

Janet Parshall Commentary

Date: 08-20-10

Length: 3:00

Title: FDA – Bad Drugs?

Tease: A Rasmussen Poll recently cited that Americans believe it is very easy to get abortions now-a-days days. The FDA may be making it even easier! Janet Parshall explains in just a moment...

Lead: Janet Parshall says, *“It is a sad day in America when politics clouds the ability for health care providers to trade in good treatment rather than be forced to be merchants of death.”* How does this relate to a possible over-the-counter abortion pill? Janet Parshall explains in her weekly commentary...

In Cue: “This has been a very bad week...”

Out Cue: “...That’s my opinion. For Moody Radio, I’m Janet Parshall.”

This has been a very bad week for the Food and Drug Administration. First the agency has given approval to a drug known as ELLA – an abortifacient. The drug will initially be available only by prescription and it will destroy unborn children days after conception.

But if the so-called Morning After Pill is any indication, also approved by the FDA, it won’t be long before the drug will be delivered over-the-counter to girls as young as 17.

Pharmacists For Life issued a statement this week stating that they “vehemently denounce and condemn the FDA for this inappropriate use of its drug regulatory power to destroy life rather than approve and regulate medicines which actually are life-saving and preserve health.”

Sadly, FDA approval for ELLA will create what is tantamount to a cottage industry of self-abortion. Who will be there for the women who self-abort? What happens when they realize what the drug has really done? ELLA will also provide cover for men who have committed crimes of sexual assault.

ELLA comes from the same chemical family as RU-486 – both drugs designed specifically to abort human life at its earliest stages by blocking implantation. ELLA is a drug designed to kill new life.

As disconcerting as the approval of ELLA is, the second controversial move by the FDA is a decision to rescind endorsement of a drug that has been used to battle breast cancer. Avastin has been known as the “poster child for expensive anti-cancer drugs.” The drug is used to treat women where breast cancer has spread.

Avastin costs about \$8000 a month and is given to 17,500 women in the US a year. The drug is believed to prevent blood flow to tumors thereby extending life by more than five months.

But the FDA, in a 12 -1 decision, decided to drop the endorsement of Avastin. The conventional wisdom is that ‘cost effectiveness’ was the overriding factor. If that is true, then America is seeing the first evidence of what many of us feared – that health care will be rationed and provision of care to patients will be predicated on cost.

The FDA has the charge of looking at health risks and benefits for drugs and has never been asked to determine cost effectiveness. This week, with these two decisions on ELLA and AVASTIN, the FDA has failed to fulfill their charge.

40,000 women lost their battle with breast cancer last year. If the FDA withdraws its endorsement of Avastin, insurers will not cover the cost of the drug and more women will be denied a very important option in their treatment.

The FDA’s decision has reinvigorated the idea that the government’s decision to withhold care is the working definition of health care rationing. We may not have ‘death panels’ per se but not providing care because of cost can end in death none the less. In the case of ELLA, the FDA has given approval of a drug solely designed to bring about death.

It is a sad day in America when politics clouds the ability for health care providers to trade in good treatment rather than be forced to be merchants of death.

That's my opinion. For Moody Radio, I'm Janet Parshall.