In Re: Petition to Provide Certification to Congress Under Section 804(l) of Chapter VIII of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, and to Authorize a Pilot Program for Importation of Prescription Drugs in the State of Illinois

AFFIDAVIT OF ALAN SAGER, Ph.D.

Professor Alan Sager, Ph.D., being duly sworn, hereby deposes and states:

QUALIFICATIONS

I am a professor of health services at the Boston University School of Public Health, where I have taught health care finance, administration, and policy to public health students since 1983. I serve as one of the two directors of the Health Reform Program, and direct the master of public health degree program in health services. I have a B.A. in economics from Brandeis University, and a Ph.D. in city and regional planning, specializing in health care, from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

I have served on the Massachusetts Health Finance Working Group, on the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Advisory Group on Health Care Reform, and as a hospital trustee. I have testified six times before U.S. House and Senate committees (four times on prescription drug issues and twice on hospital survival problems), and before eight states’ legislative committees (on prescription drug pricing, health care costs, physician balance billing, improving health care coverage, and hospital survival).

Since 1993, the Health Reform Program has been investigating methods of obtaining affordable medications for all Americans while protecting and enhancing breakthrough pharmaceutical research. The evidence and analysis offered in this affidavit rest on work performed jointly over the past fifteen years with my fellow director, Deborah Socolar, M.P.H.

I am over the age of 18, and a citizen and resident of the United States of America and the State of Massachusetts. I have personal knowledge of all the facts and opinions set forth in this Affidavit, and I would be competent to testify thereto if called upon to do so as a witness. The opinions expressed in this Affidavit are my own, and are not presented on behalf of Boston University.
INTRODUCTION

Governor Blagojevich’s petition on behalf of the State of Illinois requests that the Commissioner of the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) certify to Congress that importing prescription drugs from Canada is safe and will result in a significant reduction in the cost of prescription drugs to the American consumer. The State of Illinois asks the FDA to promulgate regulations authorizing pharmacists and wholesalers to import prescription drugs from Canada into the United States on a nationwide, statewide, or pilot program basis. Alternatively, the State of Illinois asks the FDA to grant waivers to residents nationwide, statewide, or on a pilot program basis so that residents may import prescription drugs from Canada into the United States for personal use. In my opinion, importing prescription drugs from Canada is safe, and accomplishes the essential goal of lowering drug prices.

Higher drug prices hurt American patients and penalize American employers, workers, and taxpayers. Prescription drug prices in the United States are the highest in the world, with patients and payers in the United States providing the world’s drug makers with about one-half of their world-wide revenue. The gap between U.S. prices and those in other wealthy nations is rising, and the U.S. share of drug makers’ revenue is also increasing. This is not a stable or sustainable arrangement.

Importing prescription drugs from Canada offers a safe and effective way to lower prescription drug prices in the United States. There is little evidence of any genuine health threat arising from the importation of prescription drugs from Canada, which has stringent regulatory protections in place to ensure safety. Whatever health risks have been identified are largely attributable to the current FDA opposition to imports, which has resulted in an unregulated prescription drug black market. By allowing imports from Canada, the FDA could establish a regulatory framework that would eliminate the health risks arising from the prescription drug black market. American consumers would save billions of dollars importing Canadian prescription drugs, and the lower prices would enable individuals who presently cannot afford prescription drugs to obtain needed medical treatments.

This affidavit is divided into three main sections. The first identifies and describes the unsustainable price levels of prescription drugs in the United States. The second sets out reasons why importing prescription drugs from Canada is safe, and why it will enhance the health of the citizens of the United States and the residents of Illinois. The third describes why importing prescription drugs from Canada would result in a significant reduction in drug costs for American consumers.

