

**TESTIMONY OF  
WILLIAM A. STANLEY  
BEFORE THE  
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**

**April 1, 2013**

**HB 6687, AN ACT CONCERNING CERTIFICATES OF MERIT, AND SB 1154,  
AN ACT CONCERNING THE ACCIDENTAL FAILURE OF SUIT STATUTE**

Good morning. My name is Bill Stanley. I am Vice President for Development + Community Relations at Lawrence + Memorial Hospital in new London. I would like to testify respectfully and emphatically in opposition to **HB 6687 AN ACT CONCERNING CERTIFICATES OF MERIT, AND SB 1154, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ACCIDENTAL FAILURE OF SUIT STATUTE.**

It is no secret that both of these bills would serve only to increase the cost of medical malpractice specifically and, in general, the overall cost of healthcare.

At a time when so many other factors are driving up the cost of healthcare and it is increasingly difficult to recruit physicians – mostly in the field of primary care – both of these bills would worsen those factors if they are enacted.

When the cost of healthcare rises and when physicians retire in greater numbers than ever instead of paying astronomical malpractice premiums, that reduces access to healthcare, resulting in even longer waits for appointments and treatment.

For medical liability cases, Connecticut already has in place a statutory system that requires a good-faith certificate to accompany a complaint. HB 6687 seeks to weaken that system by substantially broadening the types of professionals whose pre-lawsuit “expert” testimony could help advance an otherwise unnecessary malpractice case.

Without true expertise in the specific field of medicine or healthcare, this bill would vastly increase the number of malpractice lawsuits, and with it, increase the cost of malpractice and healthcare in general.

SB 1154 would roll back progress made in good faith in 2005 when the Connecticut General Assembly limited pre-suit testimony to experts in the same field as that in which a complaint is filed.

Each area of medicine and healthcare carries its own intricacies, equipment, technologies and methodology. Again, allowing non-experts in a specific field to provide “expert” testimony in these cases – testimony for which they may be unqualified to provide – would be irresponsible and increase the volume and cost of malpractice lawsuits.

I urge you to please oppose HB 6687 and SB 1154. Thank you.