic products to get onto the market.

2696 So, Madam Chair, I am just wondering when are we going to 2697 have --

2698

Ms. Eshoo. Gentleman yield? Would the gentleman yield?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2699 Mr. Carter. And if I could ask a question.

2700 Ms. Eshoo. Mm-hmm.

2701 Mr. Carter. When are we going to have a hearing on

2702 prescription drug costs?

Ms. Eshoo. I can't give you the date. But it is one of the top priorities of the majority. It is one of the issues that we ran on with the promise to lower drug -- prescription drug prices. I believe that there is a partisan appetite -- bipartisan appetite for this and we will have hearings and we will address it and we welcome your participation.

2709 Mr. Carter. Well, reclaiming my time. I appreciate that 2710 very much, Madam Chair, because it is a pressing issue and it 2711 is an issue that needs to be addressed now and today, unlike what 2712 we are discussing here today that is not impacting one single 2713 person at this point.

2714 So, you know, with all due respect, Madam Chair, I hope that 2715 we can get to prescription drug pricing ASAP because it is 2716 something that we need to be and that we are working on.

And, Mr. Roy, you could not be more correct -- this is a bipartisan issue. I practiced pharmacy for over 30 years. Never did I once see someone say, oh, this is the price for the Democrat -- this is the price for the Republican -- this is the price for this person and that person. It was always the same. It was always high. That is why we need to be addressing this.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2723 So I thank you for being here. I thank all of you for being 2724 here and, Madam Chair, I yield back.

2725 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

2726 I now would like to recognize a new member of the

2727 subcommittee, Ms. Barragan from California. Welcome.

2728 Ms. Barragan. I thank you. Thank you, Ms. Chairwoman.

2729 My friend from Georgia asked why we are having this as the 2730 first hearing and I just have to say something because, you know, 2731 I am in my second term and in my first term when the Republicans 2732 were in the majority they spent all of their time trying to take 2733 away health care coverage for millions of Americans.

They talk about preexisting conditions and talk about saving people with preexisting conditions. But this very lawsuit is going to put those people at stake.

2737 So why are we having this hearing? Well, because you guys 2738 have been working to take away these coverages and we are trying 2739 to highlight the importance of this lawsuit.

2740 Now, you had two years and, yes, you could have started with 2741 prescription drug prices and reducing those and that wasn't done. 2742 So you are darn right the Democrats are going to take it up.

2743

You are darn right that we are going to have hearings on this and I am proud to say that our chairwoman and our chairman have been working hard to making sure we are going to work to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2747 bring down prescription drug prices. But the hypocrisy that I 2748 hear on the other side of the aisle can't just go -- just completely 2749 unanswered in silence.

2750 So, with that said, I am going to move on to what my comments 2751 have been. I want to thank you all for your testimony here today. 2752 It has been really helpful to hear us understand the potentially 2753 devastating impact of this lawsuit and of the district court's 2754 decision.

The court's decision would not only eliminate for preexisting conditions but would also adversely impact the Medicaid program and end the Medicaid expansion.

2758 Now, the Affordable Care Act's expansion of Medicaid filled 2759 a major gap in insurance coverage and resulted in 13 million more 2760 Americans having access to care.

2761 I represent a district that is a majority minority -- about 2762 88 percent black and brown people of color and, you know, black 2763 and brown Americans still have some of the highest uninsured rates 2764 in the country. Both groups have seen their uninsured numbers 2765 fall dramatically with the ACA. You know, between 2013 and 2016, more than 4 million Latinos and 1.9 million blacks have secured 2766 affordable health coverage. Ultimately, black and brown 2767 Americans have benefitted the most from the ACA's Medicaid 2768 2769 expansion program.

2770

Ms. Young, I would like to ask can you briefly summarize

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2771 the impact of the lawsuit on Medicaid beneficiaries and, in

2772 particular, the expansion population?

2773 Ms. Young. Medicaid expansion is, as you note, a very 2774 important part of the Affordable Care Act's coverage expansion 2775 and it is benefitting millions of people in the 37 states that 2776 have expanded or are in the process of expanding this year.

2777 Medicaid expansion has been associated with better financial 2778 security and failure to expand is associated with higher rates 2779 of rural hospital closures and other difficult impacts in 2780 communities.

If this decision were to be upheld, then the federal funding for Medicaid expansion would no longer be provided and states would be -- would only be able to receive their normal match rate for covering the population that is currently covered through expansion. That is an impact of billions of dollars across the country and a very large impact in individual states.

