



For a number of reasons, though, repealing McCarran-Ferguson serves better as a threat to get insurers back on board with reform than as an actual device to drive down pricing. "They're sending a signal to the industry -- if you throw everything at us, we'll throw everything at you," says Andy Laperriere, a Washington-based policy analyst and managing director at ISI Group.

Most U.S. Markets: One or Two Main Players

McCarran-Ferguson paved the way for state authorities, rather than federal officials, to regulate the industry. According to a 2005 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the act gave the industry a "very limited exemption from the federal antitrust laws Although Congress had clear authority to regulate insurance, it determined in McCarran-Ferguson that it would be beneficial, as a matter of public policy, to allow the states to continue regulating and taxing such business in most instances."

Proponents of federal insurance regulation say that its absence is one reason why local markets are dominated by massive insurance companies with little incentive to keep consumer costs low. In January, the American Medical Assn. found in its annual survey of the country's commercial health insurance industry that just one or two companies dominate most markets -- 94% of the 314 metropolitan markets surveyed. "Without rivals to compete against, a large health-insurance company can take advantage of patients by raising premiums and dictating important aspects of patient care without fear of losing business," said AMA President-elect J. James Rohack in a statement.

Health-insurance companies contend that McCarran-Ferguson simply allows them to cooperate with one another to advance policies that are beneficial both to them and their consumers, such as sharing data to prevent fraud, assessing medical malpractice risk, and maintaining consistent policy language. "The argument here is that the insurance industry is unregulated and that is completely untrue," says Robert Zirkelbach, press secretary of America's Health Insurance Plans, or AHIP, the industry's major organization. He says health care is one of the most regulated industries in the country. Rather than addressing competition in the marketplace, he says, "The focus on this issue is a political ploy and designed to distract attention away from the real issues."

Could Repeal Hurt Competition?

Even some independent analysts question whether repealing McCarran-Ferguson alone would be enough to change pricing. The immediate effect would be to subject insurance companies -- including automobile insurers and life insurers -- to federal antitrust law for purposes of conduct, such as day-to-day decisions about how to price products, where to offer them, and what they'll look like, says David Hyman, a professor of law and medicine at the University of Illinois College of Law and adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute. Hyman considers it unlikely that repeal would fundamentally change the nature of the market. While it might increase competition in some markets, he says, it could actually decrease it in others, such as those where small insurers survive because they have access to larger providers' data. Changes to the act could therefore hurt smaller companies more than larger ones, he says.

Because the act doesn't outlaw the existence of a dominant provider but simply prohibits collusion, says Hyman, a repeal would fall short of breaking up existing market monopolies that are blamed for artificially inflating prices. The current move against McCarran-Ferguson, he says, "has more to do with the politics of pushing back against the insurance industry's opposition to health reform than it does with increasing competition in health-insurance markets."

Repeal wouldn't be a simple process. "There would be quite a bit of confusion and legal action on the state and federal level as regulators try to figure out who's responsible for regulating what," says Joseph Paduda, principal of Health Strategy Associates, a managed-care consulting firm in Madison, Conn. Austin Frakt, a health economist and assistant professor at Boston University's School of Public Health, says lawmakers also would have to take into account the other parties that contribute to driving up health-care costs -- including doctors, hospitals, and drug companies -- which McCarran-Ferguson does not address.

Threatening a repeal of McCarran-Ferguson "doesn't seem like it has been thoroughly thought through," says Frakt. As with every aspect of the proposed reform, the question of whether to regulate insurance at the federal or state level "requires a nuanced approach."

Copyright © 2009 The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.

Email	Instant Message	Print	
Discuss Story	Rate Story:	Low Control High	
On Newsvine	View popular	3.5 after 1 ratings	

MORE FROM BUSINESSWEEK

st →	Perils of the Mobile Cloud
Stock Pi	cks: Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, Eaton, Estee Lauder
Reviving	an Old Threat in Health-Insurance Battle
Perils of	the Mobile Cloud
Web-Bas	ed E-Mail: Businesses Beware
The Deat	th of Risk in Silicon Valley
Picks of	the Week: Google, Goldman, Morgan Stanley, Intel
Samsung	s' Luxia LED TV Keeps You Connected
Google's	Great Expectations
Late Buy	ing Lifts Stock Indexes
Android'	s Spread Could Become a Problem
Business	Week Section Front

Top msnbc.com stories	NBC News highlights			
Watchdog: Bailout helped but at a great	Florida girl, 7, is missing			
cost	911 tapes from balloon saga emerge			
Mass. man charged with plotting terror attacks	Lunch swap: New rules for school slop Men feeling sheepish in Seattle			
NYT: Cancer screening benefits				
'exaggerated'	OnStar used to foil carjacking			
The bust hits boomtown that banks built				
Taser: Don't shoot stun gun at chest				

SPONSORED LINKS

Get listed here

Unemployed Man Makes \$77/Hr (Online) Guy makes \$8,673/Month Part-Time! Read this special report to see how. InternetJobNews.com/local-report Hot Stock Alert - EVSO

Solar Power Your Portfolio With Evolution Solar. Invest. www.EvolutionSolar.com

Washington - Mom Lost 47lbs Following 1 Rule I Cut Down 47 lbs of Stomach Fat In A Month By Obeying This 1 Old Rule RachelRayBlogs.com

Do NOT Pay For White Teeth Mom's Whitening Method Exposed. The Results WILL Shock You. www.consumertipsweekly.net

Washington: Mom of 2 Slashed 53 lbs of Fat I Cut Down 53 lbs of Pure Fat In 1 Month By Following this 2 Step Diet KristinGotSkinny.com

Featuring	TODAY Nightly News Dateline Meet the Press msnbc tv Newsweek	News	E-mail	RSS &
Categories	Top stories Local news U.S. World Politics Business Sports	alerts	highlights	feeds
	Entertainment Health Tech & science Travel Weather	Mobile	Podcasts	Widgets
About	About us Contact Site map Jobs Stock data Terms & conditions	headlines	1 000000	Widgeto

© 2009 Microsoft MSN Privacy Advertise