

## Health Care Policy

**Health care spending and results.** The United States spends twice as much per person on health care as does any other developed country, yet on average gets worse results. The disparity has led many elected officials to call for major changes in public policy. The photo shows Sen. Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich. (right), and Sen. Tammy Baldwin, D-Wis., participating in a news conference to announce legislation giving people between the ages of fifty and sixty-four the option of buying into Medicare on February 13, 2019, in Washington, D.C.



Mark Wilson/Getty Images

## CHAPTER OBJECTIVES

- Understand the history and evolution of government involvement in health care.
- Explain major government health care programs.
- Identify important health care policy issues.
- Discuss concerns over and actions to address rising health care costs.
- Describe the role of managed care organizations.
- Explain measures that can be taken to reduce health care costs.
- Identify the role that quality of care plays in the health care system.
- Analyze selected issues in health care policy.

U.S. spending on health care has been of great concern in recent years, and regularly is at the center of political debate. Yet from 2008 through 2013, health care spending grew by less than 4 percent annually, one of the lowest rates in more than fifty years, and well down from the annual average of more than 7 percent that prevailed from 2000 through 2008 and even higher rates of increase during the 1990s. From 2014 through 2017, the rates of increase also were relatively stable. They rose to over 5 percent after adoption of the Affordable Care Act, primarily because an additional twenty million people gained health insurance coverage and many more enrolled in the federal Medicaid program as states expanded their coverage under the act. But then the rate dropped back to 3.9 percent for 2017.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) reported in early 2019 that even with this reduced rate of increasing expenditures, overall spending on health care rose to a record high of \$3.5 trillion in 2017, or nearly 18 percent of the nation's gross domestic product (GDP). The United States spent \$10,739 per person for health care in 2017, a figure certain to grow substantially over the next decade. Indeed, CMS projects that per capita spending on health care by 2027 will be an astonishing \$16,907 and that overall health care spending will rise to \$6.0 trillion, or 19.4 percent of GDP. Given these costs, and the continuing challenge of ensuring broad access to vital health care services, it is no wonder that President Barack Obama spent so much of his first year in office championing his proposed policy changes that eventually became the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, also known as Obamacare. It is equally unsurprising that the president's detractors saw the new act as another costly expansion of governmental authority they believed was unjustified.<sup>1</sup>

It is likely, however, that the high cost of health care in the United States will remain a difficult challenge for the president and Congress, and for the states, regardless of which party is in control. This is particularly so as the nation's population ages, driving up health care costs, and it continues to struggle with increasing federal deficits and a growing national debt.

Simply spending more money on health care, of course, is not necessarily the best way to deal with the nation's health care problems. The United States already spends twice as much per person on health care as most other industrialized nations, and achieves less for it. As the chief executive of the Mayo Clinic has stated: "We're not getting what we pay for. It's just that simple." The implication is that whether the money is spent through governmental programs or entirely in the private sector, fundamental changes are needed in the way the nation handles health and disease—that is, in the way we choose to structure and operate the health care system. As just one example, if more spending were shifted to preventive health care and wellness activities, the outcomes could be far better. This is because a very large percentage of health care costs go to treatment of chronic and preventable illnesses, such as diabetes, heart disease, and back and neck pain.<sup>2</sup> Would you favor such a change in spending priorities that put more emphasis on wellness and disease prevention? Are there any reasons not to make such a seemingly sensible change? This chapter should help in answering such questions.

The long-recognized gap between health care spending and results remains as striking today as when it was first noticed. In a 2018 report, for example, the Commonwealth Fund found that the United States ranks poorly in terms of health care cost, access, and affordability compared to other high-income countries based on a series of measures of

health system performance.<sup>3</sup> One reason for these findings is that prior to passage of the Affordable Care Act, some eighty-four million people in the United States either lacked health insurance or were underinsured, and therefore had limited access to health care services. Another is that the quality of health care people receive and what they pay for it depend on where they live and personal characteristics such as race, income, and education.<sup>4</sup> What, if anything, should the nation do to correct such an important inequity? And who should pay for the added cost of doing so?

The combination of the high cost of and unequal access to quality health care has long been a major concern in public policy. In 2018, the average health insurance premium for a family of four under employer-provided health plans reached \$19,616. Increasingly, workers also are forced to pay a higher percentage of these costs and to cope with higher deductibles and co-payments.<sup>5</sup> It is little wonder, then, that reform of health care policy has regularly appeared at the top of issues that voters consider important.

Most people rely on employer-provided health care insurance, for which they pay a portion of the cost, or on government programs to meet essential health care needs. Federal and state health care policies also affect the uninsured and those who pay for their own insurance. Government policies influence not only access to and quality of health care services across the country but also the pace of development and approval of new drugs and medical technologies and the extent of health care research that could lead to new lifesaving treatments. Whether the concern is periodic medical examinations, screening for major diseases, or coping with life-threatening illnesses, health care policy decisions eventually affect everyone.

This chapter examines some of the problems associated with health care services and the public policies designed to ensure that citizens have access to them at a reasonable cost. The chapter begins with background information about the evolution of major public policies, such as Medicare, Medicaid, and the veterans' health care system, and then turns to some of the leading policy disputes, including the rising costs of health care, the role of managed care, the regulation of prescription drugs, and the potential of preventive health care and other strategies to keep people healthy and save money. In this chapter, we focus on the effectiveness of current public policies, and we use the criteria of economic efficiency and equity to examine these disputes and recommendations for improving health care policy.

## BACKGROUND

Health care policy includes all the actions that governments take to influence the provision of health care services and the various government activities that affect or attempt to affect public health and well-being. Health care policy can be viewed narrowly to mean the design and implementation of the range of federal and state programs that affect the provision of health care services, such as Medicare and Medicaid. It also can be defined more broadly and more meaningfully by recognizing that government engages in many other activities that influence both public and private health care decision making. For example, the government funds health science research and public health departments and agencies; subsidizes medical education and hospital construction; regulates food, drugs, and

medical devices; regulates health-damaging environmental pollution; and allows tax deductions for some health care expenditures (which makes them more affordable). The box “Working with Sources: Health Care Policy Information” lists some useful websites to begin a policy investigation.

As a government activity, health care policymaking is relatively recent, even though governments at every level long ago established what we call **public health agencies** to counter the threat of infectious diseases or unsafe food and to support medical research. The work of these agencies should be clearly differentiated from what we recognize today as health care policymaking, which involves how we decide to deal with concerns such as access to health insurance and the provision and cost of health care services. These agencies dealt with such seemingly mundane but critical functions as providing safe drinking water supplies, sanitation, and waste removal. Many of the oldest of these public health agencies continue such work today, largely without much public notice. These include the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

## WORKING WITH SOURCES

### HEALTH CARE POLICY INFORMATION

As is the case with other public policy issues, there are hundreds of websites providing information on health care policy. The easiest way to learn about what information is available and its reliability is to visit one or more of the leading sites listed as follows and at the end of the chapter. Select one of these sites and try to find information about a major health care issue such as the ones highlighted in this chapter.

- How easily can you locate the information?
- Is coverage of the issue adequate or too limited to tell you what you need to know?
- Is the information provided at the site objective or biased in some way?

**www.ahip.org.** America’s Health Insurance Plans, a leading industry trade association, has broad and excellent coverage of and links to the full range of health care policy issues. Select the link to Issues, and then Medicaid, where you can find the industry’s views on the federal program, how well it works, and various suggestions for reform of it.

*(Continued)*

(Continued)

**www.citizen.org/topic/health-care/**. Public Citizen's Health and Safety site, with extensive links to policy issues and citizen activism. Select a topic such as drugs, devices, and supplements; health care delivery; or physician accountability.

**www.cms.gov**. The site for the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, with links covering Medicare; Medicaid/CHIP; Medicare–Medicaid coordination; private insurance; the CMS Innovation Center; regulations and guidance; research, statistics, data, and systems; and outreach and education.

**www.healthcare.gov**. The leading federal government site for general information about health care and the Affordable Care Act, including topics such as enrolling in health insurance, saving money, and taxes, penalties, and exemptions.

**www.kff.org**. Kaiser Family Foundation, one of the premier online resources for coverage of health policy news and debate. Under Topics, select Health Costs, Health Reform, Medicare, Uninsured, or Women's Health Policy, among other subjects.

**https://nam.edu/**. The National Academy of Medicine, formerly the Institute of Medicine, a major source for reliable health care studies. Includes links to related sites for health care studies and reports. Find reports on the main page under the Programs heading, which includes studies on countering the opioid epidemic, the culture of health, healthy longevity, and vital directions for health and health care.

**www.nytimes.com/section/health**. The *New York Times* health news page. Select a specific news report.

### Evolution of Health Care Policy

What we consider the core of health care policy developed in the United States only after the 1930s, with the idea of health insurance. Individuals could take out an insurance policy, much as they did for their lives, houses, or cars, that would defray the cost of health care should an illness develop or an injury occur. Most of those early policies covered only catastrophic losses. Health insurance works much the same way now, although instead of individual policies, most people are insured through their jobs, and the insurance policies cover routine medical services as well as preventive health care. Employer-sponsored health insurance became popular in the 1950s after the Internal Revenue Service ruled that its cost was a tax-deductible business expense. By the early 1960s, the push was on for federal health insurance policies, primarily to aid the poor and the elderly, two segments of the population that normally would not benefit from employer-provided health plans. It is clear that equity concerns in access to health care services were important

as health care policy developed. Those efforts culminated in the enactment of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965 that formally created the Medicare and Medicaid programs (Marmor 2000). These policies are discussed in detail later in the chapter.

Even with adoption of these two programs, the U.S. health care system remains distinctive in comparison to those of other industrialized nations, where **national health insurance**, also known as **single-payer insurance** (the government pays), is the norm; the Medicare program is one example of this in the United States. Campaigns to adopt national health insurance in the United States date back to 1948, when the Democratic Party platform endorsed the idea. Members of Congress began to introduce bills to create such a program, but they were unsuccessful until the decision in 1965 to establish insurance programs for the poor and the elderly through Medicaid and Medicare, respectively.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton submitted the Health Security Act to Congress after extensive analysis by a presidential health care task force headed by his wife, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton. The plan would have guaranteed health insurance to every American, including the thirty-four million who were uninsured at the time. Republicans in Congress criticized the Clinton plan as too expensive, bureaucratic, and intrusive, and the health insurance industry opposed it as well, and lobbied intensely against it. In the end, the Clinton recommendations failed to win congressional approval, as did the many alternatives members of Congress proposed (Hacker 1997; Patel and Rushefsky 2015).

With the election of Barack Obama and gains in Democratic seats in the House and Senate in the 2008 elections, national health care policy reform once again was in the spotlight, although with competing proposals that reflected deep differences between the two parties. President Obama had offered detailed proposals on his preferred approach to health care reform during the 2008 campaign, which he modified in 2009 in the face of Republican opposition and objections by the health insurance and pharmaceutical industries. In particular, the president abandoned what had been strong Democratic preference for a so-called public option, where the federal government would compete with private insurance companies in offering health care insurance. In 2009 and early 2010, Congress considered and eventually approved sweeping health care reforms, although on strict party-line votes. No Republican in either the Senate or the House voted for what became the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, and party members since then have vowed to repeal the act and replace it with an alternative policy.<sup>6</sup>

The **Affordable Care Act** is a highly complex and multifaceted policy in addition to being politically controversial. In recent years, most Republicans continued to call for its repeal, although with few concrete proposals for how they would replace it. Following their 2016 election success, both President Donald Trump and congressional Republicans vowed again to repeal the act, while also acknowledging that doing so might take several years. In an intriguing 2015 analysis, the Congressional Budget Office concluded that repealing the law would cost more than keeping it. Eliminating it entirely would add \$137 billion to the federal deficit over the next decade.<sup>7</sup>

The original 1,200-page law affects virtually every component of the U.S. health care system, and it survived a major legal challenge when the Supreme Court in 2012 upheld its constitutionality in a close vote.<sup>8</sup> Other legal challenges, however, continue. The major purpose of the law was to increase health insurance coverage and access to health care services, and it does so through a number of key actions: (1) expanding Medicaid and the

Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and making eligibility and benefits more uniform across the states (although the Court allowed for states to opt out of the Medicaid expansion part of the law); (2) mandating that individuals who are not covered through their employers or by public programs purchase a minimal level of health insurance, with tiered plans that must offer standard packages of benefits, or pay a penalty for failing to do so (a requirement that a Republican Congress repealed in 2017); (3) subsidizing the costs of such insurance for low- to moderate-income families; (4) offering tax credits to encourage small businesses to provide health insurance to their employees and instituting a penalty for larger employers (with fifty or more employees) who do not offer health insurance benefits; and (5) creating new regulations for health insurers to deal with several long-standing concerns, such as prohibiting insurers from excluding children and eventually all individuals with preexisting medical conditions, preventing them from setting annual and lifetime limits on coverage, and requiring them to cover family members (such as college students) up to age twenty-six. Other provisions in the act set new limits on allowable administrative costs to encourage insurers to improve efficiencies in billing and health care management. The various components of the act were to take effect over a seven-year period between 2011 and 2018. A summary of them and how they apply to individuals can be found on the federal government's web page ([www.healthcare.gov](http://www.healthcare.gov)), where the full text of the act is posted.<sup>9</sup>

### MAJOR FEATURES OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

- Mandates that individuals not covered through their employers or by public programs purchase a minimal level of health insurance through state health insurance marketplaces (eliminated by Congress in late 2017)
- Subsidizes the costs of health insurance for low- to moderate-income families
- Offers tax credits for small businesses to provide health insurance to their employees
- Removes annual and lifetime limits or caps on health insurance coverage
- Requires insurers to cover family members (such as college students) up to age twenty-six
- Expands Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program
- Mandates free preventive services for those on Medicare and offers seniors savings on prescription drugs
- Creates accountable care organizations to help doctors and health care providers cooperate to deliver better care at lower cost
- Prohibits insurers from refusing coverage or charging higher rates due to gender or preexisting medical conditions

- Mandates that at least 80 to 85 percent of insurance premium dollars (depending on the plan) be spent on health care to reduce administrative costs
- Creates a new Patient's Bill of Rights to protect consumers from insurance industry abuses
- Establishes a new Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to study improved ways to care for patients

*Source:* Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, "Summary of the Affordable Care Act," at [www.kff.org/health-reform/fact-sheet/summary-of-the-affordable-care-act/](http://www.kff.org/health-reform/fact-sheet/summary-of-the-affordable-care-act/).

