Mr. STETLER. Only that three of the five companies that were involved were before the committee because of a particular price situation that was of interest to the company and to the committee. And that seemed to us like rather specific items which might better follow a general presentation by the industry. But I must say that is not my main point.

The main point is this.

The major items that have come up in the hearings have dealt with medical and scientific issues—primarily the subject of generic and therapeutic equivalency—the major issues, it seems to us, have dealt with issues of equivalency—generic and therapeutic—some on the compendium, and some on the detailing of doctors. But certainly doctors and scientists and some of these scientific issues have been in the forefront of the hearings.

Now, we think that to the extent that medicine or pharmacologists has been heard, they have expressed a minority view. We think there is another view, and in our opinion it is the predominant view. And that there are some people that should be called by the committee or if they have asked to testify, that they should be allowed to testify. And there have been quite a number that have done just that.

I think really it is with respect to the scheduling of some of those nonindustry witnesses that there has been, in our opinion, a problem. It is in that area that I have said I think the other side of the scientific case before the committee should be more fully exposed.

I still have that feeling.

Senator NELSON. Well, I am sure that if you were conducting the hearings, you would conduct them differently. But a serious question that seems to me to be raised is that in a number of speeches you have made, you stated directly or implied that the hearings have been loaded against the industry, that you have not had a chance to appear, or that you do not know when you can appear. And this was said very shortly after the hearings started, even though I had gone into that in some detail with you in private.

Here is the sort of thing I am referring to.

In Chicago, on September 23, a little more than a month ago, in a speech to the annual convention of the American Medical Writers Association, you stated, "The fact is the pattern of the hearings was set on the first day by the testimony I have just described, and it has not changed in 4 months as one handpicked witness has followed the other to the stand. I use 'handpicked' in the most liberal, deliberate, and factual way."

That was said with the intent of convincing those people that these hearings have been unfair, biased, and loaded against the industry—isn't it?

Mr. STETLER. Not against the industry. They have not covered the scientific issues in a way to give the other side—and there is another side—an opportunity to present their views.

Now, I mean by the other side groups that have asked to testify, like the American Academy of General Practice, the two national organizations of interns, the American Medical Association, the Association of Abdominal Surgeons—groups of this type that speak for large numbers of doctors and scientists. I think they can give a more representative view than an individual physician who speaks for himself.