2787 States will have the choice between somehow finding state 2788 money to make up that gap or ending the expansion and removing 2789 those people from the Medicaid rolls or potentially cutting 2790 provider rates or making other changes in the benefit package 2791 or some combination.

2792 So you are looking at a potentially loss of -- see very 2793 significant losses of coverage in that group as well as an 2794 additional squeeze on providers.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2795 Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

2796 Ms. Hung, how has Medicaid helped your family afford 2797 treatment and why is Medicaid and Medicaid expansion so important

for children with complex medical needs and their families?

2799 Ms. Hung. Medicaid is a lifesaving program. I say this 2800 without exaggeration. Medicaid is the difference between life 2801 and death. It covers what health insurance doesn't cover for 2802 a lot of children with complex medical needs.

2803 Notably, it covers long-term services and supports including

home and community-based services that enable children's

2805 independence. For a lot of families who do have health insurance

2806 like mine, health insurance doesn't really cover certain DME --

2807 durable medical equipment -- certain specialists, the ability

2808 to go out of state.

And so that is the difference for a lot of our families.

2810 Ms. Barragan. Great. Well, thank you all. I yield back.

2811 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much.

2812 Now, the patient gentleman from Montana, Mr. Gianforte.

2813 Mr. Gianforte. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to

the panelists for your testimony today.

Every day I hear from Montanans who ask me why their health care costs keep going up and continue to increase while their coverage seems to shrink at the same time.

2818 While we look for long-term solutions to make health care

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2819 costs more affordable and accessible, I remain firmly committed 2820 to protecting those with preexisting conditions.

In fact, I don't know anyone on this committee, Republican or Democrat, who doesn't want to protect patients with preexisting conditions. Insuring Americans with preexisting conditions can keep their health insurance and access care is not controversial.

It shouldn't be -- we all agree on it -- which brings us to today. In the ruling in *Texas v. Azar*, it has not ended Obamacare. It hasn't stripped coverage of preexisting conditions and it hasn't impacted 2019 premiums.

While we sit here today talking about it, the Speaker has moved to intervene in the case and the judge ruling has been appealed. The case is working itself through the courts.

2832 We could have settled this with a legislative solution less 2833 than a month ago. One of the earliest votes we took in this 2834 Congress was to lock in protection for patients with preexisting 2835 conditions.

2836 Unfortunately, Democrats rejected that measure. And yet, 2837 here we are in full political theater talking about something 2838 we all agree on -- protecting Americans with preexisting 2839 conditions.

2840 We should be focused instead on the rising cost of 2841 prescription drugs, telehealth, rural access to health care, and 2842 other measures to make health care more affordable and accessible.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

I hope this committee will hold hearings and take action on these issues important to hardworking Montanans. I can understand, however, why my friends on the other side of the aisle do not want to take that path.

2847 Some of their party's rising stars and other jockeying for 2848 Democratic nomination in 2020 have said we should do away with 2849 private insurance. They advocate for a so-called Medicare for 2850 all. In reality, Medicare for none.

Their plan would gut Medicare and the VA as we know it, and force 225,000 Montanan seniors who rely on Medicare to the back of the line. Montana seniors have earned these benefits and lawmakers shouldn't undermine Medicare and threaten health care coverage for Montana seniors.

2856 Since we all agree we should protect patients with

2857 preexisting conditions, let us discuss our different ideas for 2858 making health care more affordable and accessible.

We should put forward our ideas -- on the one hand, Medicare for all -- a government-run single payer health care system that ends employer-sponsored health plans -- on the other, a health

- 2862 insurance system that protects patients with preexisting
- 2863 conditions, increases transparency, choice, and preserves rural

access to care and lowers cost.

2865 I look forward to a constructive conversation about our 2866 diverging approaches to fixing our health care system. In the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2867 meantime, I would like to direct a question to Mr. Miller, if 2868 I could.

2869 Under Medicare for all, Mr. Miller, do you envision access 2870 to care would be affected for seniors and those with preexisting 2871 conditions in rural areas in particular?

2872 Mr. Miller. Well, that is a particular aspect. I think, 2873 in general, the world that seniors are currently used to would 2874 be downgraded. You are taking -- spreading the money a little 2875 wider and thinner in order to help some. This is the story of 2876 the ACA.

