"That drug manufacturers and the government are going to have to do a better job."

Under the direction of FDA Commissioner Goddard, I am confident that agency—which has been improving rapidly in recent months—will do the better job required.

"The main issue, as the FDA sees it, is:

"If a drug manufacturer cannot put out good drugs, then he will have to get out of the drug business."

"The agency plans to apply that rule firmly, Mr. Rankin assures us. And he outlines how they will reach that goal . . .

"Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that FDA Deputy Commissioner Rankin's speech of Saturday, October 15, to the American College of Apothecaries at Boston be inserted at this point in the Record."

Midlothian, Tex., Mirror, October 27, 1966

Charges against the effectiveness of generics now should be laid to rest by a recent survey of the Food and Drug Administration. A quality check of 4,600 samples of 20 of the most important groups of drugs—generic and brandname—showed, in fact, that generics had the edge on potency. Of the brandnames, 8.8 percent failed to meet potency standards, compared to 7.8 percent of generics.

Obviously consumers would be well advised to confer with their doctors on the possibility of using generics for their prescriptions.

St. Louis Labor Tribune, February 16, 1967

In a survey of 246 drug manufacturers to determine the potency of their products, more than half of the firms had one or more product samples that did not meet acceptable standards. The results of the survey were released by Food and Drug Administration Commissioner James L. Goddard who said his agency would investigate other drug qualities in a broader survey.

Charles Kuralt, CBS Radio Network, February 28, 1967

The drug inspectors found that more than half of the manufacturers had at least one product sample that did not meet the standards of potency. Some were more potent than they were supposed to be, a few had very little potency at all . . . About eight percent of the total were unacceptable, either too potent or not enough. The unacceptable samples came from 127 different firms . . . The FDA, our watchdog over drug quality has made some conclusions from all this. And what does the agency conclude? . . . The Food and Drug Administration was impressed by its survey of drug potency. Impressed with the need for further surveys to watch and safeguard the quality of thousands of drugs we use today.

Senator Joseph M. Montoya, March 8, 1967, address to the Senate, quoting Science Newsletter for March 4, 1967

There is no doubt that research carried out by wealthy drug houses has led to the discovery of many new drugs. Whether or not a brandname insures a high quality product, however, is a matter of considerable debate. In fact, a recently reported analysis by the Food and Drug Administration revealed that 8.2 percent of 4,573 drug samples did not meet potency standards. Breaking this down into products marketed under brandnames versus those sold under generic names, 8.8 percent of 1,991 brandname samples were deficient compared to 7.7 percent of 2,582 generics. "Nobody came out of this survey looking good," an FDA official commented.

Senator Russell B. Long, letter to the editor, Medical World News, April 21, 1967

In a survey of drug potency recently completed by the Food and Drug Administration, some 4,600 drug samples were tested for conformance with accepted standards of potency. While the FDA found 7.7% of the established-name drugs failing to meet those standards, it also found 8.8% of trade-name products unacceptable. Fourteen of the drug manufacturers who advertised in your February 17 issue produced drugs included in the survey. And nine of the 14 advertisers produced unacceptable products!

Senator Gaylord Nelson, April 26, 1967, address to the Senate

It is correct that problems can arise as to the safety, potency or purity of drugs. But the point is that such problems are not necessarily limited to low-priced drugs sold under generic names . . .