Among the act's more intriguing and promising elements are requirements to study ways to improve the efficiency of health care service delivery and to reduce costs. A new CMS Innovation Center is to oversee such studies and to devise ways to reward health care providers for improved quality and gains in efficiency. Similarly, a new independent federal advisory board is to identify cost savings in the Medicare program, and the new Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute is to conduct research on the comparative effectiveness of health care services—that is, to determine which procedures and drugs work best and at the least cost, a widely endorsed but still controversial proposal.<sup>10</sup> Other provisions in the act seek ways to reduce costly medical errors and hospital-acquired infections by rewarding hospitals with better patient outcomes, and to promote the use of disease management programs and preventive health care. Despite the partisan rancor over the bill, the two parties were largely in agreement on the need to increase emphasis on preventive health care through both governmental and private insurance programs.<sup>11</sup>

The costs of the Affordable Care Act are sizeable, and yet they are expected to be offset in part by a variety of new revenues, including a 0.9 percent increase in the Medicare payroll tax for high earners (household income of greater than \$250,000 a year) and a 3.8 percent tax on so-called passive income such as dividends and capital gains that took effect in 2013, also only for high-earning households. The act's critics, however, argue that net costs nonetheless are likely to rise because they believe that Congress may not agree to all the new taxes and fees or make the expected reductions in some health care spending, and that younger people might not sign up for insurance plans in sufficient numbers to balance older and less healthy segments of the population. In the past several years, many critics also anticipated that prices some will pay for insurance coverage might well increase substantially, at least in the short term. The longer-term impacts are less clear, particularly in comparison to what might prevail without the act.<sup>12</sup>

As noted in chapter 6, implementation of the new act did not go as smoothly as the government had hoped. In addition, it soon became clear that each state would choose whether to offer a state insurance exchange or to defer to the federal government. Many states controlled by Republican legislators and governors chose not to offer their own exchanges as one expression of their dislike of the federal program.<sup>13</sup> In addition,



following the Supreme Court's 2012 decision, many states chose not to expand Medicaid services under the Affordable Care Act even though the federal government was covering nearly all the costs of doing so. These choices will affect the law's implementation, its success in persuading large numbers of people to sign up for insurance, and the anticipated cost savings.

The Trump administration also sought to use executive authority to weaken implementation of the law when it was unsuccessful in seeking its repeal from Congress. For example, it largely defunded programs to educate the public about enrollment in Affordable Care Act insurance programs, and one executive order instructed federal agencies "to waive, defer, grant exemptions from, or delay the implementation of" the parts of the act that they could.<sup>14</sup> Critics of the administration's actions argue that in effect it sought to sabotage the law through its rules and regulations as well as spending priorities.<sup>15</sup>

Many of the uncertainties over how well the new provisions of the act will work, what they will cost, and how they will be paid for may well be reduced over the next several years as some of the remaining conflicts over the act's provisions are resolved and more individuals sign up for insurance plans under the law. The early years were promising. In 2016, for example, the Obama administration reported that enrollment in the new plans had exceeded expectations, with about 12.7 million in the marketplace itself, and about 20 million people total, if counting the Affordable Care Act marketplace, Medicaid expansion, young adults who stayed on their parents' plan, and coverage under other provisions of the act. The percentage of nonelderly Americans without health care insurance dropped from about 15.7 percent of the population (48.6 million people) to 9.2 percent (28.5 million), although young and healthy people more than others resisted signing up for insurance under the act, thus jeopardizing the program's overall financial solvency.<sup>16</sup>

Continuing conflict over the law in Congress and the states tells us that we can expect persistent and sometimes intense disagreements between the two parties over what role the federal and state governments should play in health care insurance and the delivery of health services to the public. There also is no shortage of recommendations for how to improve the Affordable Care Act. Yet surveys conducted just after the 2016 elections and in later years, much as those taken before, showed that a large majority of Americans support the policy's major provisions, such as allowing children up to age twenty-six to stay on their parents' health plans, having the federal government help states to expand their Medicaid programs to cover a larger number of those in poverty, providing subsidies to low- and moderate-income people who use the government exchanges, and prohibiting insurers from denying coverage to those with preexisting medical conditions.<sup>17</sup> Partly because of growing public support for the act, health care policy became a major issue in the 2018 midterm elections to the benefit of Democratic candidates. It is also likely to be a prominent issue in the 2020 presidential election.

### A Hybrid System of Public and Private Health Care

Another way to consider the history of health care in the United States and the nation's present health care system is to emphasize that it relies largely on the private market and individual choice to reach health care goals, as we indicated in the chapter's opening paragraphs. Even following enactment of the Affordable Care Act, the U.S. government plays a

smaller role in health care than, for example, the governments of Great Britain or Canada, nations with national health insurance programs that provide comprehensive health services. Their systems have been criticized for delays in providing health services for some patients as well as the quality of care, although these weaknesses appear to be less important today than previously, and most citizens in these and other developed nations appear to be well served by such health care systems.<sup>18</sup>

In contrast to such government-run systems, most health care services in the United States are provided by doctors and other medical staff who work in clinics and hospitals that are privately run, even if many are not-for-profit operations. Indeed, the United States has long had the smallest amount of public insurance or provision of public health services of any developed nation in the world (Patel and Rushefsky 2015). The result is a health care system that is something of a hybrid. It is neither completely private nor fully public. It does, however, reflect the unique political culture of the nation, as first discussed in chapter 1. Americans place great emphasis on individual rights, limited government authority, and a relatively unrestrained market system. Those who favor a larger government role to reduce the current inequities in access to health care services are in effect suggesting that health care be considered a so-called **merit good** to which people are entitled. In short, they tend to believe that normal market forces should not be the determining factor in the way society allocates such a good.

Most nonelderly U.S. adults have employer-sponsored, private health insurance, and others purchase similar insurance through individual policies. Those over age sixty-five are covered through Medicare, discussed later in the chapter. But with rising costs and a slow-growing economy, employer coverage is likely to be less widely available in the future. About 56 percent of small firms and 98 percent of large companies offered health benefits to at least some of their employees in 2018.<sup>19</sup> The annual premium for covered workers averaged \$19,616 for family coverage, with employees paying \$5,547 of that amount; single premiums averaged \$6,896.<sup>20</sup> These premiums have been rising at about 3 to 5 percent for the past several years, leading employers to cut back on some benefits and to shift more of the cost to employees. That trend will likely continue.

Employer and other private health insurance policies generally cover a substantial portion of health care costs, but not all. Some services, such as elective cosmetic surgery, generally are not covered, and only partial payment may apply to others. The federal government can specify services that must be included in private insurance plans, but there are major gaps in coverage, such as assistance with expensive prescription drugs and provision of long-term care in nursing homes and similar facilities that may follow a disabling injury or illness, or simple aging. People are living longer, and the demand for these services is expected to rise dramatically in the future as the U.S. population ages. Most policies historically also have had a lifetime cap on covered expenses that could be exceeded in the event of serious medical conditions, but the Affordable Care Act eliminated such caps.

### The Perils of Being Uninsured

The number of individuals and families without any insurance coverage rose significantly between 1990 and 2010, and this was a major driver in congressional approval of the

Affordable Care Act. The number of nonelderly Americans without insurance (that is, those not eligible for Medicare) fell from forty-four million in 2013, before the act took effect, to twenty-seven million by 2016, and then rose somewhat. Continued uncertainty over the Affordable Care Act may further increase the population of uninsured citizens. That percentage varies widely around the nation and from state to state. In some states (e.g., Georgia, Florida, and Texas), more than 15 percent of the nonelderly population was uninsured in recent years, but in several states (Connecticut, Vermont, Hawaii, and Massachusetts), the rate was 7 percent or less.<sup>21</sup>

As the cost of medical care continues to grow, what happens to the uninsured? The consequences for them can be devastating—a higher lifelong risk of serious medical problems and premature death. The uninsured are more likely than the insured to receive too little medical care, to receive it too late, to be sick, and to die prematurely. A 2009 Harvard University study estimated that some forty-five thousand Americans die each year from lack of health insurance.<sup>22</sup> Studies like these on the consequences of being uninsured played a role in consideration and enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

The uninsured also are more likely than the insured to receive less adequate care when they are in a hospital, even for acute care, such as injuries from an automobile accident. They are more likely to go without cancer screening tests, such as mammograms, clinical breast exams, Pap tests, and colorectal screenings, and therefore suffer from delayed diagnosis and treatment.<sup>23</sup>

In addition, the uninsured tend not to receive the care recommended for chronic diseases such as diabetes, HIV infection, end-stage renal (kidney) disease, mental illness, and high blood pressure, and they have worse clinical outcomes than patients with insurance. “The fact is that the quality and length of life are distinctly different for insured and uninsured populations,” a 2002 National Academy of Medicine report said. It added

**Prescription for health care.**

Michelle Loose, a University of Denver accelerated nursing student, checks the blood pressure for patient Elife Bzuneh, during a medical clinic night at the DAWN clinic on August 9, 2016, in Aurora, Colorado. DAWN is a student-run clinic established to serve uninsured patients in Aurora at no cost. It opened in March 2015. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, or Obamacare, was designed to improve access to health care for those without medical insurance, among other goals.



Anya Semenoff/The Denver Post via Getty Images

that if this group obtained coverage, the health and longevity of working-age Americans would improve (National Academy of Medicine 2002).

At least some policymakers are aware of some of these risks and the inequities they present to the U.S. public. As the failure of the Clinton health policy initiative in the 1990s and continuing controversy over the Affordable Care Act show, however, reaching agreement on extending insurance coverage to the entire population is not an easy task. The debate is likely to continue for years, and the rising costs of health care may force reconsideration of current policies that leave so many citizens without health care insurance.

## Strengths and Weaknesses of the U.S. Health Care System

No one seriously doubts that the United States has one of the finest health care systems in the world by any of the conventionally used indicators, such as the number of physicians per capita, the number of state-of-the-art hospitals and clinics, or the number of health care specialists and their expertise. The United States also has a large percentage of the world's major pharmaceutical research centers and biotechnology companies, which increases the availability of cutting-edge medical treatments.

Despite these many strengths, however, patients and physicians alike frequently complain about the U.S. health care system. As noted at the beginning of the chapter, the United States is ranked well below the level of other developed nations despite spending far more than other nations on health care per person.<sup>24</sup> Such findings reflect the highly unequal access of the population to critical health care services, from prenatal care to preventive screening for chronic illnesses. The poor, the elderly, minorities, and those living in rural areas generally receive less frequent and less adequate medical care than white, middle-class residents of urban and suburban areas. Because of such disparities, among others, the fifty states vary widely in the health of their populations, with Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Connecticut at the top in recent rankings and Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana at the bottom.<sup>25</sup>

As discussed earlier, comparisons of U.S. health care costs to those in other nations force the question of what U.S. citizens are getting for their money. Just how effective are current programs, and are health care dollars being well spent? How might the programs be modified to improve their effectiveness and efficiency and to ensure that there is equitable access to health care services? Plenty of controversy surrounds each of these questions, and they remain at the center of policymakers' concerns about the future of the U.S. health care system. The websites listed in the box "Working with Sources: Health Care Policy Information" in the early part of this chapter cover health care developments and policies and offer a wealth of information on these issues.