In this affidavit, the word “importing,” and its variants, will be used to describe the activity of bringing prescription drugs from Canada into the United States. Another term, “reimporting,” refers to bringing back into the United States drugs manufactured here but then exported for use in another nation. For purposes of this Affidavit, the word “importing,” and its variants, includes “reimporting.”
I. UNITED STATES DRUG PRICES ARE RISING AND UNSUSTAINABLE

1. **The world’s highest prices—and rising.** Prescription drug prices in the United States are the highest in the world. The evidence in Exhibit 1, calculated from data compiled by the Canadian Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, shows that U.S. prices are extraordinarily high, and that the gap between U.S. prices and those in other wealthy nations is actually widening.\(^1\) The top line in each pair of bars shows the 2002 U.S. price excess over those in other nations; the bottom line shows the smaller excess for the year 2000.

It appears likely that the gap between U.S. drug prices and those in other wealthy nations is going to grow substantially greater in the years ahead. The European Court of Justice has issued a ruling that, if upheld, will result in lower drug prices in many of the 15 European Union nations.\(^2\) The ruling would regularize the practice of moving drugs from one nation to another within the EU. The probable result will be that many Europeans will pay substantially lower prices for medications. Responses available to drug makers include accepting the resulting revenue loss, raising U.S. prices still higher, and fighting for higher prices in EU nations.

---

**Exhibit 1**

* Rise in U.S. Brand Name Drug Price Excess over Prices in 7 Nations, 2000 to 2002

- **Switzerland:** 58% (2002), 44% (2000)
- **United Kingdom:** 60% (2002), 46% (2000)
- **Germany:** 74% (2002), 53% (2000)
- **Canada:** 67% (2002), 50% (2000)
- **Sweden:** 78% (2002), 67% (2000)
- **France:** 102% (2002), 81% (2000)
- **Italy:** 112% (2002), 80% (2000)

---

\(^1\) Calculated by the Canadian Patented Medicine Prices Review Board.

\(^2\) European Court of Justice ruling.
2. Spending on retail prescription drugs here has doubled every five years since 1994, rising more than twice as fast as the rest of health spending, as indicated in Exhibit 2. Further, spending on retail prescription drugs has grown more than 4.5 times as fast as the U.S. economy as a whole.\(^3\)

**Exhibit 2**


![Graph showing the growth of retail prescription drug and all other health spending from 1994 to 2004 as percentage of 1994 spending. The graph indicates a significant increase in spending over the years.]
3. The continuing rise in prescription drug prices is particularly worrisome, given that health care spending itself represented more than fifteen percent (15%) of the gross domestic product in 2003, four times reported defense spending and double education spending. (Please refer to Exhibit 3.) In 1970, by contrast, health, education, and defense spending were all about the same share of the economy—about seven percent of GDP.

Exhibit 3

4. As shown in Exhibit 4, the world’s drug makers drew more than one-half their revenue from North America in 2002, up from one-third in 1996. The great majority of that revenue comes from the United States.
II. IMPORTING IS HEALTHY AND SAFE

Prescription drugs, medical supplies, food, and other goods subject to adulteration routinely and safely move across the U.S. – Canadian border. The net additional benefits of importing prescription drugs from Canada into the United States are substantial, whereas the net additional risks, if any, are minimal. That conclusion follows from an analysis of the number of patients who will be helped medically by lower-cost prescriptions, and how much they will be helped, versus the number of patients who will be harmed by importation, and how much they will be harmed. For the reasons that follow, the evidence is clear that the net benefits will be enormous, whereas the net risks are negligible.

1. Net Additional Benefits of Importing

Many Americans suffer avoidable death, disability, illness, and pain owing to their inability to afford needed medications. Multiple studies confirm that patients do not fill their doctors’ prescriptions. It seems likely that many other patients do not even go to the doctor to ask for prescriptions, knowing that they cannot afford to fill them. The benefits associated with importing lower-priced drugs will therefore be enjoyed by patients who today do not obtain prescriptions or do not fill them.

