AFF

Abby and I affirm Resolved: The United States federal government should impose price controls on the pharmaceutical industry.

Our Sole Contention is Accessibility

Currently, companies are able to charge as much as they would like for drugs, especially in situations where one company has a monopoly. For example, Bernstein 16 at the New York Times reports that upon acquiring the rights to a critical drug for patients with life-threatening infections, Turing Pharmaceuticals raised its price by 5500 percent–from \$13.50 to \$750 per tablet.

Tirrell 17 at CNBC explains that this is not an isolated incident. Many other pharma companies have exploited the opaque, multi-layered and dysfunctional value chain around pharmaceutical pricing to their advantage, leveraging the FDA's suboptimal regulatory approach to generics to create artificial, unwarranted and inappropriate monopolies.

This isn't just the case of some drugs being expensive before patents expire. Augustine 18 at the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine writes that major price increases for generic drugs have become increasingly common as more than half of existing generics are now produced by a single supplier.

Thus, the price of generics has been increasing exponentially. Court 17 at MarketWatch writes that recently, the prices of 14 common generic medications were increased by 20% to 85%.

This is really bad, as Augustine writes that generics are 89 percent of all prescriptions written.

Generics are supposed to be cheap alternatives to brand name drugs. But at the point where all drugs, including generics, are increasing in price a ton, Emanuel 16 at CNBC

concludes that the only way to stop drug companies from jacking up the costs of these life-saving treatments is through price controls.

There are two impacts. First, non-adherence.

Kesselheim 16 at the American Medical Association explains that increasing drug costs have important clinical implications. Increases reduce the affordability of prescribed regimens and thus patient adherence, leading to negative health outcomes.

When people can't afford drugs, they don't take them. Brody 17 at the New York Times furthers that "When the co-pay for a drug hits \$50 or more, adherence really drops.

Augustine 18 at the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine reports in 2015, about 20 percent of Americans did not fill at least one prescription due to affordability considerations.

Reducing drug costs is imperative, as **Brody** explains that this lack of adherence is estimated to cause approximately 125,000 deaths annually and at least 10 percent of hospitalizations, and to cost the American health care system between \$100 billion and \$289 billion a year.

The second is Hepatitis C in prisoners.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2018, Hepatitis C is a liver infection caused by the blood-borne Hepatitis C virus. Today, most people become infected with the Hepatitis C virus by sharing needles or other equipment to inject drugs. For 70%–85% of people who become infected with Hepatitis C, it becomes a long-term, chronic infection. Chronic Hepatitis C is a serious disease than can result in long-term health problems, even death. Nearly 750,000 American prisoners have Hepatitis C.

Once a death sentence, the disease has recently become treatable. Alcorn 18 at the New York Times writes that In 2014, drugmakers began to introduce new medicines that cure nearly all patients, revolutionizing treatment. But these drugs were introduced at a cost of \$84,000 per course of therapy. Even four years later, cheaper generics have emerged—at a cost of \$26,400 per course of treatment. This has yielded drugs that prisons can't possibly afford to pay for patients. In 2015, state corrections departments were treating less than 1 percent of inmates known to be infected.

If price controls were enacted and the price for the cure for Hepatitis C was reduced, the lives of nearly 750,000 prisoners could be saved.

Thus, we proudly affirm.