## A Pluralistic Health Care System

Before we turn to a description and assessment of specific U.S. health care programs, we start with an overview of the health care system itself. The individual health care programs are complicated enough to confuse even the experts, but they do not represent the totality of government activities that affect the health and welfare of the U.S. public. A broad view of health care policy suggests that many other actions should be included as well. Table 8-1 lists the collection of agencies and policies at the federal, state, and local levels.

**TABLE 8-1** Major Government Health-Related Programs

Level of Government	Agency and Function
Federal	<p>Department of Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food safety inspection (meat and poultry)</li> <li>• Food stamp and child nutrition programs</li> <li>• Consumer education</li> </ul> <p>Department of Health and Human Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and Drug Administration</li> <li>• Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</li> <li>• Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services</li> <li>• Health Resources and Services Administration (health resources for underserved populations)</li> <li>• Indian Health Service</li> <li>• Substance abuse programs</li> <li>• Health education</li> <li>• Public Health Service (including the surgeon general's office, the National Institutes of Health, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)</li> </ul> <p>Department of Labor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occupational Safety and Health Administration (regulation of workplace safety and health)</li> </ul> <p>Department of Veterans Affairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veterans Health Administration (VA hospitals and programs)</li> </ul> <p>Environmental Protection Agency (regulation of clean air and water, drinking water, pesticides, and toxic chemicals)</p>
State	<p>Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)</p> <p>State hospitals</p> <p>State mental hospitals</p> <p>Support of state medical schools</p> <p>State departments of health</p> <p>Health education</p> <p>State departments of agriculture and consumer protection</p> <p>State environmental protection programs</p>
Local	<p>City and county hospitals and clinics</p> <p>Public health departments and sanitation</p> <p>Emergency services</p> <p>City and county health and human services programs</p>

The table indicates the diversity of departments and agencies that are involved in health-related services, broadly defined, and shows that authority is highly diffused rather than concentrated and is shared among all levels of government. As we saw in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, states have a great deal of discretion in what they choose to do under the act, as they have long had with state Medicaid programs. Moreover, as noted earlier in discussion of the hybrid U.S. health care system, health services are delivered through both the private sector and public programs. The programs most frequently in the public eye, such as Medicare and Medicaid, are only part of what governments do to promote the public's health. To put this in other terms, solutions to U.S. health problems are not to be found solely in either expanding or modifying the established Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans' health care programs. Other actions also are possible, including those that rely on preventive health care. These include personal decisions related to diet and exercise, detection of disease at its earliest stages, health education, medical research, environmental protection, and a host of public and private programs to improve mental and physical health. We will return to a discussion of such preventive health care below.

## MAJOR GOVERNMENT HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

The following sections describe the major federal and state programs that deal directly with health care services. In addition to the programs' goals and provisions, the discussion tries to evaluate them in terms of the major public policy criteria we set out earlier in the text: effectiveness, efficiency, and equity.

### Medicare

The federal **Medicare** program began in 1965, following authorization by that year's amendments to the Social Security Act of 1935. It was intended to help senior citizens, defined as those age sixty-five and older, to meet basic health care needs. It now includes people under age sixty-five with permanent disabilities and those with diabetes or end-stage renal disease—for example, patients who need dialysis treatment or a kidney transplant. Total Medicare enrollment in 2018 (counting original Medicare and Medicare Advantage programs) exceeded fifty-eight million, a number expected to rise sharply over the next two decades as the rest of the baby boom generation—those born between 1946 and 1964—reaches age sixty-five. By 2030, the number of Medicare enrollees will likely be greater than eighty million. In 2019, the three major entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid (including CHIP)—already accounted for about 50 percent of federal spending.<sup>26</sup>

*Medicare Program Provisions.* The Medicare program has two main parts, one standard and the other optional. Medicare Part A is the core plan, which pays partially for hospital charges, with individuals responsible for a deductible and co-payments that can be substantial. The program is paid for by Medicare trust funds, which most employees pay through a payroll deduction, much like the Social Security tax, which employers match.

Part A also covers up to one hundred days in a nursing care facility following release from the hospital, but again with co-payments. Part A of Medicare covers people who are eligible for the federal Social Security system or Railroad Retirement benefits.

The optional part of the Medicare program, Part B, is supplemental insurance for coverage of health care expenses other than hospital stays. These include physician charges, diagnostic tests, and hospital outpatient services. The cost of Part B insurance is shared by individuals who choose to enroll in it (in 2019, they paid \$135.50 per month, or more for those with higher incomes) and by the government, which covers about three-fourths of the cost from general federal revenues. Part B also has both deductibles and co-payments, and historically it did not cover routine physical examinations by a physician, but it now covers a yearly “wellness” visit that is designed to help prevent disease and maintain good health, and a variety of other preventive health services such as cardiovascular, cancer, and diabetes screenings. Many of these services were mandated by Congress under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and further changes have come with the Affordable Care Act.

Medicare uses a fee schedule of “reasonable” costs that specifies what physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, and home services should charge for a given procedure, and the government pays 80 percent of that amount. Some physicians choose not to participate in the Medicare system because they believe the fee schedule is too low and their options for raising patient fees are unrealistic.

Equally important is the fact that the regular Medicare program does not cover many other medical expenses, including prescription drugs used outside of the hospital, dental care, and eyeglasses. It also pays for only the first ninety days of a hospital stay and limited nursing home care. Because of these restrictions and the deductibles and co-payment charges, Medicare historically has covered only about two-thirds of the health care costs for the elderly. Individuals must therefore pay for the rest of the costs or purchase supplementary private insurance policies to cover the gaps in Medicare. Low-income elderly also may be eligible for state Medicaid programs, which cover some of these costs. Despite the many restrictions, Medicare is a bargain for the elderly, who would have to pay much higher fees for a full private insurance policy, considering the chronic and serious health problems they are likely to face. In 2018, Congress approved a new Chronic Care Act that permits Medicare to provide more benefits to better coordinate and manage chronic diseases. However, critics fault the new law because that care is restricted to those enrolled in the private Medicare Advantage programs. It is not available to those in the traditional Medicare program.<sup>27</sup>

As we discussed earlier, the costs of health care in general, including Medicare, continue to rise, and this trend poses major challenges to the solvency of the Medicare trust fund as the population ages and the ranks of Medicare recipients swell. With the enactment of the Medicare prescription drug benefit program in 2003, a previous Medicare + Choice program was replaced with Medicare Advantage (Part C), which consists of managed care programs that are run by private health insurance companies. In 2019, about 37 percent of those on Medicare signed up for a Medicare Advantage plan, with the rest choosing to remain with a traditional fee-for-service Medicare plan (Part B). The figure was well up from earlier years after the Trump administration aggressively sought to promote the private insurance plans over traditional Medicare.<sup>28</sup> Medicare Part D

took effect on January 1, 2006. Approved by Congress in late 2003 in response to the rapid rise in drug prices, particularly for senior citizens, the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 has several key elements. It is intended to provide discounts for routine prescription drugs and also to protect those who enroll against the extremely high costs that come with a serious illness. Prescription drug benefits depend on the plan that is selected.<sup>29</sup>

*Fraud and Abuse under Medicare.* A perennial problem in all government health care programs is fraud and abuse, especially notable under Medicare. Indeed, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has declared both Medicare and Medicaid as “high risk” programs that are “particularly vulnerable to fraud, waste, abuse, and improper payments.”<sup>30</sup> Less-than-scrupulous health care providers may charge the government for services that were not performed or order tests and procedures that may not be necessary but for which the health care provider knows Medicare will pay. The CMS has no official estimate of fraud, but the GAO has indicated that up to \$60 billion a year, or about 10 percent of Medicare’s budget, may be lost to a combination of fraud, waste, abuse, and improper payments.

Such improper payments have a long history. A 1998 Department of Health and Human Services investigation into abuses by community mental health centers noted there was “extensive evidence of providers who are not qualified, patients who are not eligible, and services billed to Medicare that are not appropriate,” including services “that weren’t covered, weren’t provided, or weren’t needed.”<sup>31</sup> More recent assessments of Medicare spending echo those concerns. The program continues to be deficient in its monitoring and enforcement of quality standards and in its oversight of spending even though it spends over \$1 billion annually to combat fraud, waste, and abuse. Health care centers say that at least part of the problem lies in the government’s complex billing procedures that contribute to errors. Federal agents who investigate Medicare fraud are not persuaded by such arguments. They charge that health care providers intentionally put services into a higher-paying category, or “up code” their billing, and engage in other illegal practices to increase profits.

*Medicare’s Future.* Given the projections of an aging population, the cost of the Medicare program represents one of the most important issues in health care policy. It is a subject of regular debate in Congress, and some members have proposed dramatic changes, such as converting Medicare from a government-run insurance program to one where program participants are issued vouchers to purchase private health insurance on the open market. After the 2016 elections, many Republicans in Congress continued to press for such a major policy change. Aside from the prescription drug plan approved in 2003, there has been little agreement on how to modify Medicare to alter its benefits or improve its effectiveness and sustainability over time in light of the increasing demand for its services. There is no shortage of suggestions for how to reform the program, and these ideas are widely available.<sup>32</sup> However, bipartisan cooperation on health care policy, including Medicare reform, is made difficult by intense ideological disagreements over the role of government in health care and the different constituencies to which each of the major parties tries to appeal. The debate is certain to continue.



## Medicaid

**Medicaid** is the second major program of the U.S. health care policy system. Like Medicare, it was established in 1965, as Title XIX of the Social Security Act. It is designed to assist the poor and disabled through a federal-state program of health insurance. It differs from Medicare in one critical way: Medicare serves all citizens once they reach age sixty-five, regardless of income and is therefore a form of national health insurance for senior citizens, but Medicaid is a specialized health care program for the poor and disabled.

*Medicaid Provisions and Controversies.* Under Medicaid, the federal government establishes standards for hospital services, outpatient services, physician services, and laboratory testing, and it pays about half of the cost. States pay the remainder and set standards for eligibility and overall benefit levels, which have varied significantly from one state to another. If a state chooses to have a Medicaid program—and all have since 1982—it must also extend benefits to welfare recipients and to those receiving Supplemental Security Income because of blindness, another disability, or age. Medicaid provided health insurance coverage for over seventy-three million people in 2019, including thirty-five million children. By default, Medicaid has become the major payer for long-term health care provided in nursing homes and similar facilities, and it accounts for about half of the nation's spending for such services. Because of the rising demand and cost for these services, some states are changing their Medicaid programs to reduce use of nursing homes and to encourage health care in the home or community. These and other innovative approaches to help keep costs down will likely become more prevalent in the years ahead.<sup>33</sup>

In some respects, the state Medicaid programs are more generous than Medicare. The federal government requires states to cover hospitalization, nursing home services, physician services, diagnostic and screening tests, and X-rays. States may opt to cover prescription drug and other expenses, for which the cost can be exceedingly high. States are also required to cover children under the age of eighteen if the family income falls below the poverty level. Much like Medicare expenses, Medicaid costs continue to rise, in part because of expanded coverage under the Affordable Care Act. In 2017, spending stood at \$582 billion, or about 17 percent of all national health expenditures.

As might be expected in such a program, the states historically have been at odds with the federal government over the imposition of additional burdens. Medicaid is one of the largest programs in most state budgets. As states and counties spend more on Medicaid and face enormous resistance to raising taxes, they must cut back on the program's optional services, reduce the rate of reimbursement for physician and other services, and curtail funding elsewhere. Education, welfare, and other programs may suffer as Medicaid costs continue to rise.

In response to concern over the rising costs of Medicaid, in late 2005 Congress approved broad changes that gave states new power to reduce their costs through imposition of premiums and higher co-payments for many of Medicaid's benefits; these include prescription drugs, physician services, and hospital services, such as use of emergency rooms for nonurgent care. Higher costs for beneficiaries are expected to reduce their demand for those services. States also were authorized to cap or eliminate coverage for many services that previous federal law guaranteed within the program. In addition, the

new law made it somewhat more difficult for senior citizens to qualify for Medicaid nursing home care by transferring their assets to their children or other relatives.<sup>34</sup>

As part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, a new Title XXI was added to the Social Security Act to create the **Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)**, which helps to ensure that children living in poverty have medical coverage. The federal government provides funds to the states, which the states match. The states are free to set the eligibility levels, which can include families that earn up to three times the poverty level. More than eight million children have been covered under CHIP in recent years, but the states have varied widely in their ability to enroll children in the program. As has been the case for Medicaid in general, many states have reduced their funding of CHIP in recent years, as they have struggled with budget constraints and competing priorities. In 2007, Congress twice passed legislation to extend and expand CHIP, especially for families that work but remain too poor to pay for health insurance and make too much to enroll in Medicaid; the bills were vetoed by President George W. Bush. In 2009, Congress again took up similar legislation, with the cost to be financed largely by an increase in the federal tobacco tax. Both the House and Senate approved the measure by large margins and with bipartisan support, and President Obama signed it on February 4, 2009.<sup>35</sup> The Affordable Care Act made additional changes to the program, some of which continue to be subject to congressional debate.

