In a Congressional hearing about the high cost of prescription drugs, filmed by C-Span, Chip Roy attacked other members of Congress for questioning drug makers’ profits. On video, Chip Roy said, “I hope you make a lot more” money to a drug company CEO. He’s taken thousands from pharmaceutical lobbyists and voted repeatedly against lowering the costs of prescription drugs.

Statesman: Roy “Exploded” During A Committee Hearing Examining Prescription Drug Prices, Shouting He Was Glad A Company That Made Money And Said, “I Hope They Make A Lot More.” “Chip Roy, a Republican congressman from Hays County, exploded at a hearing Thursday examining prescription drug prices, blasting Democrats for ‘preening and posturing for cameras and attacking people for making profit in a capitalistic society.’ He shouted that he was glad a company that made a drug that had saved him in his battle with Hodgkin’s lymphoma made money and ‘I hope they make a lot more.’ The House Oversight and Reform Committee was holding a hearing on an HIV prevention drug known as Truvada, which costs $2,100 a month and has been difficult for patients to afford and had been developed with federal research funding. The hearing was titled ‘HIV Prevention Drug: Billions in Corporate Profits after Millions in Taxpayer Investments.’” [Statesman, 5/17/19]

Roy’s Comments Were Pointed Toward Daniel O’Day, CEO Of Gilead Sciences, Inc. “Roy, who lives just outside Austin and was first elected in November, apparently was set off by what he said was ‘a rant’ by the Democrat who spoke immediately before him, Rep. Katie Hill of California. She asked a pointed line of questions to Daniel O’Day, the chairman and CEO of Gilead Sciences Inc. which makes the drug about his compensation and corporate profits and said she “took issue” with the millions of dollars paid to corporate executives. ‘To sit here and attack the capitalistic system that produces and distributes medicines that are saving lives around the world, I mean, it is just offensive,’ said Roy, turning slightly toward Hill. Then, directing himself to O’Day, he said, ‘I hope you make a lot of money.’” [Statesman, 5/17/19]

NOTE: Video of Roy’s remarks at the committee hearing can be found in the Statesman’s report on the incident, or it can be found on C-SPAN’s website here.

2017-2020: Chip Roy Took $16,500 From Pharmaceutical Lobbyists:

Dee Buchanan Contributed $1,500 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 5/30/20; 4/30/20; 9/28/18]

Buchanan Worked For Ogivly Government Relations And Represented Pfizer, Inc. And Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers Of America. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Manus Cooney Contributed $2,000 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 6/6/19; 7/12/18; 1/17/18]

Cooney Worked For American Continental Group And Represented Amgen Inc. And Bayer AG. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Steven Duffield Contributed $500 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 8/8/19]

Duffield Worked For Endgame Strategies And Represented Association For Accessible Medicines. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Jack M. Fields Contributed $1,000 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 6/27/19]

Fields Worked For 21st Century Group And Represented NeuroRx And Rafael Pharmaceuticals. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Joseph H. Gibson Contributed $500 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 7/20/18]
Gibson Worked For The Gibson Group And Represented Association For Accessible Medicines. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Kent Hance Contributed $4,000 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 6/30/20; 9/26/18; 4/26/18; 12/27/17]

Hance Worked For Hance Scarborough LLP And Represented Titan Pharmaceuticals And The Pharmaceutical Research Manufacturers Of America. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Jeffrey MacKinnon Contributed $500 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 11/2/18]

MacKinnon Worked For Farragut Partners And Represented AstraZeneca PLC, Spectrum Pharmaceutical And Heron Therapeutics. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

J. Allen Martin Contributed $250 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 10/22/18]

Martin Worked For The Livingston Group And Represented Titan Pharmaceuticals. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Texans For Lamar Smith Contributed $4,000 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 9/30/19; 6/27/19]

Lamar Smith Worked For Akin Gump Et Al And Represented Pfizer Inc. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]


Darren Willcox Contributed $1,000 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 9/6/19]


Lawrence Willcox Contributed $750 To Chip Roy’s Campaign Committee. [FEC, 6/4/19; 1/19/18]

Willcox Worked For Capitol Tax Partners And Represented AbbVie Inc. [Center for Responsive Politics – Lobbyists Lobbying on Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, 2019]

