

Senator NELSON. Mr. Squibb, would you mind interrupting your presentation? I would like to ask you about the press release of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association commenting on your statement. Have you had a chance to read it?

Mr. SQUIBB. Yes; I just received a copy a few minutes ago.

Senator NELSON. Do you have any comment you would like to make about the release?

Mr. SQUIBB. I think I look at this more in sorrow than in anger.

Senator NELSON. I did not understand that.

Mr. SQUIBB. I say I am looking at this more in sorrow than in anger. This, I think, just points up what I have said today. I certainly have not commented anywhere that I know of that the prices have not in fact declined. They have declined and they are still declining. That does not change the burden of the argument that the industry is thought to be still high priced. Of course, they have declined. Over on the second page, I certainly do not derogate research. Quite to the contrary. This points up the fact which I bring out later, that it is very difficult to talk rationally about research in the industry without somebody getting a little bit overexcited about the emotional impact of killer diseases and so forth. And I know of nowhere in the statement where I even mentioned the words "they are cutting equivalency of drugs." I do not even discuss this at all. This seems to me to be sort of setting up a straw man and then blowing it down with a lot of wind but it does not really cover the points that I have been trying to make here.

Senator NELSON. On the second page it says: "As to the value of the research which Mr. Squibb derogates." In your statement you did not derogate research.

Mr. SQUIBB. No, I did not derogate it at all. I indicated there might possibly be within the scope of industry research some which is not wholly productive or wholly important. Just this one slight suspicion or remark cast on research brings forth this extraordinarily strong answer which is the point I am making. It is very hard to stand off and objectively talk about research. It is almost a holy man in the industry. I think the research should be examined factually without derogation, without criticism, like every other part of the business of which it is an important part, one of many parts.

Senator NELSON. I think that the statement rather dramatically emphasized the comments in the opening of your statement in which you say that the only answer that the pharmaceutical industry has given to date is to, "tell its story," to "improve its image", to "explain its contributions to medical knowledge and the health of the people." I think their statement dramatizes the cogency of your observation about their kind of response to any suggestions or criticism.

Mr. SQUIBB. It says I speak for myself. Of course, I speak for myself. I only hope some day that the words I am saying here will be adopted by the industry. That is my wish.

Mr. GROSSMAN. Mr. Squibb, I wonder if I might ask you in the same area, do you feel that there is room for dissent in the industry and that there are others who feel as you do and perhaps do not come before us for any reason?

Mr. SQUIBB. Oh, surely.