*Issues of Medicaid Fraud and Abuse.* The Medicaid program, like Medicare, is vulnerable to fraud and abuse by service providers, such as filing inaccurate claims for reimbursement. Although the money lost to fraud is less than in the Medicare program, the costs are nevertheless substantial. The service providers defend themselves by arguing that they are the victims of an excessively complicated system of eligibility requirements and reimbursement procedures. The states vary widely in how they administer the Medicaid program, and some states, such as New York, have been singled out for doing a poor job historically of dealing with Medicaid fraud.<sup>36</sup> The National Conference of State Legislatures lists an extensive number of actions that the states have taken and might take to reduce Medicaid fraud and abuse, and also recounts the many provisions of the Affordable Care Act that are directed at the problem.<sup>37</sup>

### Veterans' Health Care

With all the attention paid to Medicare and Medicaid, policymakers and journalists sometimes forget that one of the oldest programs of federal health care service is similar to the national insurance programs that are the rule in Canada, Great Britain, and many other developed nations, but this one is for veterans only. The **veterans' health care system** is designed to serve the needs of U.S. veterans by providing primary medical care, specialized care, and other medical and social services, such as rehabilitation. The Veterans Health Administration operates veterans' hospitals and clinics across the nation and provides extensive coverage for veterans with service-related disabilities and diseases and more limited coverage for other veterans, particularly those with no private health care insurance. It also engages in diverse medical research.

Congress expanded the existing veterans' health programs by enacting the Veterans' Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996. That legislation created an enhanced health

benefits plan that emphasizes preventive and primary care, but it also offers a full range of services, including inpatient and outpatient medical, surgical, and mental health services; prescription and over-the-counter drugs and medical and surgical supplies; emergency care; comprehensive rehabilitative services; and even payment of travel expenses associated with care for eligible veterans. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care benefits extend to preventive care and include periodic physical examinations, health and nutrition education, drug use education and drug monitoring, and mental health and substance abuse preventive services. Medical needs attributable to service-related injuries and disease typically are free of individual deductibles and co-payments. VA uses a priority group structure and a financial means test to set co-payment charges for other veterans (see [www.va.gov](http://www.va.gov)). Its medical system has undergone a major transformation in recent years, and many now consider it to be a model for a national health care system. This is especially so because of its use of electronic medical records, its strong focus on preventive care measures (for example, for cancer, diabetes, and heart disease), and its high scores on health care quality indicators.<sup>38</sup>

At the request of senior military leaders, in 2000 Congress approved another health care program for career military personnel. It expands the military's health plan, known as **Tricare**, to include retirees with at least twenty years of service once they become eligible for Medicare. Tricare pays for most of the costs for medical treatment that are not covered by Medicare, except for a yearly cap for out-of-pocket expenses. The plan also includes generous prescription drug coverage. Active-duty service members choose from a number of Tricare programs, depending on their status and needs, at a modest cost.<sup>39</sup>

One consequence of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan became clear by 2011. There would be a major and costly expansion of service to veterans, many of whom suffered debilitating brain injuries and other serious battle wounds that would take years of treatment and recovery. The Pentagon has estimated that more than 200,000 troops have suffered from traumatic brain injury in the wars, chiefly from roadside bombs and similar devices, with long-term effects and treatment costs unknown.<sup>40</sup> According to the GAO, the number of veterans who have sought mental health care increased from 900,000 in 2006 to 1.2 million in 2010. The number of veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars who entered therapy increased from 35,000 in 2006 to 139,000 in 2010, requiring the VA to double its staffing for mental health care.<sup>41</sup> We do have some idea of the overall health care costs of the wars. In its tally of the long-term costs, the *New York Times* included an independent estimate that health care and disability payments for veterans of the wars over the next forty years will be nearly \$590 billion.<sup>42</sup> Such projections are all the more reason to ensure that these health care programs are both effective in meeting veterans' needs and efficient in the use of federal health care dollars.

Despite its many strengths, the veterans' health care system has fallen short in delivery of timely health care services, partly because of soaring demand for services as wounded soldiers returned from Iraq and Afghanistan and as aging Vietnam-era veterans sought treatment for chronic diseases. The capacity of the system to treat patients (for example, the number of hospitals, clinics, doctors, and nurses) has not kept pace with the rising needs of veterans. Policymakers differ on the solutions needed, with some calling for improved management and efficiency at VA and others for increased spending, and still others for redirecting billions of VA dollars into the private care system.<sup>43</sup>



Michel du Cille/The Washington Post via Getty Images

**Expansion in veterans' care.** The care of military veterans has attracted much new attention with the return of thousands of military personnel from Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom suffered serious injuries in the wars. The photo shows former U.S. Army sergeant Brendan Marrocco demonstrating pull-ups during occupational therapy at the Military Advanced Training Center at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in May 2014. Marrocco was the first military service member to receive a double arm transplant.

## OTHER HEALTH CARE POLICY ISSUES

Several major health care policy issues do not directly involve government insurance programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and the veterans' health care system but instead affect the way private medical insurance operates and the legal rights of policyholders. Two issues merit brief mention here: the portability of insurance as individuals leave one job for another, and the rights of patients to seek legal recourse for decisions made by a managed care or other health organization. Both are somewhat less important today than they were several decades ago, as health care policy has evolved and such rights have come to be acknowledged.

### Portability

Given the large number of people whose health care services are provided under employer-sponsored insurance plans, the possible loss of benefits when an employee switches jobs was a longtime concern. One employer's plan might not be the same as another's in cost or quality. People with a preexisting medical condition, such as heart disease, hypertension, or cancer, might have found that a new employer's insurance company was unwilling to cover them at all or would charge higher premiums. To address some of these problems, in 1996 Congress approved the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). The law guarantees that employees who change jobs have the right to insurance coverage, even if that coverage comes at a higher cost. That is, they have the right of **portability** for their insurance coverage. They can take guaranteed coverage with them if they change jobs, and they do not have to endure the waiting period that policies often impose to limit coverage of preexisting conditions. With enactment of the Affordable Care Act,

portability is not as important today. Similarly, a federal act approved in the mid-1980s, the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA), was designed to allow employees to remain on an employer's health insurance policy for up to eighteen months, although the employee pays for the insurance premium, and it is no longer as important given insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act.

### Patients' Rights

Historically, one of the most common complaints about managed care health systems, such as HMOs (discussed below), was the inappropriate denial of care. Congress approved the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to support **patients' rights**, particularly by allowing individuals to sue health insurance companies for such decisions, although only in federal court. ERISA says that federal regulations supersede state laws governing employee health plans and that no punitive damages may be sought beyond compensation for actual medical expenses. Once again, enactment of the Affordable Care Act set in place new expectations for insurance company coverage, and behavior builds on the heritage of ERISA but also makes it less important today.

### RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

As this chapter has emphasized, one of the most difficult issues in health care policy disputes is cost. To make matters worse, the cost of providing health care services is rising inexorably even if more slowly today than a few years ago. Health care is expensive enough that individuals whose employers do not provide full coverage can easily find themselves unable to pay for private insurance or for all the medical services they need. The result can be financially devastating should a major medical emergency arise from an acute illness or an accident. Indeed, such circumstances often are a major reason for personal bankruptcy filings. Even those with relatively generous health care insurance policies can find themselves facing enormous medical bills because of required deductible expenses and co-payment fees—for example, for prescription drugs and hospital stays.

Table 8-2 shows the trend in health care costs. It lists total U.S. health care expenditures for the years 1980 to 2017 (with projections out to 2027), as well as per capita expenditures, indicating that health care costs rose substantially over this period and are projected to rise much more in coming years, in part because of increases in the number of people served by Medicare and Medicaid and expected increases in those enrolled in private health insurance plans purchased through the new health insurance exchanges created by the Affordable Care Act.

As might be expected, rising costs deeply affect the leading federal health care programs. Medicare expenditures alone totaled about \$702 billion in 2017, and the overall cost for federal and state spending on Medicaid was over \$582 billion, for a total of about \$1.3 trillion. As noted in the chapter opening, costs have been rising more slowly in recent years than previously, and the growth may slow even more as the Affordable Care Act is more fully implemented. Indeed, in 2014, the Congressional Budget Office reported that Medicare spending on a per capita basis was falling, and new economic analyses

**TABLE 8-2****National Health Expenditures, 1980–2027 (in current dollars)**

Item	1980	1990	2000	2017	2027 (estimated)
Total national health care expenditures (in billions)	\$255.3	\$721.4	\$1,369.2	\$3,492.1	\$5,963.2
Per capita health care expenditures	\$1,108	\$2,843	\$4,855	\$10,739	\$16,907
Health care expenditures as percentage of GDP	8.9%	12.1%	13.4%	17.9%	19.4%

*Sources:* Drawn from current and historical tables prepared by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Office of the Actuary website ([www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov)), March 25, 2019. Projections of health expenditures are offered for ten years out from the time of publication, or through 2027, for the most recent year of data (2017). The documents are updated annually.

suggested that much of the cost of giving children health care coverage under Medicaid is likely to be recovered over time in federal and state taxes that the individuals pay.<sup>44</sup>

Rising expenditures for drugs are part of this larger picture of health care expenditures. As many television viewers have noted, pharmaceutical manufacturers have changed their marketing strategies and now advertise drugs directly to consumers, instead of only to health professionals. Among developed nations, the United States stands nearly alone in allowing such advertising. In sometimes deceptive advertisements, viewers are urged to ask their doctors for the new medications. The practice has been a success for the pharmaceutical companies, as the public demand for expensive new prescription drugs grew, even though many of them are only marginally more effective than cheaper, over-the-counter medications and generic versions of similar drugs, and sometimes come with significant risks of side effects.<sup>45</sup>

What is the future of health care costs? As shown in Table 8-2, the CMS offers projections for U.S. health care costs through 2027, and they show no change in the overall upward trend. Total health care expenditures are expected to grow at a substantially higher rate than the economy as a whole, rising from \$3.5 trillion in 2017 to \$6.0 trillion in 2027, per capita expenditures from \$10,739 to \$16,907, and expenditures as a percentage of GDP from 17.9 percent to 19.4 percent.<sup>46</sup> The federal government anticipates that pressure will increase on both public and private payers to cover accelerating health care costs, and it anticipates additional need to reconsider health care priorities in the years ahead. These projections assume that all major provisions of the Affordable Care Act remain in effect, but even if they do not, there will still be substantial increases in overall health care spending, and there will be a continuing need to find ways to greatly improve the efficiency of the health care system.<sup>47</sup>

## State Policy Innovations

The federal government is not the only policy actor trying to contain health care costs; the states also have a role to play, and some states have adopted innovative public policies. For example, as we pointed out in chapter 6, Oregon approved a state health plan that offered Medicaid recipients and others universal access to basic and effective health care. Based on a public-private partnership, the plan included state-run insurance pools, insurance reforms, and a federal waiver allowing for the expansion of Medicaid. The system featured rationing of services based on a ranking of medical procedures that the state and its residents believed to be cost-effective.

Other states have long promoted policy innovation. California, for example, developed an aggressive antismoking media campaign and raised tobacco taxes to get people to stop smoking, a preventive health care action. The goal is to reduce the number of people needing expensive medical services in the future, and thus to improve the economic efficiency of health care programs. By all accounts, the effort has been successful. States also have taken measures to deal with rising rates of obesity, such as limiting access to calorie-laden fast food in public schools. One notable success story under the Affordable Care Act was the formation of accountable care organizations for coordinating patient care, where doctors are rewarded for keeping patients healthy rather than for how many procedures they perform. In Rio Grande Valley in Texas, the change meant that preventive care, such as encouraging change in diet and lifestyle, became a key focus of the Medicare program there. The change saved money and improved patients' health.<sup>48</sup>

Some states, as noted early in the chapter, have gone well beyond these limited measures to adopt comprehensive health care plans. Most notably, a landmark plan enacted in Massachusetts in 2006 requires all state residents to purchase health insurance coverage and imposes a financial penalty on those who do not. There is a state subsidy for low-income residents, the poorest of whom are enrolled automatically into the program. The plan also requires employers with eleven or more employees to make a "fair and reasonable" contribution toward their health insurance coverage or to pay a "fair share" contribution annually per employee. Although the plan is potentially costly, supporters point to its coverage of more than 350,000 state residents who previously did not have health insurance. They also highlight the plan's Health Care Quality and Cost Council, which sets goals for improving quality, containing costs, and reducing inequities in health care. Despite its many successes and serving as a model for what became the national policy under the Affordable Care Act, critics continue to fault the Massachusetts plan for its level of government involvement and costs.<sup>49</sup>

These and many other examples illustrate the pivotal role that the states can play in finding solutions to the emerging health care crisis. Where the federal government has often been unable to act because of the constraints on policymaking that we discussed in chapter 2, states have been able to try different approaches and demonstrate their merits.

