Senator HATFIELD. Do you think the USP should use more biological testing than what it does now to determine standards for these drugs? Do you feel that there is sufficient biological tests, as you advocate here, in using both animals and people to determine these minimum standards?

Dr. TAUSSIG. Well, I think they are doing a good job now in the face of a difficult problem. I believe, that the recent evidence that has been brought forth by James Wilson that you can produce phocomelia in Rhesus monkeys is going to encourage testing in these higher animals.

That is an expensive way of doing it, but, if it is going to save untold lives, it is going to be less expensive in seeing that a dangerous drug gets on the market. It will be expensive for the drug companies, but, if that is going to be the means of safety, the public will want it.

Gradually, I think, we are going to realize which drugs are likely to have more severe reactions than we have today. In other words, I wouldn't like to put more in the Bureau of Standards until we are perfectly sure we are giving the right lead and the right line.

Senator NELSON. Earlier in your testimony you referred to an article by Mr. Morton Mintz which appeared in the Washington Post on July 15, 1962, regarding thalidomide. You said you would furnish us with a copy. We have a copy of that article.

Dr. TAUSSIG. Oh, fine.

Senator NELSON. And I would request that at the end of your testimony the article by Mr. Mintz be printed in the record. Go ahead, Doctor.[5]

Dr. TAUSSIG. Thank you.

Senator NELSON. I think you were on page 6.

Dr. TAUSSIG. Yes, at the top. One of the basic simple elementary precautions is to have the generic name on every drug, and when the drug is a compound with the various preparations, each of the substances should be clearly listed so that the lay person and the physician may have the opportunity to know what the preparation contains.

The question has been raised as to inactive ingredients. These too, might be listed, so that people who are allergic to an inactive substance could know it. It is a very difficult thing of how much to list. You don't want to get so much on the label that nobody is going to read it.

The most important thing is to know, I think, if they are allergic to some inactive ingredient, that that person probably knows it and would try to find out whether it was in all the pills that come in.

Senator NELSON. But you do advocate that the generic name of the active ingredients of any drug or drug combination be placed on the label of the prescription bottle that the patient himself gets?

Dr. TAUSSIG. Yes. Let's be fair to the drug companies because they have produced many valuable drugs. The wonder drugs of today have altered the face of medicine. Private enterprise and the competition which results therefrom has been and is a tremendous stimulus, and we want this to continue. Quite rightly if a pharmaceutical manufacturer produces a superior product, they wish their name on the product. It could be either the name that catches the imagination or the name of the company.

---

[5] See p. 1525, infra.