The unmet need for medications is very substantial. In a 1999 report prepared for the U.S. House of Representatives Prescription Drug Task Force, my colleague and I estimated that roughly one-quarter of all Americans lacked insurance for prescription drugs. That share has surely increased over the past five years, owing to a rise in the number of Americans without any health insurance, to a loss of retiree health insurance coverage, and even to an apparent rise in the share of persons covered by job-based health insurance that excludes prescription drug coverage.

Numerous recent surveys have found evidence of substantial unmet need for medications in the United States, especially among seniors, whose health problems are greater and whose rates of drug coverage are lower than in the under-65 population. A study in eight states, for example, found that nearly one-fourth of seniors surveyed reported that, because of high costs, they skipped doses of medication or failed to obtain prescribed drugs. In the same survey, chronically ill seniors who were uninsured for drugs skipped medications at rates 2-3 times higher than those who had drug coverage.

A November 2002 Harris poll found that surveyed adults reported these striking problems within the previous year:

- 18 percent—and 33 percent of those in fair or poor health—had failed to ask for prescriptions because of their cost
- 22 percent—and 41 percent of sicker adults—failed to fill a prescription because of the cost
- 15 percent—and 29 percent of sicker adults—took a lower dose to make it last longer
- 18 percent—and 37 percent of sicker adults—took a drug less often than prescribed to make it last longer.
More recently, an Associated Press/Ipsos poll found that one-third of Americans report that paying for medications is a problem.\textsuperscript{9}

The inability to afford medications is more acute among African Americans and Latinos than among non-Latino Caucasians.\textsuperscript{10}

Caregivers also see these problems. Inability to afford medications is a “substantial barrier” to patient compliance with physician directives.\textsuperscript{11}

Caregivers in safety-net hospitals and clinics also report substantial difficulty in helping patients who lack drug coverage obtain the medications they need, with health center pharmacies, in some cases, having to turn away patients when funding runs short.\textsuperscript{12}

Often, sadly, it is easiest to measure the harm associated with lack of medications when new price barriers to using drugs are introduced. Tamblyn and colleagues found that introducing prescription drug cost-sharing for older patients in Quebec led to a drop in use of essential drugs by 9 percent. Adverse clinical events increased from 5.8 per 10,000 person months to 12.6.\textsuperscript{13} The clinical harm suffered by the large numbers of Americans uninsured or underinsured for prescription drugs must be substantial.

Similarly, Soumerai and colleagues found that limits on prescription drug use in the New Hampshire Medicaid program led to substantial increases in use of emergency mental health services and inpatient care by elders.\textsuperscript{14}

Rising drug prices have also for several years been associated with the erosion of prescription drug coverage under employers’ retiree health programs—and even with the truncation of coverage under such programs. This is not surprising, since more than one-half of retiree health costs are from prescription drugs.\textsuperscript{15}

In a recent four-day period, two instances of cuts in private or public prescription drug programs were announced. Both cuts were said to be caused partly by high drug costs.

- Rising drug prices were implicated in placing some 800 AIDS in the U.S. on waiting lists for vital medications.\textsuperscript{16}

- Two New Hampshire hospitals ended their program of subsidized drug purchases. They blamed a combination of low reimbursement rates and the rising cost of prescription drugs.\textsuperscript{17}

When drug prices are lowered, through importation or other means, more patients will be able to fill more prescriptions. While there is some disagreement about the size of the increase in use in response to lower prices, I believe it will be substantial.\textsuperscript{18} Much of the unmet need just described will be met, easing human suffering.
2. **Net Additional Risks of Importing**

The prohibition on drug importation, and high drug prices, have together created an unregulated black market for prescription drugs, one that can be eliminated by allowing regulated imports. Drug makers’ artificially high U.S. prices spur importing without accompanying oversight or controls. While almost all Canadian drugs are safe, some corrupt or careless suppliers may sell risky medications. Some desperate patients may buy them. High prices here drive both actions. If the United States achieved lower drug prices through legal importation, patients would have no need to buy from unsafe or illegal operators, domestic or foreign. Today’s rare unsafe imports are therefore a reason to legalize importation—not a pretext for intransigence.

