June 15, 2005

Honorable Arlen Specter
Honorable Patrick Leahy
Honorable James Sensenbrenner
Honorable John Conyers

Consent decrees play a critical role in our legal system. Everyone benefits from the ability to avoid lengthy and expensive trials by mutual agreement to common-sense, compromise solutions. Unfortunately, this time-honored approach is under unwarranted attack.

The “Consent Decree Fairness Act” (H.R. 1229) would effectively end the consent decree process in any case involving state or local officials. It would do so by letting these officials terminate any federal court consent decree after four years or whenever a new state or local administration takes office. They could do so without even explaining why they think the consent decree was no longer needed or showing they are in compliance with applicable law.

Instead, the legislation would require those who had brought lawsuits leading to consent decrees to demonstrate once again that the agreement should still be enforced – and it would deliberately make it very difficult for them to do so. That would undermine the purpose for entering into consent decrees with state or local officials, and thus leave no option but protracted, high-cost legal battles with those seeking legal redress when due process and other rights are in question.

This is not only unwise, it is unnecessary, as either party in a consent decree can already change the consent agreement any time they can convincingly demonstrate that change is needed.

The sponsors have stated that they believe this legislation is needed to control Medicaid costs. However, consent decrees should not be made a scapegoat for financial challenges in state Medicaid programs that, in fact, are due to spiraling costs throughout the health care system. The specific consent decrees behind their concerns protect due process rights that must be guarded for all Americans – especially those most vulnerable among us whose voices are so easily muted.

Eliminating consent decrees would damage the integrity and efficiency of our legal system. It would have no meaningful impact on the ever-escalating cost problems that plague our entire health care system, which is the real issue that needs to be addressed all across this great nation.

That is why we, the undersigned members of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO), strongly oppose this legislation. We urge you to also oppose it, and look forward to working with you to ensure affordable access to necessary health care in ways that maintain the integrity of our legal system and the rights of all Americans.

June 15, 2005
Sincerely,
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