Instead of working for Maine people, Susan Collins has become part of Washington, taking millions of dollars from special interests like drug companies, insurance companies and Wall Street and then working for them in the Senate. Susan Collins – She’s not for you anymore.

CHAPTER #1: DRUG PRICES

Susan Collins has taken more than $1.4 million dollars from drug companies and the insurance industry.

And even as the cost of prescription drugs has continued to skyrocket for Mainers, Collins has voted to allow drug companies to enter secret agreements, preventing the availability of lower cost generic options.

Collins’ votes allowed drug companies to make billions in profits, but costs Mainers dearly.

Susan Collins. She’s not for you anymore.

SUSAN COLLINS HAS TAKEN MORE THAN $1.4 MILLION FROM DRUG AND INSURANCE COMPANIES WHILE THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS HAS SKYROCKETED

1995-2019: SUSAN COLLINS HAS TAKEN $1.4 MILLION FROM DRUG COMPANIES AND THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY...

1995-2019: Susan Collins Has Accepted $412,999 From The Pharmaceutical/Health Products Industry. [Open Secrets, accessed 12/18/19]

1995-2019: Susan Collins Has Accepted $1,018,960 From The Insurance Industry. [Open Secrets, accessed 12/18/19]

…EVEN AS THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS HAS INCREASED

HEADLINE: “No End In Sight To Rising Drug Prices, Study Finds.” [NBC, 5/31/19]

2019: Scripps Research Translational Institute Study Found That Between 2012 And 2017, 48 Of 49 Brand Name Drugs Included In The Study Saw Regular Price Increases. “In the study, researchers from the Scripps Research Translational Institute analyzed Blue Cross Blue Shield pharmacy claims from 2012 to 2017, focusing on a total of 49 brand-name drugs that had more than 100,000 total claims each. All but one of the drugs included in the study saw regular annual or biannual cost increases. The cost of 36 of the drugs increased over the six-year period by more than 50 percent, and the cost of 16 more than doubled. Overall, the median cost of the drugs included in the study increased 76 percent.” [NBC, 5/31/19]

2008-2016: The Price Of Brand-Name Oral Prescription Drugs Increased By 9 Percent Per Year And The Price Of Injectable Drugs Increased 15 Percent Per Year. “Looking at wholesale data for around 27,000 prescription drugs, Hernandez and her colleagues found that, between 2008 and 2016, brand-name oral prescription drugs rose 9 percent annually, while injectable drugs increased 15 percent per year. Inflation, meanwhile, is only about 2 percent.” [CNBC, 1/10/19]

2007-2017: Total Spending On Prescription Drugs Increased By 41 Percent, From $236 Billion To $333 Billion. “Total spending by the government, consumers and insurers on prescription drugs was $333 billion in 2017, according to National Health Expenditure data. That was an increase of just 0.4 percent from the previous year. But that spending rose more than 41 percent over the previous decade, from $236 billion in 2007.” [NPR, 1/7/19]

SUSAN COLLINS TWICE VOTED AGAINST CRACKING DOWN ON SECRET “PAY-FOR-DELAY” AGREEMENTS THAT DELAY ACCESS TO CHEAPER GENERIC PRESCRIPTION DRUGS
2010: SUSAN COLLINS VOTED TO REMOVE A PROVISION BANNING “PAY-FOR-DELAY” AGREEMENTS FROM AN APPROPRIATIONS BILL

7/29/10: Susan Collins Voted For An Amendment That Would Have Removed A Provision Prohibiting So-Called “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements From An Underlying Appropriations Bill. On July 29, 2010, Susan Collins voted for an “Amendment that would remove a provision to prohibit brand-name drug companies from paying generic-drug companies to delay introducing cheaper generic drugs into the market.” The Senate Appropriations Committee rejected the amendment by a vote of 15 to 15. The underlying bill was the Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act. [CQ, 7/29/10; S. 3677, 7/29/10]

- **New York Times Editorial:** The Amendment Would Have Removed A Provision From The Underlying Bill That Would Have “Greatly Curtail[ed] Pay-For-Delay Practices.” “The bill pending in the Senate, which was incorporated into a general government appropriations bill, is similar to legislation already approved by the House. It would greatly curtail pay-for-delay practices by presuming that such agreements are illegal and anticompetitive while leaving an opportunity for the affected companies to overcome that presumption in court. On the merits, the bill deserves passage. But the proposal barely survived a challenge in the Senate Appropriations Committee when an amendment that would have dropped it from the broader bill failed to win a majority; it lost on a 15-to-15 tie.” [Editorial, New York Times, 8/9/10]

- **Washington Drug Letter:** The Provision Banned “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements Between Generic And Brand-Name Pharmaceutical Companies Under Which Generic Manufacturers Agreed To Delay Or Limit Research, Development, Manufacturing, Or Sales Of Their Generic Drugs. “But less than a week later, the Senate Appropriations Committee included Kohl's bill in the Fiscal 2011 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act. Kohl's provision, opposed by the brand and generics industries, would amend the FTC Act by banning agreements between brand and generic companies in which an ANDA filer receives anything of value or agrees to limit or forego research, development, manufacturing or sales of its generic drug for any period.” [Washington Drug Letter, 8/2/10]