The dangers associated with importing drugs from Canada to the United States have been highly exaggerated. Negative analyses of the safety issues involved in importing prescription drugs from Canada focus on purportedly unsafe drugs seized in connection with the prescription drug black market, without giving adequate consideration to the regulatory controls that would be involved in a legal importation framework.

For example, on September 29, 2003, the FDA issued a press release stating that it found “Hundreds of Potentially Dangerous Imported Drug Shipments.”\(^{19}\) The FDA declared that 1,019 of 1,153 packages (88 percent) “were violative because they contained unapproved drugs.” Packages were selected if they originated in nations “from which drugs are known to be exported via the mail.” It is worth noting that only 16 percent of the packages were from Canada, which in itself suggests that a legal program of importation from Canada would reduce the risks associated with black market drugs from non-Canadian sources.

The FDA cited several specific problems: unapproved drugs, drugs requiring careful dosing, drugs with inadequate labeling, improperly packaged drugs, drugs withdrawn from the market, animal drugs not approved for human use, drugs with dangerous interactions, drugs requiring subsequent patient monitoring, and controlled substances.

The FDA reported no tallies of the ways in which the 1,019 “violative” drugs failed legal tests, but it appears from the FDA’s public statements that the largest problem was the FDA’s own inadequate testing. According to the Associated Press, FDA Associate Commissioner William Hubbard reportedly “conceded the drugs hadn’t been tested for safety [at the border by the FDA or Customs] and that in most instances drugs imported by consumers are illegal regardless of their safety.”\(^{20}\)

By allowing the legal importation of prescription drugs from Canada, the FDA could adopt regulations requiring testing of imported drugs. Indeed, the proposal offered by the State of Illinois includes rigorous testing requirements for imported drugs.

There are several additional indications that importing drugs from Canada is not dangerous.

- When pressed, the FDA has apparently not been able to identify a single American patient who has been harmed by importing drugs from Canada.\(^{21}\) The FDA’s Director of Pharmacy Affairs said “I can’t think of one thing off the top of my head where somebody died or somebody got put in the hospital because of these
medications. I just don’t know if there’s anything like that.’’ Similarly, a spokesperson for Health Canada said that organization “does not have any information that would indicate that any Americans have become ill or have died as a result of taking prescription medications purchased from Canada.’’

- United Health, a large insurer, announced in October of 2002 that it would reimburse patients who bought drugs in Canada or other nations. That new policy applied to some 97,000 persons who bought insurance though AARP.\textsuperscript{22}

- The Associated Press has reviewed the 473 complaints to state regulators about pharmacies and pharmacists in Minnesota from 1999 to 2004. None “alleged an error by a foreign pharmacy.”\textsuperscript{23}

- The State of Minnesota has inspected mail order pharmacies in Canada and found some of them safe enough to list on a state web site, along with comparative prices.\textsuperscript{24}

- The governor of New Hampshire has found that importing drugs from Canadian pharmacies would be safe. The state’s crime laboratory performed a blind analysis of drugs bought in Canada and drugs bought in New Hampshire. No differences were found.\textsuperscript{25}

Drug importing should not be declared illegal because it is dangerous. Rather, it should be recognized that drug importing can sometimes be dangerous because it is illegal.

High U.S. drug prices and the prohibition on importation have together resulted in a domestic U.S. black market for prescription drugs and other unsafe practices that endanger patient safety. For example:

- BNA reported in 2000 that high drug costs were responsible for an internet black market in fertility drugs.\textsuperscript{26}

- The \textit{New York Post} described illegal marketing of outdated drugs and cited the head of the state attorney-general’s Medicaid Fraud Control Unit who attributed this to the high price of drugs in the U.S.\textsuperscript{27}

- The \textit{Boston Globe} reports an increase in the theft and diversion of prescription drugs in the New York region.\textsuperscript{28}

- The \textit{Wall Street Journal} noted that the Caremark PBM has been sued by pharmacists for reselling medications that other patients had returned. Most states prohibit this practice because it is believed to be unsafe.\textsuperscript{29}

These are avoidable consequences that could be reduced or eliminated outright through the legal importation of prescription drugs.
III. IMPORTING WILL RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT COST REDUCTIONS

If adequate supplies of drugs can be imported from Canada, the dollar savings to U.S. patients and other payers would be enormous. These dollar savings would be in addition to the direct, indirect, and intangible benefits of better health associated with greater ability to afford needed medications.