## Regulation of Prescription Drugs

Given the already high and rapidly rising cost of prescription drugs, another way to control health care costs is to change the way the federal government and drug manufacturers develop and approve new medicines. The current process of drug development is long and expensive, forcing drug manufacturers to charge high prices to cover their cost of

research and development. For example, Neulasta, a drug used in some cancer treatments to improve the immune system, costs \$5,000 per injection. The new drug Harvoni, used to treat hepatitis C, costs over \$1,000 per pill, or more than \$94,000 for a twelve-week course of treatment. Mylan, at the time the only maker of the widely prescribed EpiPen used for severe allergy and asthma attacks, raised the price of its two-pack nearly fivefold since 2010, reaching \$608 in 2016. The increase sparked a public outcry and a congressional hearing.<sup>50</sup> In defense of their pricing policies, the drug companies note that, for every successful product, dozens of others never make it to market despite millions of dollars in development costs. Moreover, even drugs that are approved have patent protection against generic competition for only about eleven years.

Is there a way to reduce such costs without jeopardizing the public's health? Or is it more important to maintain a rigorous and demanding drug approval process regardless of the time and cost it imposes? Congress addressed the need for such balancing when it passed legislation in 2007 aimed at expanding the FDA's regulatory powers and budget, particularly for its monitoring of prescription drugs and medical devices.<sup>51</sup> Adding to the concerns that prompted the policy change, some news accounts in 2008 questioned the validity of new drug studies, with allegations that pharmaceutical companies often were ghostwriting medical research studies about their own drugs that were later published in medical journals as objective scientific evaluations.<sup>52</sup> The box "Steps to Analysis: Regulation of New Drug Approval" deals with these kinds of issues. It focuses on the difficult trade-offs that the FDA faces in trying to move new drug treatments to market. How carefully should it review the safety and effectiveness of new drugs prior to their approval? Is it better to err on the side of caution or to help ensure that we have early access to new medical treatments?

## MANAGED CARE ORGANIZATIONS

**Managed care**, now a fixture of modern health care services and policy, was proposed as one way to contain rising health care costs that had soared under the old system of unrestrained **fee-for-service**, in which the patient or an insurance company pays for the medical service rendered. Over the past several decades, the United States has shifted from fee-for-service to a system dominated by managed care, typically with the costs borne by **third-party payers**, such as health insurance companies or the government. By most measurements, the transition has been successful, particularly in holding down health care costs and promoting preventive health care.

## STEPS TO ANALYSIS

### REGULATION OF NEW DRUG APPROVAL

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) requires pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies to conduct elaborate, lengthy, and costly testing of new drugs

*(Continued)*



(Continued)

before they can be approved for patient use. The justification for this process is to ensure the safety and effectiveness of new drugs prior to marketing. Drug manufacturers complain that the FDA procedures are too demanding and costly and delay the availability of new treatments, prevent some of them from reaching the market at all, and contribute to the high cost of new drug development.

In response to some of these concerns, Congress enacted the Prescription Drug User Fee Act in 1992, which imposed tight deadlines for new drug evaluation at the agency. Reviews are now expected to be completed within ten months, half the time that was common before the act. Priority drugs may be reviewed even more quickly.

Many questions arise today. Should we be concerned that some drugs might be approved too quickly, and with insufficient attention to their safety, efficacy, or quality? Should the agency use a special, expedited procedure to approve so-called breakthrough drugs that offer great promise for serious illnesses, such as cancer and heart disease, as members of Congress favored when voting for the 21st Century Cures Act in 2016? What about drugs that might be used to combat bioterrorism? To explore these questions, consider this example. In 1999, the FDA approved the pain relief drug Vioxx, a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medication. Vioxx was widely used, even though the majority of those taking it could have chosen instead to use safer, more effective, and cheaper drugs that had long been on the market. Then, in 2004, new information appeared on serious side effects of using the drug; those taking Vioxx for a long time faced a doubled risk of heart attack or stroke. The manufacturer, Merck, withdrew Vioxx from the market, and the FDA issued a public health advisory to warn patients to consult with their physicians about use of the drug. Merck faced at least seven thousand lawsuits over the drug, with a potential financial liability of perhaps \$50 billion. In 2007, it settled the cases for nearly \$5 billion. Was the FDA approval process insufficient in this case? Was its post-approval monitoring of the drug's safety adequate?<sup>a</sup>

Consider a related concern: that the ingredients in cosmetics and food supplements require no FDA approval at all despite what are sometimes serious health effects, such as liver damage. In 1994, after intense lobbying by the food supplement industry, Congress approved the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act, which weakened the capacity of the FDA to oversee the safety of products advertised as nutritional supplements. Before the act, the FDA could keep a product off the market until its manufacturer proved it was safe, but the new law forced the FDA to prove a product was unsafe, which it was ill equipped to do.<sup>b</sup>

Was this policy change a good idea? Should the makers of both food supplements and cosmetics be required to prove their safety before they are marketed, or does doing so place too great a burden on them? Should consumer rights trump such cost concerns? What information would you need to answer these questions?

In trying to answer these questions, you might want to visit the FDA's website ([www.fda.gov](http://www.fda.gov)) as well as sites for the Kaiser Family Foundation ([www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org)), the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services ([www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov)), and Medicare ([www.medicare.gov](http://www.medicare.gov)) and search for information on drug prices and proposals to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

<sup>a</sup>For a review of similar problems with the FDA approval process, see "Prescription for Trouble," *Consumer Reports*, January 2006, 34–39. For the Vioxx settlement as well as allegations that drug studies may not be as valid as once thought, see Stephanie Saul, "Merck Wrote Drug Studies for Doctors," *New York Times*, April 16, 2008.

<sup>b</sup>See Eric Lipton and Rachel Abrams, "Their Hair Fell Out. Should the F.D.A. Have the Power to Act?" *New York Times*, August 15, 2016; and Anahad O'Connor, "'Supplements and Safety' Explores What's in Your Supplements," *New York Times*, January 19, 2016.

Managed care organizations provide health care by forming networks of doctors, other health care providers, and hospitals associated with a given plan; monitoring their treatment activities; and limiting access to specialists and costly procedures. The best-known type of managed care organization is a **health maintenance organization (HMO)**. Along with other managed care companies, such as a **preferred provider organization (PPO)**, HMOs promote health services that are the most cost-effective, such as ensuring regular physicals and certain medical screening tests, limiting access to costly services and specialists, and negotiating lower fees with health care providers. PPOs differ from HMOs in that enrollees have a financial incentive to use physicians on the preferred list but may opt to see other health professionals at a higher cost. By most accounts, HMOs and PPOs save the nation billions of dollars a year in health care costs, an important achievement.

Managed care still has its critics, even if by most indications it has been a highly successful design that balances quality health care service with the concern over how to constrain costs. Recent criticism of HMOs has focused on limits placed on patients' stays in hospitals—routinely, only twenty-four hours following childbirth, for example—and denying or limiting coverage for certain procedures. HMOs counter that they are trying to ensure that limited health care dollars are spent efficiently and fairly and that patients be provided with only safe and proven treatments. They fear that expanding patients' rights might lead to the use of unnecessary and possibly dangerous procedures, resulting in higher insurance fees and injuries to patients. They also argue that laws guaranteeing patients the power to select physicians and to sue their health care plans will raise premium costs and leave more people uninsured and vulnerable to health risks.

Following patient complaints and adverse publicity in the 1990s and early 2000s, however, managed care companies changed some of their policies to become more accommodating than in the past. The evidence suggests they are not denying care in many cases, even though the occasional horror story to that effect pops up in a movie or on television. Indeed, some states, including Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, require managed care plans to report incidents of care denial and how they were resolved. In these states, plan

administrators seem to be reluctant to second-guess physicians, but the plans still deny access to physicians outside of their networks and nonessential or experimental treatments.

## REDUCING HEALTH CARE COSTS

If managed care has not succeeded in restraining the rise in health care costs, other strategies may emerge to reach that goal. Four merit brief mention: (1) passing on additional costs to health care consumers, (2) setting up personal health accounts, (3) managing disease more effectively, and (4) using preventive health care.

Everyone complains about the cost of health care, but the fact is that few people ever see the full price tag because insurance plans take care of most of it. Of course, even simple surgeries can cost thousands of dollars, and many prescription drugs can run to hundreds of dollars per month. These relatively low burdens on individuals can escalate quickly if a major health care need arises. But under more normal circumstances, these modest costs borne by individuals suggest that one way to reduce rising demand for health care services and prescription drugs is to pass along more of the cost to them. For example, if employees had to cover more of the costs now paid by their employers' insurance policies, they might have an incentive to reduce their demand for health services that are not essential, such as visiting a hospital emergency room for a nonemergency situation, demanding exotic new drugs when less expensive alternatives exist, or requesting expensive diagnostic tests that a physician believes are unnecessary. Raising the policyholder's share of the cost with higher deductibles and higher levels of co-payments would inject "market discipline" into health care coverage.<sup>53</sup>

A variation on this theme is that individuals who use health services more frequently than average should pay more of the cost—for example, through higher insurance premiums. In other words, the sicker should pay more, just as those with more driving citations or accidents pay higher automobile insurance premiums and those with safe driving records get a break. Is this proposal fair? It might be if the health care consumers brought on their conditions through poor choices over which they had reasonable control. But what about individuals with inherited diseases, or accident victims, or those who simply have the misfortune of suffering from a rare (and expensive) illness? Is it ethical to pass the costs of treatment along to them and their families?

Many employers seeking ways to cope with rising premium costs are setting up personal health accounts for their workers. The employers deposit money into an account that is used to pay for each employee's health expenses that the regular insurance does not cover. The money can be used for prescription drugs, physician visits, dental work, and other health-related bills. Employees make their own decisions about how best to spend the limited funds. Once the money is gone, the employee is responsible for any additional charges that year. These plans may come with a very high deductible, which would make them essentially catastrophic insurance policies; if so, the employee is better off using the plan for a highly unusual major medical need, not routine services. Those who make poor choices, or are unlucky and suffer from a serious injury, or need continuing medical care, may be worse off under such a plan. Is this kind of plan likely to be effective as a compromise to control costs and still cover catastrophic illness or injury?

Disease management programs focus on a few chronic diseases associated with high costs. The programs promise to reduce employers' costs by bringing employee diseases under control more effectively than is likely through conventional medical treatment. Managed care organizations have led the way in developing these kinds of programs. Surveys indicate that a majority have implemented programs for managing conditions such as asthma, diabetes, heart disease, end-stage renal disease, cancer, and depression. Their goal is to train patients to take better care of themselves by monitoring their diseases, watching their diets, and seeking appropriate and timely medical care. Some critics are concerned that singling out employees with chronic conditions for the training programs may pose a threat to them. Even some insurance programs believe that disease management of this kind raises difficult ethical issues involving medical privacy and employee–employer relationships. But few question that such programs make many individuals healthier and also reduce health care costs. How would you weigh the ethical issues of disease management?

The compelling logic of preventive care is addressed more fully at the end of the chapter. All agree that if people take good care of themselves throughout their lives, they are likely to be healthier and need less medical care than those who do not. Preventive care health plans usually allow regular physical examinations and diagnostic tests; education and training in diet, exercise, and stress management; and smoking cessation programs.

## QUALITY OF CARE

The issue of quality in medical care is easy to understand. At a minimum, every patient should expect to receive professional and competent care that is consistent with good medical practice. The physician or other health care professional should be well trained, up-to-date on new research and treatments, and able to spend enough time with a patient to properly diagnose and treat medical conditions that arise. These expectations are particularly reasonable in the United States, given the vast amounts of money invested by government, insurance companies, and individuals in one of the best medical care systems in the world.