2877 We can create winners but we will also create losers. Now, 2878 the politics as to who you favor sort out differently in different 2879 folks. It is hard to get a balancing act where everybody comes 2880 out on top unless you make some harder decisions, which is to 2881 set priorities and understand where you need to subsidize and 2882 what you need to do to improve care and the health of people before 2883 they get sick.

2884 Mr. Gianforte. So it is your belief that if this Congress 2885 were to adopt a Medicare for all approach, seniors would be 2886 disadvantaged? They have -- it will be more difficult to access 2887 care?

2888 Mr. Miller. They would be the first to be disadvantaged 2889 as well as those with employer-based coverage because -- if you 2890 swallowed it whole. I mean, there are lots of other problems

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2891 Avik mentioned. It is not just the spending. It is actually 2892 the inefficiency of the tax extraction costs.

2893 When you run that much money through the government, you 2894 don't get what you think comes out of it.

2895 Mr. Gianforte. One other topic, quickly, if I could. 2896 Telehealth is very important in rural areas. It is really vital 2897 to patients in Montana. How do you see -- foresee telehealth

2898 services being affected under a single payer system?

2899 Mr. Miller. Well, Medicare has probably not been in the 2900 forefront of promoting telehealth. I think there is a lot more 2901 buzz about telehealth as a way to break down geographical barriers 2902 to care, to have more competitive markets.

And so if past history is any guide of Medicare fee for service, it is not as welcoming to telehealth as private insurance would be.

2906 Mr. Gianforte. Okay. And I yield back.

2907 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

2908 I now would like to recognize the gentleman from Vermont, 2909 Mr. Welch.

2910 Mr. Welch. Thank you. I will be brief. Just a few 2911 comments.

I think it is important that we had this hearing. It is -- this did not come out of thin air. I mean, I was on the committee when we wrote the Affordable Care Act. Very

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2915 contentious. It was a party line vote.

I was on the committee when we repealed it -- this committee repealed the Affordable Care Act, and we never saw a bill. We never had a hearing.

2919 And now we have a continuation of this effort by the 2920 Republican attorneys general to attack it and we have the unusual 2921 decision by the administration where instead of defending a 2922 federal law they are opposing a federal law.

2923 So it is why I have been continuing to get so many letters 2924 from Vermonters who are fearful that this access to health care 2925 that they have is really in jeopardy.

Loretta Heimbecker from Montgomery has a 21-year-old who is making \$11.50 an hour. He has got a medical condition from birth, and absent the access to health care he wouldn't be able to work and the mother would probably be broke.

I have got a cancer patient, Kathleen Voigt Walsh from Jericho, who would not have access to the treatment she needs absent this. I mean, Ms. Hung, you really, in your own personal presentation, have explained why people who really need it would be scared if we lost it.

And I also served in Congress when the essential agenda on the Republican side was to try to repeal it. I mean, it was a pretty weird place to be -- Congress -- when on a Friday afternoon if there is nothing else to do we would put a bill on the floor

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2939 to repeal health care for the sixtieth time. I mean, we are just
2940 banging our head against the wall.

2941 So thank you for having this hearing because I see it as 2942 a reassurance to a lot of people I represent that we mean business 2943 -- that we are going to defend what we have.

2944 Now, second, on some of the criticisms about this not being 2945 a hearing on prescription drugs, Mr. Roy, you were in -- did a 2946 great job helping us start the process in Oversight and Government 2947 Reform.

But I know our chair of this subcommittee -- this is the committee where there is actual jurisdiction -- is totally committed to pursuing this and I thank -- I thank our chair.

And I have been hearing very good things from President Trump about the need to do this. So my hope is that we are going to get a lot of Republican support to do practical things so we are not getting ripped off, as the president has said, by us paying the whole cost of research -- a lot of it, by the way, from taxpayers, not necessarily from the companies -- and have to pay

2957 the highest prices.

2958 So I am commenting and not asking questions. But I know 2959 that there has been extensive and excellent testimony. But I 2960 just want to say to the chair and I want to say to my colleagues, 2961 Republican and Democrat, if the net effect of this hearing is 2962 that we are affirming a bipartisan commitment not to mess with

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 2963 the Affordable Care Act, then I am going to be able to reassure 2964 my constituents that their health care is safe.
- 2965 And if the criticism is essentially we have got to do more, 2966 we are ready to do more, right?

