

to avoid any of that type of suspicion. Now it may be that this was simply carelessness or oversight or some low-level clerical incompetence. However, it was done and I think this is most unfortunate that that was done. This is a personal opinion only, of course, but I do not think that the advertising that the PMA is getting in that form is worth, what was it Mr. Stetler said, \$250,000 a crack. I surely do not.

Mr. GORDON. How about the content?

Mr. SQUIBB. Well, that is what I mean, the content of the advertising, using a one-case story. It is old hat, an old-fashioned way of doing this. I see what they are trying to say. They are trying to tell the industry's story. I think they could do it in a much more modern effective way than that particular one. This same type of thing has been done many times in the past. I think, as a personal opinion, that this is rather wasteful. And again I think this is the type of thing that does not impress the doctors, who say, "Well, you have spent all that money, a million dollars for this, why don't you cut the prices?" This is one of the nastiest comments an industry man gets to his advertising and I tried to cover that in my advertising discussion. You must be sure that your advertising looks believable and effective so that somebody does not say "Cut that out and cut the prices down." This piece seems to me to be a waste, poorly conceived, and inefficiently presented for the dollars spent.

Senator NELSON. I want to thank you, Mr. Squibb, for your testimony. Your statement and comments, I think, are among the most thoughtful and refreshing contributions to the dialog about the problems that these hearings are being conducted on of any witness that we have had. I am sure there will be some in the industry who will not agree with everything you have said, but your testimony coming from a person with long and distinguished experience in the industry, your comments which are obviously intended to help guide the industry to improve itself and avoid regulation of some kind or another that might come, your testimony with its constructive criticism evinces a dedicated concern for the industry rather than an attack on the industry which the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association interprets your remarks as being. I think it is unfortunate that the association would make an attack in a manner which weakens their position even more. But in any event, you have made a significant contribution, and if the leadership in the industry would give serious thought to the observations you have made, it could be of great value to the industry itself as well as to the health of the Nation. You have made a great contribution and the committee is appreciative of it, and I am sure that those who understand what this is all about and who are concerned about the problem across the Nation, will be appreciative of your public service in coming here today and expressing honestly, intelligently, and creatively your concern as well as offering your suggestions for improvements in an industry which is a great industry and which can avoid getting itself into serious problems if it is willing to impose some self-discipline as you suggest. Thank you very much.

Mr. SQUIBB. Thank you, Senator, very much.

Senator NELSON. That will conclude the hearings until Tuesday, the 19th of December in the Caucus Room. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 2:30 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned to reconvene on Tuesday, December 19, 1967.)