The evidence suggests, however, that quality care is not as routinely available as many would like to believe. Patients complain about poor-quality care, and even the American Medical Association has conceded that errors in diagnosis and treatment occur at a significant rate.<sup>54</sup> In addition, critics have long argued that many physicians rely excessively on costly medical technology and drugs, in part to increase revenues for medical offices and hospitals and in part as “defensive medicine,” to guard against liability in malpractice claims. Physicians and other health professionals also may spend less time with patients today than previously because of rising patient demand and lower rates of reimbursement for their services. The result may be a lower quality of medical care.<sup>55</sup>

## Medical Errors

One element of the concern about the quality of medical care is more concrete and disturbing—the incidence of medical errors. A widely circulated and influential report

released in 1999 by what is now the National Academy of Medicine (NAM) estimated that between 44,000 and 98,000 patients die each year of medical errors made in hospitals. A 2016 study put the number at over 250,000 lives a year lost to medical errors in hospitals and other health care facilities, which would make such errors the third leading cause of death in the United States.<sup>56</sup> The errors include operations on the wrong patient or the wrong side of a patient, incorrect drug prescriptions or administration of the wrong dosages, malfunctioning mechanical equipment, and nursing and other staff errors, such as poor communication of medical information. Neither study included the more than 700,000 infections acquired in the nation's hospitals each year, which the CDC claims lead to some 75,000 deaths annually. The CDC findings have led many hospitals to adopt new procedures to try to cut infection rates, with some measure of success.<sup>57</sup>

Following the 1999 NAM study of medical errors, Congress approved, and President Bush signed, legislation that establishes procedures for voluntary and confidential reporting of medical errors to independent organizations that are to submit the information to a national database. Many recommendations for improving hospital safety have been made since that time, and greater attention to reducing medical errors came also after the federal Medicare program announced that it would no longer pay for medical errors—what it called “reasonably preventable” conditions on a list it made available to hospitals. Some of the nation's largest health insurance companies also announced that they would not pay for what they called “never events”—that is, medical errors that should never occur.<sup>58</sup> As noted earlier, the Affordable Care Act is likely to be yet another force for reducing medical errors.

### **FOCUSED DISCUSSION: SHOULD THERE BE GREATER EMPHASIS ON PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE?**

Throughout the chapter, we have highlighted many of the weaknesses of the U.S. health care system, particularly its high costs and the forecasts for increasing costs as the baby boom generation ages. Much of the debate over health care policy actions, from government programs such as Medicare and Medicaid to employer-provided health insurance plans, focuses on how to pay for expensive health care services. One of the most promising ways to constrain health care costs and to keep people healthy would be to place greater emphasis on **preventive health care**, or the promotion of health and prevention of disease in individuals. This would include routine screening for serious diseases such as diabetes, heart disease, and high blood pressure; better treatment of chronic illnesses; improved health care education; and more attention to the role of diet, exercise, smoking, and other lifestyle choices that can affect individuals' health. Put otherwise, ill health and premature death are not merely functions of genetics or exposure to disease-causing microbes or environmental pollutants over which individuals have little control. They also reflect choices people make in their daily lives.

For this focused discussion, we turn to selected efforts of this kind, particularly those involving smoking and diet. We evaluate them in terms of the criteria we have emphasized in the chapter and throughout the book: effectiveness, economic efficiency, and equity and other ethical issues. That is, we want to see how effective preventive health care measures might be in improving health, what they might save in costs to the nation, and how

we can appraise the wisdom of such policy actions in terms of ethical issues, including possible infringement on individuals' right to behave as they choose without government regulations or pressures to change their lifestyles.

### Effectiveness

One way to appreciate the importance of preventive health care is to consider the leading causes of death in the United States. Heart disease and cancer are dominant, followed by chronic respiratory diseases such as emphysema and cerebrovascular diseases or stroke. Among the leading contributing factors in these cases are smoking, diet, lack of exercise, stress, and exposure to environmental pollutants. Moreover, even where the causes can be found elsewhere (such as in genetic predisposition to certain diseases), early detection and treatment can both save lives and lower the costs of treatment. For chronic diseases such as diabetes and high blood pressure, regular monitoring of those conditions and use of appropriate medical treatments could improve the quality of patients' lives, reduce premature death rates, and save money, all at the same time.

Take the issue of smoking. It is widely recognized to be the single most preventable cause of premature death in the United States, accounting for more than 480,000 deaths annually, nearly one in five deaths, according to the CDC. Another 16 million suffer from a disease attributable to smoking. Secondhand smoke takes an additional health toll, accounting for an estimated 41,000 deaths a year. Roughly half of those who smoke die prematurely from cancer, heart disease, emphysema, and other smoking-related diseases, and the CDC estimates that on average smokers die ten years earlier than nonsmokers.<sup>59</sup>

If there is good news related to smoking, it can be found in the number of Americans who have quit. An estimated 48 million people have stopped smoking, while about 34 million people continue to smoke. Of those eighteen years of age or older, smokers account for about 14 percent, the lowest level since the mid-1960s. The U.S. surgeon general's reports indicate that smoking cessation at any age conveys health benefits; for example, quitting even at age sixty-five can reduce the risk of dying from some diseases by as much as 50 percent.<sup>60</sup> The recent marketing of e-cigarettes that deliver nicotine without the harmful ingredients may help some to quit smoking, and they are rising sharply in popularity. Yet experts continue to debate their safety, especially in light of recent cases of serious lung damage and deaths attributable to vaping.<sup>61</sup> Some also are concerned that, at least for some users, e-cigarettes may prolong their habit of smoking. Because of those concerns, in 2016 the FDA adopted major new rules that extend federal regulation over e-cigarettes.<sup>62</sup>


Or consider the role of diet and insufficient exercise to prevent excessive weight gain. The surgeon general has observed that, left unabated, "overweight and obesity may soon cause as much preventable disease and death as cigarette smoking."<sup>63</sup> Recent studies by the CDC indicate that over 40 percent of U.S. adults age twenty or older are obese, as are 18 percent of children and adolescents. Another 32 percent of the adult population is overweight, and the number of young people who are overweight has tripled since 1980.<sup>64</sup>

As might be expected, the rates of obesity and overweight vary substantially from state to state, but the trend has been toward ever-higher rates of obesity. Only a few areas in the nation, such as Colorado, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, still have comparatively low obesity rates, with 25 percent or less of the adult population having a body mass

index greater than 30. Quite a few states fall on the opposite end of this scale, including Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, which have relatively high rates of obesity (with 35 percent or more of their adult population as obese). (See Figure 8-1).<sup>65</sup> Being overweight, which for some is beyond their control because of genetic and other factors, increases the risk of many health problems. Among them are hypertension, high cholesterol levels, type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease, and stroke. Taken together, these are so important that recent studies suggest an eventual decline in U.S. life expectancy because of obesity trends and their associated health problems.<sup>66</sup>

The American diet is a strong contributing factor in obesity for both children and adults, with increasing reliance on prepared foods high in calories, fat, and cholesterol. Some critics single out the nation's food industry for much of the blame, saying it undermines good nutrition by strongly promoting sales of unhealthy food (Nestle 2002, 2015). Not surprisingly,

**FIGURE 8-1** State Obesity Rates, 2017



*Source:* The State of Obesity, "Adult Obesity in the United States," September 2018, available at <https://stateofobesity.org/adult-obesity/>. The online figure provides the measured obesity rates for each state.

the food industry rejects the charge, and it has fought hard in Congress and state legislatures to protect itself against any legal liability for the nation's collective weight gain.<sup>67</sup>

Some analysts have favored the imposition of taxes on unhealthy food, such as sugary soft drinks, much as we have taxed and regulated cigarettes to discourage their use, and the idea has gained some traction in recent years, both in the United States and in other nations. Even without taxes, governments can try to discourage unhealthy diets. In 2016, the federal government issued new dietary guidelines that urged Americans to reduce their intake of sugar, and to consume more fruits and vegetables, whole grains, lean cuts of meat, and lower-fat foods while cutting back on foods with high levels of saturated fat, trans fats, and cholesterol. In addition, in a move praised by nutritionists, in 2014 the FDA issued new rules that require chain restaurants and some other establishments to indicate calorie content on their menus, an action stimulated by the Affordable Care Act.<sup>68</sup> Some studies indicate that once obese or overweight, many people find it extraordinarily difficult to lose the extra pounds and keep them off, thus suggesting the logic of early intervention in obesity prevention programs.<sup>69</sup>

By most accounts, Americans also fall well short of the recommended levels of physical exercise and fitness, and they drink more alcohol than they should. Both habits contribute to poor health. Indeed, recent studies suggest that low levels of fitness may be nearly as bad for health and longevity as smoking.<sup>70</sup> At least a portion of the national weight gain can be attributed to declining physical activity at work, as more jobs become sedentary or require only very light activity—for example, being seated at a desk and using a computer for much of the workday.<sup>71</sup> About one in ten adults reports consuming alcohol excessively, with higher percentages among younger adults.

Despite these habits, life expectancy in the United States reached an all-time high of 78.9 years in 2014—which at the time placed it only number twenty-six among the thirty-six Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) nations, behind Canada and Germany but close to the Czech Republic and Turkey. However, for several years since then U.S. life expectancy has declined, falling to 78.7 years, in part because of a rise in drug overdoses and suicides. Life expectancy is slightly higher for women and somewhat lower for men, and there are large and growing disparities between rich and poor citizens, which parallels growth in U.S. income inequality over the past several decades.<sup>72</sup> It is reasonable to assume that average life expectancy would be even higher if people took better care of themselves throughout their lives, and also higher if more people had regular access to health care services.

### Economic Efficiency Issues

Consistent with the information provided in the previous section, many advocates of preventive health care defend such initiatives as providing economic benefits. That is, spending money on preventive health care would pay substantial dividends, both financially and in improved health and well-being. For example, a 2009 article in *Health Affairs* put the cost of obesity at \$147 billion per year in 2008, up from \$78 billion in 1998, and another study in 2012 estimated that obesity accounted for \$190 billion in U.S. health care costs at that time. These studies indicate the potential savings if the nation found effective and acceptable ways to reduce our collective waistlines.<sup>73</sup> In addition, some studies make



clear that health care for obese and overweight individuals can cost considerably more (about 37 percent more on average) than for those of normal weight.<sup>74</sup> As one example, type 2 diabetes, strongly associated with being overweight, currently ranks number one in direct health care costs, at more than \$327 billion a year in the United States in 2017; this number is likely to increase substantially as the percentage of Americans with diabetes or prediabetes rises.<sup>75</sup> Excessive weight also has been linked to more than a hundred thousand cancer deaths per year.<sup>76</sup> Studies like the ones cited here have helped convince the federal government to spend more on anti-obesity therapies and to increase support for research on obesity.

Experience at the state level tells much the same story. The state of West Virginia, for example, found that the cost of obesity for its state employees more than doubled since 1995, and consumed more than one-fifth of the health plan's cost. An even more striking study comes from California. In 2005, a report put the cost of obesity to businesses and the state itself at \$22 billion per year in lost productivity, increased medical costs, and higher insurance payments. The report was the first to link such weight problems to increases in employer costs. The study concluded that a 5 percent increase in physical activity could save businesses and the state \$6 billion each year; a 10 percent increase could save nearly \$13 billion.<sup>77</sup> Numbers like these suggest that both state governments and businesses would be wise to give serious thought to programs that promise to reduce weight gain. Analysts have long made similar arguments about the costs of smoking, which are estimated to result in about \$156 billion in health-related economic productivity losses each year.

### Equity and Other Ethical Issues

As suggested in the box “Working with Sources: Ethical Issues in Health Care,” acting on preventive health care should be evaluated not only on the grounds of effectiveness and efficiency but also in terms of ethics. One of the concerns is equity, or fair treatment for all groups in the population, and another is whether governments (or employers) are justified in taking actions that may impinge on individual rights.

Consider the case of smoking. Do the statistics presented earlier make for a strong case for further government intervention to reduce smoking and therefore smoking-related disease? For example, should government further raise the price of cigarettes to discourage their use? Studies show that increasing the price of cigarettes can substantially decrease the number of young people who become smokers, and that restrictions on smoking in workplaces and public places can decrease smoking by young adults (Tauras 2005). But does this mean that it is right for government to restrict smoking, particularly among adults who choose to smoke? Should state and local governments become more aggressive in restricting smoking in public places? What about using the kind of graphic warning labels on cigarette packs that are common in more than eighty other nations, with good evidence that they work, but which are rejected in the United States? Or, would it be right for employers to refuse to hire employees who smoke, or to fire those who do, based on the impact on their health and the cost to the employer? In these illustrations, it is easy to see that smokers might well feel they are being treated unfairly as a group even if they acknowledge the possible health care costs of their habit.

