

" We would then be required to buy the drugs at the prices these companies set on a trade-name basis. They would charge anywhere from 5 to 100 times the cost of production, even though other quality producers sell the same product for a fraction of that price.

I can cite one example, and it does not involve trade names. A person can go into a drugstore and buy a bottle of aspirin tablets.

I bought some the other day. A person can get a product manufactured by a firm and approved under its generic name. He can buy the aspirin tablets at a very nominal cost. If one wants to buy a name brand aspirin, it is exactly the same product. It may be advertised that there is none better. They are right. There is none better and there is none worse. It is all aspirin. That is all it is.

[P. 25356]

So one can buy the same size tablets and call them by a name brand. If he buys a large bottle, on a bulk basis, he will pay about a penny apiece. Why should we, as a government, pay a penny apiece for aspirin tablets, when there are bottles of them in every drugstore at seven for a penny—the same size and the same quality. It makes no sense.

We could provide all the aspirin tablets necessary, but we think we should provide them in the same way that we provide them for the President of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives, the Members of the Senate, and the generals of the Army at Bethesda Naval Hospital and Walter Reed Army Hospital. Buy them for the quality we want, require that they be the proper quality; but so far as we are concerned, we will pay what the article is worth.

If you want to let them charge you 10 times that much, go ahead and pay the high price. I am not criticizing those people.

My father at one time was a patent medicine salesman. He had two medicines. One was named High Poplarlorum, and the other was named Low Poplarhirum. Both bottles were the same size. One bottle sold for 50 cents, the other for a dollar. The people practically always bought the dollar bottle. The difference between these two products was that the High Poplarlorum was made from the bark that had been skinned down the tree, and the Low Poplarhirum was made from the bark that had been skinned up the tree.

I cannot criticize them for charging a dollar for a 50-cent bottle, when I know that my dad did the same thing, as a boy. But we have no business making the old people pay two or three times more than they should to get these products.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, because I am due downstairs at the con-

ference committee on truth in packaging, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] has, subject to the approval of the Senator from Louisiana, allowed me to interpolate one question at this point. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is satisfactory.

Mr. COTTON. I note that the effective date on the drugs is not January 1, but July 1, 1968.

Also, having had my attention drawn to it—and I thank the Senator—I note the contingency dates that might come ahead of that.

After the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is voted on, I would like to offer an amendment simply changing the date of July 1, 1968—leaving the contingency in—to January 1, 1968, 6 months. If that is done, would the Senator accept it and take it to conference?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I will.

Mr. COTTON. Of course, I have been in the Senate too long not to know exactly what is meant when the chairman of a committee says that he will take an amendment to conference. It usually means "out the window." But if the Senator from New Hampshire only advances that date 6 months and leaves all the contingencies in, would the Senator from Louisiana feel that the amendment had merit enough so that he really would attempt to keep it in the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would like to see the old people be able to get these drugs just as soon as it can be arranged. I would be happy to accept the amendment, when it is in order. I do not believe it is in order at this time.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not offer it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a very brief period.

Ever so often a tax measure comes along which serves as a catchall for special interest amendments. The word is out that this is it.

Mr. President, unless the Senate moves to strip from this bill unworthy amendments entirely extraneous to the measure, there will be many more. Every time I go out the door, I see someone else drafting another amendment. H.R. 10 is in the works to be offered. Further depletion amendments will be offered. And why not? Why does not everyone offer everything he wishes, if we are to take a bill to encourage foreign investment in the United States and then use it as a vehicle to give a 200-percent increase in the percentage depletion allowance to the gatherers of clamshells?

That brings up a question, Mr. President. A goodly number of Senators—at least, some who have expressed them-