2967 Madam Chair, so I thank you for this hearing and I thank 2968 the witnesses for their excellent testimony and look forward to 2969 more down the line.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his enrichment of the work at this subcommittee. I think it is important to know that on the -- note that on the very first day of this Congress that House Democrats voted to intervene in this case -- the very first day of the Congress -- as it moves through appeal.

So we are the ones that are representing the government, and I think that for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle you may not like my suggestion but if you are for all of these things that you are talking about, write to the attorneys general and the governors that were -- that brought the suit and say, we want it called off.

We want to move on and strengthen the health care system in our country. You will find a partner in every single person on this side of the aisle.

2985 With that, I would like to recognize Mr. O'Halleran -- what 2986 state?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2987 Mr. Burgess. Arizona.

Ms. Eshoo. Arizona -- from the great state of Arizona -who is, I believe, waiving on to the subcommittee, and we have a wonderful rule in the full committee that if you are not a member of a subcommittee you can still come and participate. But you are the last one to be called on. So thank you for your patience and thank you for caring and showing up.

2994 Mr. O'Halleran. I thank you, Madam Chair. I am also 2995 usually last in my house also to be called on.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Although I am not a permanent member of the subcommittee, I appreciate your invitation for me to join you today to discuss this issue that is so critical to families across Arizona, and thank you to the witnesses.

3000 As some of you know, the district I represent is extremely

3001 large and diverse -- the size of Pennsylvania. Twelve

3002 federally-recognized tribes are in my district.

3003 Since I came to Congress two years ago, I have been focused 3004 on working across the aisle to solve health care issues. We face 3005 these issues together because it is one thing that I hear about 3006 every single corner of my rural district and one of the overriding 3007 issues in Congress.

A district where hospitals and the jobs they provide are barely hanging on and where decades of toxic legacy of uranium mining has left thousands with exposure-related cancers across

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3011 Indian country.

A district where Medicaid expansion made the difference for some veterans getting coverage, some hospitals keeping their doors open, where essential health benefits meant some struggling with opiate addiction could finally get substance abuse treatment.

3017 I am here because the lawsuit we are discussing today isn't 3018 about any of those policies and how they save taxpayer dollars 3019 and protect rural jobs. I am a former Republican state 3020 legislator. I know that this lawsuit is purely motivated not 3021 by what is best for the people we are representing but by politics. 3022 Ms. Young, I have three questions for you. The first is, 3023 the first letter I ever sent as a member of Congress was a 3024 bipartisan letter to congressional leadership about dangers of 3025 ACA repeal on the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, which was 3026 included in the ACA.

3027 Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to enter my letter into 3028 the record.

- 3029 Ms. Eshoo. So ordered.
- 3030 [The information follows:]

3031

3032 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT 7 *********

3033 Mr. O'Halleran. Ms. Young, can you describe what the fate 3034 of this law would be if this lawsuit succeeds and what it means 3035 for tribal communities?

3036 Ms. Young. The district court's opinion as written struck 3037 down the entire Affordable Care Act so it would -- even unrelated 3038 provisions like the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

3039 So if the decision were upheld then the Indian Health Care 3040 Improvement Act would no longer have the force of law and the 3041 improvements included in that law like better integration with 3042 the Veterans Health Service and better integration for behavioral 3043 health and other core benefits for the Indian Health Service would 3044 be eliminated.

3045 Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Ms. Young.

3046 Are cancers caused by uranium exposure considered a

3047 preexisting condition?

3048 Ms. Young. I suspect that under most medical underwriting 3049 screens they would be, yes.

Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you. And, Ms. Young, over 120 rural hospitals have closed since 2005. Right now, 673 additional facilities are vulnerable and could close. That is more than a third of rural hospitals in the United States.

3054 If this lawsuit succeeds, do you anticipate rural hospitals 3055 and the jobs they provide would be endangered as a result of fewer 3056 people having health coverage?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3057 As you know, rural hospitals face a number of Ms. Young. 3058 challenges and a number of difficult pressures. There has been 3059 research demonstrating that a state's failure to expand Medicaid 3060 is associated with higher rates of rural hospital closures. And so if funding for the federal -- the federal funding for Medicaid 3061 3062 expansion were removed then it is likely that that would place 3063 additional stress on rural hospitals.

3064 Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you.

Madam Chair, this is why last year I led the fight to urge my state's attorney general to drop this partisan lawsuit. So much is at stake in Arizona for veterans, the tribes, for jobs in rural communities like mine.