## WORKING WITH SOURCES

### ETHICAL ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE

Some of the most contentious issues in health care involve ethical rather than economic issues. One of the prominent debates in recent years concerned provisions of the Affordable Care Act that related to insurance coverage for contraceptive services. The act requires group health insurance plans to offer Food and Drug Administration–approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling for women with reproductive capacity (not for men), and to do so without a co-pay or deductible. The law exempted health plans that are sponsored by certain religious organizations or nonprofit organizations with religious objections to contraception, such as churches. In addition, the federal government provided some accommodation for eligible organizations that voiced religious objections to such coverage, with the insurance companies rather than the religious organization paying for the contraceptive coverage.

Some organizations and businesses objected to the new mandated coverage even with this accommodation, saying that the requirement to provide cost-free contraceptive coverage violated their religious freedom. That is, they did not want to provide such coverage for their employees. Among the dozen or so businesses objecting to the new law was the arts and crafts store Hobby Lobby, with some twenty-one thousand employees. In November 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear two cases brought by such secular, for-profit corporations, whose owners sought an exemption under the law based on their religious beliefs, and in late June 2014, the Court ruled 5 to 4 in favor of the corporations. Controversies over this section of the Affordable Care Act continued under the Trump administration as it sought to further weaken the provision.<sup>a</sup>

To examine some of the arguments for and against the Affordable Care Act's contraceptive coverage mandates, go to the federal government's website for preventive health care services for women at [www.healthcare.gov/coverage/preventive-care-benefits/](http://www.healthcare.gov/coverage/preventive-care-benefits/) to see a review of the services that are covered under the act. For an overview of Planned Parenthood's perspective on the act's contraceptive coverage rules, see [www.plannedparenthood.org/about-us/newsroom/press-releases/planned-parenthood-statement-final-birth-control-rule-new-report-impact](http://www.plannedparenthood.org/about-us/newsroom/press-releases/planned-parenthood-statement-final-birth-control-rule-new-report-impact). For the perspective of religious organizations on the new contraceptive coverage rules, go to the website for the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops at [www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/health-care](http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/health-care) and follow the Contraception link to the Health and Human Services contraceptive services rule.

*(Continued)*

(Continued)

- What do you see as the main points of contention?
- Is one view more persuasive than another?
- Do you think the ethical issues involved in either support for or opposition to the rules are stated clearly enough?

<sup>a</sup>See Matt Stevens, "Judge Blocks Trump's Attempt to Roll Back Birth Control Mandate," *New York Times*, January 14, 2019.

Lifestyle choices and wellness activities also are part of the equity question when it comes to provision of generous prescription drug coverage or other health care insurance benefits. Some would argue that heavily subsidized coverage of drugs and other medical expenses discourages individuals from making sensible lifestyle decisions regarding diet, weight, exercise, and smoking. Individuals may believe that medical science will be able to treat any resulting illness with no cost to them, so they have little incentive to take responsibility for such choices. However, if they were responsible for more of the eventual cost, they might make different choices.<sup>78</sup>

Given the arguments here for effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and other ethical issues, would you favor a major shift on the part of government, employers, and insurance companies toward emphasizing preventive health care? What reasons do you find most persuasive? What reasons might lead you to challenge such a recommendation?

## CONCLUSIONS

This chapter traces the evolution of government health care policies and examines the leading programs. It emphasizes issues of cost, access, and quality, and the diverse ways government activities affect the public's health and well-being. The present array of health care programs, from Medicare and Medicaid to innovative state preventive health measures and provisions of the Affordable Care Act, may seem complex and confusing to many, and it strikes health care professionals the same way. Students of public policy, using the criteria discussed in the text, can evaluate all programs against standards of effectiveness in delivering quality health care services, efficiency of present expenditures in terms of the benefits received, and equity in access to and payments for those services. Many analysts, policymakers, health care professionals, and patients alike find strengths and weaknesses in this system in terms of all three criteria. The strengths merit the praise they have received, but the weaknesses need to be addressed as well.

Rising costs alone suggest the imperative of change. As we have shown, the costs threaten to bankrupt the Medicare system as the baby boom generation ages. Employers

and individuals face similar hurdles in meeting the anticipated increases in insurance policy premiums and almost certainly higher deductibles and co-payments. Health care policy therefore would profit greatly from critical assessments that point to better ways of providing affordable and high-quality health care to the U.S. public in the future. The questions posed throughout the chapter encourage such assessments, from how best to reform Medicare and Medicaid to the effectiveness of many state efforts to constrain costs to the promotion of health education, wellness training, and other preventive health care measures. Fortunately for the student of public policy, information to help design more appropriate health care policies and institutions is widely available on the internet through government and independent sites.



Sharpen your skills with SAGE Edge at <http://edge.sagepub.com/kraft7e>. **SAGE Edge for students** provides a personalized approach to help you accomplish your coursework goals in an easy-to-use learning environment.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Consider the data provided in this chapter on the rising cost of health care services. What are the most effective ways to control these costs? Try to think of several alternative ways to do so, and then compare them in terms of the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, and equity.
2. Considering the chapter's discussion of the consequences of being uninsured, what should governments do to meet the needs of Americans without health care insurance beyond what the Affordable Care Act does?
3. Should employers continue to carry the burden of providing health care benefits to employees, or should the government institute a form of national health insurance instead? What difference might this make for the ability of U.S. companies, such as automobile manufacturers, to compete internationally when most other developed countries provide national health insurance?
4. Was Congress right to approve the new Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) in 2010 despite unanimous opposition by Republicans and considerable doubt about it among the American public? What provisions in the act ought to be kept, and which would you favor repealing or replacing with something else, and why?
5. What kinds of public policies might be designed to give individuals more incentives to remain healthy and reduce demand for costly health care services?

## KEYWORDS

Affordable Care Act	255	fee-for-service	273	managed care	273
Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)	267	health maintenance organization (HMO)	275	Medicaid	266
				Medicare	263

merit good 259	preferred provider organization (PPO) 275	third-party payers 273
national health insurance 255	preventive health care 278	Tricare 268
patients' rights 270	public health agencies 253	veterans' health care system 267
portability 269	single-payer insurance 255	

## MAJOR LEGISLATION

Balanced Budget Act of 1997

Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009

Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (COBRA)

Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA)

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)

Health Security Act

Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003

Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010

Social Security Act Amendments of 1965

Veterans' Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996

## SUGGESTED READINGS

**Thomas S. Bodenheimer** and **Kevin Grumbach**, *Understanding Health Policy*, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2016). A broad introduction to the field of health care policy.

**Jacob S. Hacker**, *The Road to Nowhere: The Genesis of President Clinton's Plan for Health Security* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997). A review of the failure of Clinton's national health care plan of 1993.

**Lawrence R. Jacobs** and **Theda Skocpol**, *Health Care Reform and American Politics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford

University Press, 2016). A history and assessment of the politics of the Affordable Care Act of 2010.

**Eric M. Patashnik**, **Alan S. Gerber**, and **Conor M. Dowling**, *Unhealthy Politics: The Battle over Evidence-Based Medicine* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2017). Explores patient harm resulting from use of medical procedures not well grounded in evidence of effectiveness.

**Kant Patel** and **Mark E. Rushefsky**, *Health Care Politics and Policy in America*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2015). A major text in health care policy that covers the full spectrum of issues.

## SUGGESTED WEBSITES

**www.citizen.org/topic/health-care.** Public Citizen's health and safety page, with extensive links to policy issues and citizen activism.

**www.cms.gov.** Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services within the Department of Health and Human Services, with extensive links to federal and state health care programs.

**www.hhs.gov/healthcare/about-the-law/index.html.** The federal government's portal for health care information, particularly related to the Affordable Care Act.

**www.kff.org.** Kaiser Family Foundation, respected by both liberals and conservatives for its reliable health care studies and reports. Written for the general public.

**www.rwjf.org/en/library/collections/health-policy.html.** Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's health policy page. Research and policy analysis on health care issues, with a progressive leaning.

## NOTES

1. The cost estimates come from the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Office of the Actuary, and are based on the National Health Expenditure Accounts, with detailed reports available at [www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov).
2. Studies of health care spending and its impacts can be found at many sites, but among the best is the Peterson-Kaiser Health System Tracker, available at [www.healthsystemtracker.org](http://www.healthsystemtracker.org). The site covers health spending, quality of care, access and affordability, and health and well-being.
3. Irene Papanicolas, Liana R. Woskie, and Ashish Jha, "Health Care Spending in the United States and Other High-Income Countries," Commonwealth Fund, March 13, 2018, available at [www.commonwealthfund.org](http://www.commonwealthfund.org).
4. Kevin Sack, "Research Finds Wide Disparities in Health Care by Race and Region," *New York Times*, June 5, 2008.
5. The data come from the website for the Kaiser Family Foundation: [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org). The foundation staff regularly survey employers nationwide on the costs of health insurance for employees and report the results. The data cited come from the October 3, 2018, report.
6. See, for example, Reed Abelson, Gardiner Harris, and Robert Pear, "Whatever Court Rules, Major Changes in Health Are Likely to Last," *New York Times*, November 14, 2011. See also Lawrence R. Jacobs and Theda Skocpol, *Health Care Reform and American Politics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); and a compilation by the staff of the *Washington Post*, *Landmark: The Inside Story of America's New Health-Care Law and What It Means for Us All* (New York: Public Affairs/Perseus Books, 2010).
7. See Philip Ellis, "Budgetary and Economic Effects of Repealing the Affordable Care Act," Congressional Budget Office, June 19, 2015, available at [www.cbo.gov/publication/50252](http://www.cbo.gov/publication/50252).
8. See Adam Liptak, "Supreme Court Upholds Health Care Law, 5–4, in Victory for Obama," *New York Times*, June 28, 2012.
9. For a detailed summary of the act, see Marian Jarlenski and Richard Rubin, "Health Care Overhaul's Key Parts," *CQ Weekly*, April 12, 2010, 914–922. See also Timothy S. Jost, "The Affordable Care Act under the Trump Administration," August 30, 2018, at the Commonwealth Fund website: [www.commonwealthfund.org](http://www.commonwealthfund.org).
10. See, for example, Sharon Begley, "The Best Medicine," *Scientific American*, July 2011, 50–55; and Jocelyn Kaiser, "Health Bill Backs Evidence-Based Medicine, New Drug Studies," *Science*

- 327 (March 26, 2010). The U.S. Government Accountability Office released an initial and positive assessment of the institute in March 2015: “Comparative Effectiveness: Initial Assessment of the Patient-Center Outcomes Research Institute” (GAO-15-301).
11. See Robert Pear, “New Health Initiatives Put Spotlight on Prevention,” *New York Times*, April 5, 2010.
  12. See a special report, “Questioning the Cost of the Health Care Overhaul,” *New York Times*, April 3, 2010.
  13. See, for example, “In Florida, Opposition by the State and Snags in Signing Up on the Web,” *New York Times*, October 10, 2013. See also Emily Ethridge, “Medicaid Expansion a Tough Call for GOP,” *CQ Weekly*, June 17, 2013, 1037–1038.
  14. Nicholas Bagley and Abbe R. Gluck, “Trump Sabotage of Obamacare Is Illegal,” *New York Times*, August 14, 2018; and Robert Pear, “Shopping for Health Insurance: Many Options but Little Guidance,” *New York Times*, October 28, 2018.
  15. Jost, “Affordable Care Act under the Trump Administration.” See also Bagley and Gluck, “Trump’s Sabotage of Obamacare Is Illegal.”
  16. Enrollment numbers are taken from [obamacarefacts.com](http://obamacarefacts.com), retrieved on October 10, 2016, and from the Kaiser Family Foundation report “Key Facts about the Uninsured Population,” September 29, 2016, available at [kff.org](http://www.kff.org). On the reluctance of younger people to sign up for insurance plans, see Abby Goodnough and Reed Abelson, “Health Care Law’s Beneficiaries Reflect Its Strengths, and Its Faults,” *New York Times*, October 14, 2016.
  17. Ashley Kirzinger, Elise Sugarman, and Mollyann Brodie, “Kaiser Health Tracking Poll: November 2016,” Kaiser Family Foundation, December 1, 2016, available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org). See a more recent summary of polling data by Ashley Kirzinger, Cailey Muñana, and Mollyann Brodie, “6 Charts about Public Opinion on the Affordable Care Act,” Kaiser Family Foundation, December 19, 2018, available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org). For a broad discussion of other possible reforms, see Theodore Joyce, ed., “Health Insurance Reform in the USA—What, How, and Why?,” a special section of the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 37, no. 1 (2018): 181–201.
  18. For a revealing picture of health care around the world that includes a review of the British system, see the PBS *Frontline* documentary “Sick around the World,” available with discussion, interviews, and analysis at [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/sickaroundtheworld](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/sickaroundtheworld).
  19. The data come from the annual Employer Health Benefits Survey conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation, available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org).
  20. *Ibid.*
  21. The numbers come from the Kaiser Family Foundation’s “Key Facts about the Uninsured Population,” December 7, 2018, available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org); and from Kaiser’s “Health Insurance Coverage of Nonelderly 0–64,” also available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org).
  22. Stan Dorn, “Uninsured and Dying Because of It: Updating the Institute of Medicine Analysis on the Impact of Uninsurance on Mortality,” Tax Policy Center, January 8, 2008, available at <http://webarchive.urban.org/publications/411588.html>; and Andrew P. Wilper et al., “Health Insurance and Mortality in U.S. Adults,” *American Journal of Public Health* 99, no. 12 (December 2009): 2289–2295.
  23. Many of these consequences of being without health insurance are discussed at length in the Kaiser report “Key Facts about the Uninsured Population,” cited previously. The section dealing with how “not having coverage” affects health care access provides references to the research literature.
  24. World Health Organization, *World Health Statistics 2018*, available at the WHO website: [www.who.int/gho/publications/world\\_health\\_statistics/en/](http://www.who.int/gho/publications/world_health_statistics/en/). See also regular reports from the Commonwealth Fund.
  25. Taken from the *America’s Health Rankings 2018 Annual Report*, available at [www.americashealthrankings.org](http://www.americashealthrankings.org). The data are presented on an interactive map of the United States, allowing quick access to individual state health care data.
  26. The precise percentage depends on which programs are counted. The estimate used here is taken from a Center on Budget and Policy Priorities report, “Policy Basics: Where Do Our Federal Tax Dollars Go?,” January 29, 2019, available at [www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/policy-basics-where-do-our-federal-tax-dollars-go](http://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/policy-basics-where-do-our-federal-tax-dollars-go).