In 2001 U.S. Senate testimony, I estimated that Americans would save some $38.4 billion in one year on brand name prescription drugs if manufacturers sold in the U.S. at Canadian prices. I estimate that U.S. retail drug spending will have risen by 55.5 percent from 2001 to 2004. Applying this 55.5 percent increase to the figures included in that 2001 testimony, I project that Americans would save some $59.7 billion at manufacturers’ prices in 2004 were U.S. brand name prescription drugs sold at Canadian prices. State-by-state projected spending and savings are set forth in Exhibit 5.

These are the gross savings. They assume that Americans cease buying current prescriptions at U.S. prices and start buying those prescriptions at Canadian prices. There is no allowance for demanding greater numbers of prescriptions in response to the lower prices.

These savings would also be reduced, to some extent, by the cost of inspecting drugs imported from Canada. The inspection regime required by federal statute for importation of prescription drugs is not trivial. But the inspection costs are unlikely to equal even one percent of the dollar savings and the direct, indirect, and intangible benefits accruing from lower prices.
### Exhibit 5

**State-by-State Projected Spending on Brand Name Drugs in 2004, and Savings if the U.S. Paid Canadian Prices**

($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Name Drug Spending in 2004 at Factory Prices</th>
<th>Savings if Paid Canadian Prices</th>
<th>Brand Name Drug Spending in 2004 at Factory Prices</th>
<th>Savings if Paid Canadian Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$2,723 $1,022</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$411 $154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$233 $87</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$1,098 $412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$2,453 $921</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$838 $314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$1,585 $596</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$686 $258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$13,229 $4,966</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$6,223 $2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$1,703 $639</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$706 $264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$2,376 $893</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$12,500 $4,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$527 $198</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$4,504 $1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. C.</td>
<td>$316 $118</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$338 $126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$10,889 $4,087</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$6,842 $2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$4,318 $1,621</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$1,854 $695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$546 $205</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$1,611 $605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$586 $219</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$8,837 $3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$6,958 $2,611</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$701 $263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$3,613 $1,356</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$2,308 $866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$1,658 $622</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$353 $132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$1,499 $563</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$3,737 $1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$2,745 $1,031</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$10,571 $3,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$2,646 $992</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$989 $372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$801 $300</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$322 $121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$2,946 $1,106</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$3,739 $1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$3,812 $1,431</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$2,814 $1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$6,818 $2,560</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$1,362 $512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$2,618 $983</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$3,062 $1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$1,689 $635</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$233 $87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$3,184 $1,194</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>$159,107 $59,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

_______________________________
Professor Alan Sager, Ph.D.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME
this _____ day of April, 2004.

_______________________________
Notary Public
NOTES


31 Actual savings in a given state would vary slightly from those calculated here. That is because these calculations make three simplifying assumptions:


b) That private insurance, Medicaid, and self-pay shares of the market are similar from state to state. These actually vary somewhat from state to state.

c) That discounts and rebates are shared evenly among the states; in reality, these also vary somewhat from state to state.

Further, these calculations, while updated from the 2001 estimates in proportion to the rise in retail drug spending between 2001 and 2004, do not reflect changes in the U.S. – Canadian differential in prices for brand name drugs. And, as shown earlier in Exhibit 1, that differential has been widening somewhat in recent years. In 2000, U.S. prices were 60 percent above Canadian levels but this excess had risen to 67 percent in 2002.