I am interested in finding bipartisan solutions to the problems we have got and I will work with anyone here to do that. But this lawsuit doesn't take us in that direction. It takes us back, and my district can't afford that.

3073 Thank you, and I yield back.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman for making the time to be here and to not only make his statement but the -- ask the excellent questions that you have.

3077At this time I want to remind members that pursuant to the3078committee rules they have 10 business days to submit additional

3079 information or questions for the record to be answered --

3080 Mr. Burgess. Madam Chair?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3081 Ms. Eshoo. Yes.

3082 Mr. Burgess. Could I seek recognition for a unanimous 3083 consent request?

3084 Ms. Eshoo. Sure. Just a minute. Let me just finish this,

3085 all right?

I want to remind members that pursuant to committee rules that members have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the record to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared and I ask each of the witnesses to respond promptly to any such questions, and I see your heads nodding so I am comforted by that, that these questions that you may receive.

3092And I would recognize the ranking member and I also have3093a list of -- to request unanimous consent for the record.

3094 Mr. Burgess. Oh, I can go after you.

Ms. Eshoo. Okay. The first, a statement for the record from the American Cancer Society, Cancer Action Network, and 33 other patient and consumer advocacy organizations; a statement for the record from the American Academy of Family Physicians,

3099 a statement for the record from the American College of

3100 Physicians, the Wall Street Journal editorial, Texas Obamacare

3101 -- entitled "Texas Obamacare Blunder." I think that was

3102 referenced by Mr. Lazarus earlier today.

3103 Jonathan Adler and Abbe Gluck, New York Times op-ed entitled 3104 "What the Lawless Obamacare Ruling Means"; a brief of the amicus

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

3105 curiae from the American Medical Association, the American

3106 Academy of Family Physicians, the American College of Physicians,

3107 the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Academy of

3108 Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

3109 Isn't it extraordinary what we have in this country? Just 3110 the listing of these -- of these organizations.

3111 The U.S.A. Community Catalyst, the National Health Law 3112 Program, Center for Public Policy Priorities, and Center on Budget 3113 and Policy Priorities; the brief of the amicus curiae from the 3114 American Cancer Society, the Cancer Action Network, the American 3115 Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the 3116 American Lung Association, and National Multiple Sclerosis 3117 Society, supporting defendants, and a statement for the record from America's Health Insurance Plans. 3118

3119 So I am asking unanimous -- a unanimous consent request to 3120 enter the following items in the record. I hear no objections 3121 and I will call on -- recognize the ranking member.

3122 [The information follows:]

3123

3124 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT 8 *********

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

- 3125 Mr. Burgess. Thank you, first off. Thank you for reminding
- 3126 me why I have not yet paid my AMA dues this year.
- 3127 [Laughter.]
- 3128 Mr. Burgess. I have a unanimous consent request. I would

3129 ask unanimous consent to place into the record the letter that

3130 was sent by Mr. Walden and myself regarding the Medicare for all

3131 hearing.

3132 Ms. Eshoo. No objection.

- 3133 [The information follows:]
- 3134

Ms. Eshoo. The only request that I would make is that maybe on your email mailing list that when you notify the chairman of the full committee that maybe my office can be notified as well. Mr. Burgess. Welcome to the world that I inhabited two years ago.

3141 Ms. Eshoo. That's why I think you will understand.

3142 Mr. Burgess. I never found -- I never found out until after 3143 the fact.

3144 Ms. Eshoo. Right. Right.

3145 Mr. Burgess. But I would take that up with your full

3146 committee chair. I am sure they will recognize the importance

of including you in the email distribution list.

3148 Ms. Eshoo. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just thank the witnesses. You have been here for almost three hours. We thank you for not only traveling to be here but for the work that you do that brings you here as witnesses.

3152 Dr. -- Mr. Lazarus says he is retired but he brings with 3153 him decades of experience. We appreciate it. To each witness, 3154 whether you were -- you are a majority or minority witness, we 3155 thank you, and do get a prompt reply to the questions because 3156 members really benefit for that.

3157 So our collective thanks to you and to Ms. Hung, what a 3158 beautiful mother. You brought it all. I am glad that you are 3159 sitting in the center of the table because you centered it all

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

- 3160 with your comments.
- 3161 So with that, I will adjourn this subcommittee's hearing
- 3162 today.
- 3163 Thank you.
- 3164 [Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

3165