27. Robert Pear, "Medicare Allows More Benefits for Chronically Ill, Aiming to Improve Care for Millions," *New York Times*, June 24, 2018.
28. Robert Pear, "U.S. Agency's Emails Plug Private Medicare Plans," *New York Times*, December 2, 2018.
29. For a clear discussion of all these provisions, see Mary Agnes Carey, "Provisions of the Medicare Bill," *CQ Weekly*, January 24, 2004, 238–243. It is interesting that Congress chose to devise such a complex drug plan when the federal government already has one that is widely considered a model. This is housed within the veterans' health care program. See Robert Pear and Walt Bogdanich, "Some Successful Models Ignored as Congress Works on Drug Bill," *New York Times*, September 4, 2003.
30. Government Accountability Office, "Medicare and Medicaid Fraud, Waste, and Abuse: Effective Implementation of Recent Laws and Agency Actions Could Help Reduce Improper Payments" (GAO-11-409T), March 9, 2011; and a follow-up study, "Medicare Fraud: Progress Made, but More Action Needed to Address Medicare Fraud, Waste, and Abuse" (GAO-14-560T), April 30, 2014.
31. Robert Pear, "Cost of Rampant Mental Health Care Fraud Soars in Medicare," *New York Times*, September 30, 1998.
32. For one account, see the Center for Medicare Advocacy's extensive discussion of reform proposals at [www.medicareadvocacy.org/medicare-info/medicare-and-health-care-reform/](http://www.medicareadvocacy.org/medicare-info/medicare-and-health-care-reform/). As noted earlier, the Affordable Care Act includes many provisions aimed at improving care under both Medicare and Medicaid and controlling rising costs.
33. A comprehensive review of Medicaid and its future can be found at the Kaiser Family Foundation website at [www.kff.org/tag/medicaids-future/](http://www.kff.org/tag/medicaids-future/), and details about the program's enrollment and cost can be found at the CMS website at [www.medicicaid.gov](http://www.medicicaid.gov).
34. Robert Pear, "Budget Accord Could Mean Payments by Medicaid Recipients," *New York Times*, December 20, 2005.
35. Alex Wayne, "Congress Defies Bush on SCHIP," *CQ Weekly* online edition, October 1, 2007; and Robert Pear, "Health Bill for Children Is Passed by Senate," *New York Times*, January 30, 2009.
36. Clifford J. Levy and Michael Luo, "New York Medicaid Fraud May Reach into Billions," *New York Times*, July 18, 2005.
37. The report can be found at [www.ncsl.org/research/health/medicaid-fraud-and-abuse.aspx](http://www.ncsl.org/research/health/medicaid-fraud-and-abuse.aspx).
38. Gilbert M. Gaul, "Back in the Pink: The VA Health Care System Outperforms Medicare and Most Private Plans," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, August 29–September 4, 2005. On the history of the VA program and its many successes, see Colin D. Moore, "Innovation without Reputation: How Bureaucrats Saved the Veterans' Health Care System," *Perspectives on Politics* 13, no. 2 (June 2015): 327–344.
39. The various Tricare plans are described at the program's website: [www.military.com/benefits/tricare](http://www.military.com/benefits/tricare).
40. Greg Miller, "Engineering a New Line of Attack on a Signature War Injury," *Science* 335 (January 6, 2012).
41. Government Accountability Office, "VA Mental Health: Number of Veterans Receiving Care, Barriers Faced, and Efforts to Increase Access" (GAO-12-12), October 13, 2011.
42. See Shan Carter and Amanda Cox, "One 9/11 Tally: 3.3 Trillion," *New York Times*, September 8, 2011. For another view of the costs of veterans' health care resulting from the wars, see David Herszenhorn, "Estimates of Iraq War Cost Were Not Close to Ballpark," *New York Times*, March 19, 2008. For a much fuller treatment of the subject, see Government Accountability Office, "VA Health Care: Long-Term Care Strategic Planning and Budgeting Need Improvement," January 2009.
43. See Jennifer Steinhauer and Dave Philipps, "V.A. Seeks to Redirect Billions of Dollars into Private Care," *New York Times*, January 12, 2019.
44. The program cost data come from the Kaiser Family Foundation and are available at [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org). More detailed reports are available from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services at [www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov). See also Margot Sanger-Katz, "Per Capita Medicare Spending Is Actually Falling," *New York Times*, September 3, 2014; and Sanger-Katz, "How Medicaid for Children Recoups Much of Its Cost in the Long Run," *New York Times*, January 12, 2015.
45. Robert Pear, "Investigators Find Repeated Deception in Ads for Drugs," *New York Times*, December 4, 2002. The article summarizes findings from a GAO report. See also Elisabeth Rosenthal, "A Push to Sell Testosterone Gels Troubles



- Doctors,” *New York Times*, October 15, 2013; and Rosenthal, “Ask Your Doctor If This Ad Is Right for You,” *New York Times*, February 27, 2016.
46. Extensive data on these trends can be found at [www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov). The CMS actuary staff also offer a detailed discussion of the economic models, assumptions, and calculations that lie behind these kinds of cost projections.
  47. For an overview of reform ideas for controlling health care spending, see Marilyn Werber Serafini, “Bending the Curve,” *National Journal*, October 3, 2009, 22–28; and Ezekiel J. Emanuel, “Saving by the Bundle,” *New York Times*, November 16, 2011.
  48. See Bob Kocher and Farzad Mostashari, “A Health Care Success Story,” *New York Times*, September 23, 2014.
  49. The plan and its implementation are described in a May 2012 report by the Kaiser Family Foundation, “Massachusetts Health Care Reform: Six Years Later,” available at <http://kaiserfamilyfoundation.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/8311.pdf>. See also Kevin Sack, “With Health Care for Nearly All, Massachusetts Now Faces Costs,” *New York Times*, March 16, 2009; and Marilyn Werber Serafini, “The Lessons of Massachusetts,” *National Journal*, July 18, 2009, 20–27.
  50. See Eric Lipton and Rachel Abrams, “EpiPen Maker Lobbies to Shift High Costs to Others,” *New York Times*, September 16, 2016.
  51. Drew Armstrong, “FDA Bill Clears after Intense Negotiations,” *CQ Weekly* online edition, September 24, 2007.
  52. See Stephanie Saul, “Merck Wrote Drug Studies for Doctors,” *New York Times*, April 16, 2008.
  53. Cited in “The Unraveling of Health Insurance,” *Consumer Reports*, July 2002, 48–53. See also Charles Morris, “The Economics of Health Care,” *Commonweal* 132 (online edition, April 8, 2005), for insightful analysis of the need to find more creative ways to limit overuse and misallocation of health care resources.
  54. See, for example, “Misdiagnosis Is More Common Than Drug Errors or Wrong-Site Surgery,” *Washington Post*, May 6, 2013.
  55. For research on health care quality and discussions of national commitment to quality health care, see the website for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: [www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/index.html](http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/index.html).
  56. See Ariana Eunjung Cha, “Researchers: Medical Errors Now Third Leading Cause of Death in the United States,” *Washington Post*, May 3, 2016. The study was published in a leading medical journal. A 2013 study put the number of medical errors even higher, at 440,000 a year. See David Bornstein, “Reducing Preventable Harm in Hospitals,” *New York Times*, January 26, 2016.
  57. Bornstein, “Reducing Preventable Harm in Hospitals.”
  58. Tina Rosenberg, “To Make Hospitals Less Deadly, a Dose of Data,” *New York Times*, December 4, 2013; and Bornstein, “Reducing Preventable Harm in Hospitals.”
  59. The figures come from the CDC, which reports regularly on smoking-related deaths and economic losses, and are available at [www.cdc.gov/tobacco](http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco).
  60. These statistics are taken from the surgeon general’s extensive report of 2004, and are available at the CDC website: [www.cdc.gov/tobacco](http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco).
  61. Centers for Disease Control and Protection, “Outbreak of Lung Injury Associated with E-Cigarette Use, or Vaping,” September 27, 2019, available at [www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic\\_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html](http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html).
  62. Sabrina Tavernise, “A Hot Debate over E-Cigarettes as a Path to Tobacco, or from It,” *New York Times*, February 23, 2014; Matt Richtel, “Selling a Poison by the Barrel: Liquid Nicotine for E-Cigarettes,” *New York Times*, March 23, 2014; and Tavernise, “F.D.A. Tightens Rules for E-Cigarettes in a Landmark Move,” *New York Times*, May 5, 2016. For a thorough discussion of the regulation of e-cigarettes, see a “point-counterpoint” review in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 35, no. 2 (2016): 472–495.
  63. Quoted in a review of Marion Nestle’s *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), by Ben Geman, *National Journal*, June 22, 2002, 1899.
  64. The new data can be found at the CDC site on overweight and obesity: [www.cdc.gov/obesity](http://www.cdc.gov/obesity). Obesity is defined as having a body mass index (BMI) of 30 or greater, and being overweight is defined as having a BMI of 25 or higher.
  65. Reed Abelson, “F Is for Americans Getting Fatter,” *New York Times*, July 7, 2011.
  66. See the National Institutes of Health for a summary of some of the data: [www.nih.gov/news-events/](http://www.nih.gov/news-events/)

- news-releases/nih-study-finds-extreme-obesity-may-shorten-life-expectancy-14-years.
67. Melanie Warner, "The Food Industry Empire Strikes Back," *New York Times*, July 7, 2005.
  68. Anahad O'Connor, "New Dietary Guidelines Urge Less Sugar for All and Less Protein for Boys and Men," *New York Times*, January 7, 2016; and Sabrina Tavernise, "F.D.A. to Require Calorie Count, Even for Popcorn at the Movies," *New York Times*, November 24, 2014.
  69. Tara Parker-Pope, "The Fat Trap," *New York Times Magazine*, December 28, 2011. See also David H. Freedman, "How to Fix the Obesity Crisis," *Scientific American*, February 2011.
  70. The study is summarized in Anne Lise Straden, "Being Unfit Nearly as Harmful as Smoking," *Real Clear Science*, August 16, 2016. The original research was published in the *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*.
  71. Tara Parker-Pope, "Less Active at Work, Americans Have Packed on Pounds," *New York Times*, May 25, 2011.
  72. The National Center for Health Statistics in the CDC releases these figures each year. The OECD numbers come from <https://data.oecd.org/healthstat/life-expectancy-at-birth.htm>.
  73. Neil Munro, "The End of Obesity," *National Journal*, February 6, 2010, 36–42. The 2012 study is J. Cawley and C. Meyerhoefer, "The Medical Care Costs of Obesity: An Instrumental Variables Approach," *Journal of Health Economics* 31, no. 1 (2012): 219–230.
  74. The cost estimates come from the journal *Health Affairs* and are reported on its website: [www.healthaffairs.org](http://www.healthaffairs.org).
  75. The estimates come from the American Diabetes Association ([www.diabetes.org](http://www.diabetes.org)) and from David S. Ludwig and Kenneth S. Rogoff, "The Toll of America's Obesity," *New York Times*, August 9, 2018.
  76. Munro, "End of Obesity."
  77. David M. Drucker, "A Fat and Lazy State: Obesity Costly for California," *LA Daily News*, April 13, 2005.
  78. Morris, "Economics of Health Care."