Roy Voted Against The Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, Which Would Allow The Federal Government To Negotiate Lower Drug Prices. In December 2019, Roy voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would allow the Health and Human Services Department to negotiate prices for certain drugs under Medicare programs and would make a number of modifications to Medicare programs related to drug costs and plan benefits. Specifically, the bill would establish a fair price negotiation program in which HHS would enter into agreements with drug manufacturers negotiate maximum fair prices for certain drugs.” The motion passed by a vote of 230-192. [HR 3, Vote #682, 12/12/19; CQ, 12/12/19]
The Bill Would Cap Seniors’ Out-Of-Pocket Costs For Prescription Drugs At $2,000 Per Year. “It would also cap seniors’ out-of-pocket prescription drug costs at $2,000 a year. And it would require drug companies that have raised their prices above the inflation rate since 2016 to either lower their prices or rebate the portion back to the U.S. Treasury.” [Washington Post, 9/19/19]

CBO: H.R. 3’s Negotiation Provision Would Reduce Drug Prices By 55 Percent. “CBO then estimated net spending for drugs with the international prices selected for negotiation under title I [of H.R. 3]. CBO estimates that reducing prices to 114 percent of the AIM price, on average, would reduce—by nearly 55 percent—the prices for the first group of drugs subject to negotiation.” [Congressional Budget Office, 10/11/19]

Roy Voted Against The Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act. In May 2019, Roy voted against: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that comprises a package of measures related to the development and market entry of generic drugs and a package of measures related to enrollment in and federal funding to support Affordable Care Act health insurance marketplaces. Title I of the bill includes provisions intended to facilitate the development and market entry of generic and biosimilar drug products. Specifically, it would allow the Food and Drug Administration to approve a subsequent company's application to manufacture a generic drug in cases where an initial company has applied but not received final FDA approval to introduce the drug after 30 months; approval of the subsequent application would trigger a 180-day exclusivity period for sale of the generic drug by the initial applicant company, after which point other generic versions could enter the market. It would prohibit generic and brand-name drug manufacturers from entering into agreements in which brand-name manufacturers pay to delay entry of a generic drug into the market, and it would authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue penalties and initiate civil actions to enforce the prohibition. It would allow generic drug manufacturers to bring civil action against the license holder for a brand-name drug if the license holder does not provide ‘sufficient quantities’ of samples of the brand-name drug on ‘commercially reasonable, market-based terms;' it would also outline certain affirmative legal defenses for defendants and certain terms for legal remedies in the case of a successful suit. Title II of the bill includes several provisions intended to facilitate enrollment in and provide funding and support for state- and federally-operated health insurance marketplaces under the Affordable Care Act. Specifically, it would authorize $200 million in grant funding for states to establish and operate state-based ACA health insurance marketplaces. It would authorize $100 million for Health and Human Services Department consumer outreach and educational activities related to ACA marketplace plans. It would authorize $100 million for the HHS ‘navigator’ program, which funds certified entities to help individuals enroll in qualified plans, and would make certain modifications to the duties and selection of navigators. It would prohibit the HHS, Treasury, and Labor departments from taking any action to implement or enforce an August 2018 rule that effectively extends the maximum duration of coverage for short-term, limited-duration health insurance plans, which are not required to meet ACA patient protection requirements. As amended, the bill would authorize $25 million annually in grant funding for the ACA navigator program in state-based marketplaces and include a number of additional requirements related to outreach and education programs by navigators and by HHS.” The bill passed 234-183. [HR 987, Vote #214, 5/16/19; CQ, 5/16/19]
‘parking’ by permitting the FDA to approve a second generic application before the first drug has gone on the market under select circumstances. […] 2) The bill bans ‘pay-for-delay’ agreements This is pretty straight-forward: Sometimes, brand-name drug manufacturers will straight-up pay a generic manufacturer to delay the generic product from entering the market. The Federal Trade Commission has estimated that such deals increase spending on prescription drugs by $3.5 billion annually.” [Vox, 5/13/19]

**The Bill Made It Easier For Generic Drugs To Be Developed.** “3) The bill makes it easier for generic manufacturers to get the materials from brand-name drug makers Another hiccup in the generic drug pipeline is when brand-name manufacturers refuse to provide the materials that generic competitors need to produce their cheaper knockoff versions of the brand-name drug. […] The House bill would allow generic manufacturers to request the FDA authorize them to obtain materials from the brand-name company, allow generic drug makers to sue in court for samples and the court would be allowed to award monetary damages to the generic company as a way to discourage brand-name companies from participating in anti-competitive behavior.” [Vox, 5/13/19]

**The Bill Included Money For States To Set Up ACA Insurance Marketplaces, Restored Funding For ACA Enrollment And Outreach, And Repealed The Expansion Of Short Term Insurance Plans.** “Democrats have paired those policies with a few proposals to shore up Obamacare: providing money for states to set up their own insurance marketplaces[,] restoring funding for ACA enrollment outreach and support cut by the Trump administration[,] repealing President Donald Trump’s expansion of skimpy ‘short-term’ insurance plans” [Vox, 5/13/19]