2012: SUSAN COLLINS VOTED AGAINST AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD HAVE CRACKED DOWN ON “PAY-FOR-DELAY” AGREEMENTS

5/24/12: Susan Collins Voted Against An Amendment That Would Have “Ensured That Anti-Competitive ‘Pay-For-Delay’ Settlements Between Brand-Name And Generic Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Do Not Block Generic Drugs From Entering The Market.” On May 24, 2012, Susan Collins voted against an amendment that would have “provide[d] substantial savings in health care costs to the Federal government and consumers by fostering competition among generic pharmaceutical manufacturers and ensuring that anti-competitive ‘pay-for-delay’ settlements between brand-name and generic pharmaceutical manufacturers do not block generic drugs from entering the market.” The amendment was rejected 28-67. [CQ, 5/24/12; S.Amdt. 2111 to S. 3187, Vote 105, 5/24/12]

- **Amendment “Would Have Prevented Generic Pharmaceutical Companies From Reaching Pay-For-Delay Settlements With Makers Of Brand-Name Drugs Under Which They Were Paid To Put Off The Introduction Of Generic Versions Of Brand-Name Drugs.”** “SENATE Vote 1: Generic drugs: The Senate has rejected an amendment sponsored by Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., to the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (S. 3187). The amendment would have prevented generic pharmaceutical companies from reaching pay-for-delay settlements with makers of brand-name drugs under which they were paid to put off the introduction of generic versions of brand-name drugs. The vote, Thursday, was 28 yeas to 67 nays.” [Tusla World, 5/27/12]

- **Alliance For Retired Americans:** Bingaman Amendment “Would Prohibit Brand Name And Generic Drug Companies From Entering Into Agreements That Delay Access To Generic Drugs By The Public.” “Senator Bingaman, D-NM, introduced an amendment to a drug company user fee bill that would prohibit brand name and generic drug companies from entering into agreements that delay access to generic drugs by the public.” [Alliance for Retired Americans, Congressional Voting Record, January 2012—January 2013]

Amendment Sponsor Democratic Sen. Bingaman Said His Amendment Would Prohibit The “Anticompetitive, Anticonsumer Practice” Of “So-Called Pay-For-Delay Settlements” Between Brand-Name And Generic Pharmaceutical Manufacturers. BINGAMAN: “We have a circumstance today in which an anticompetitive, anticonsumer [sic] practice is engaged in, and our amendment will change the law so that practice can no longer be engaged in. The practice I am talking about is the entering into so-called pay-for-delay settlements between brand-name drug–brand-name pharmaceutical companies and generic manufacturers.” [Congressional Record, 5/24/12]
SECRET “PAY-FOR-DELAY” DEALS DELAYED THE INTRODUCTION OF CHEAPER GENERIC DRUGS, RAISED DRUGS PRICES WHILE MAKING DRUG COMPANIES BILLIONS

NBC: “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements “Allow Drug Manufacturers In Some Instances To Pay Competitors Not To Manufacture Generic Versions Of Their Products.” “Known as ‘reverse settlement payments,’ or ‘pay-to-delay’ deals, the financial arrangements are a unique but common practice in the pharmaceutical industry. Essentially, they allow drug manufacturers in some instances to pay competitors not to manufacture generic versions of their products, thereby ensuring that they maintain patent protection for as long as possible.” [NBC, 8/13/15]

2010: Federal Trade Commission Estimated That “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements “Cost Consumers And Taxpayers $3.5 Billion In Higher Drug Costs Every Year.” “Pay-for-delay agreements are estimated to cost American consumers $3.5 billion per year - $35 billion over the next 10 years.” [Federal Trade Commission, January 2010]

2019: California Attorney General Xavier Becerra Said “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements Caused Consumers To “Pay As Much As 90% More For Drugs Shielded From Competition” Under The Deals. “Under such ‘pay-for-delay’ agreements, drugmakers could maintain a monopoly on branded medications after their patents expired, [California Attorney General Xavier] Becerra said. The practices caused consumers ‘to pay as much as 90% more for drugs shielded from competition,’ his office added.” [CNN, 7/29/19]

Brand-Name Drugs Impacted By “Pay-For-Delay” Deals Cost 10 Times More Than Their Generic Versions. “On average, brand-name drugs affected by pay-for-delay deals cost 10 times more than generic versions, according to a 2013 report from consumer advocacy groups CalPIRG and Community Catalyst that analyzed information about 20 medications. Brand-name drugmakers made an estimated $98 billion in total sales of those drugs while generic versions were delayed, the report said.” [Los Angeles Times, 7/29/19]

2013: In A Study Of 20 Drugs Impacted By “Pay-For-Delay” Agreements, Brand-Name Manufacturers Made $98 Billion In Total Sales While The Generic Versions Were Delayed. “On average, brand-name drugs affected by pay-for-delay deals cost 10 times more than generic versions, according to a 2013 report from consumer advocacy groups CalPIRG and Community Catalyst that analyzed information about 20 medications. Brand-name drugmakers made an estimated $98 billion in total sales of those drugs while generic versions were delayed, the report said.” [Los Angeles Times, 7/29/19]