

As to the press, given the fact that you conduct a 2- or 3- or 4-hour hearing covering very long and complicated testimony, and the fact that the reports of the press must necessarily be condensed because there is not that much space in the paper, I think that the press has done a balanced job of reporting. We have had a series of hearings here, the nature of which is to study what appear to be problems in the industry that are of public concern.

As to publicity of the industry, I do not think there is any doubt in the world that 99⁹⁹/₁₀₀ percent of the inches in the press are favorable to the drug industry. There is only a tiny percentage that is unfavorable. That part that has been unfavorable with regard to drug pricing is unfavorable because it appears on its face to be an inexplicable pricing structure. We have heard from the industry in great detail, and I for one am not persuaded that it has given an adequate explanation of why a drug like prednisone should sell in competitive bidding in New York City, and to the Defense Supply Agency, and the Veterans' Administration, and hospitals for 45 cents a hundred and in the retail market for \$17.90 a hundred, while the Medical Letter, a distinguished publication, says that at least 22 versions of the drug with this vast price range are of equivalent therapeutic value.

This is a matter of important public concern. When you have two drugs of equal value, one selling for 45 cents a hundred to one group and the other for \$17.90 a hundred to pharmacists, that is news; and I would have considered the press quite biased if they had not printed it.

The other aspect that has been news is that the same company selling at \$17.90 to the pharmacists are themselves offering their drug in the competitive marketplace at \$1.20 a hundred; and at the same time, companies that are selling it for \$17.90 a hundred to the pharmacists in the retail marketplace in America are selling it for one-fourth that in the marketplace in Bern, Switzerland, and elsewhere. These are matters of news, and I do not think the press has been biased, frankly, in reporting this rather interesting and significant variance in the price structure.

Senator SCORR. None of which I read in this morning's press, Mr. Chairman. I was not referring to that. I am not making any prejudgment. I wonder if the fact that these witnesses are due to appear had anything to do with the fact that the only news in the paper this morning consists of attacks upon the witnesses before they have been heard. I would be doing less than my duty, even at the peril of a politician being critical of the press, if I did not say that I expect as a member of this committee a balanced reporting of what goes on here, and I think balanced reporting does not include an assault on the witnesses before they have been heard by quoting, after 4 hours of testimony, simply those statements which reflect on one company.

Senator NELSON. I would like to continue on this point. As to the FDA, I would want the Senator to know that there is no fault that rests with them. If there is any fault at all, it rests with the chairman of this subcommittee, because I decided upon the order in which they would appear.

Senator SCOTT. You did not write the story.

Senator NELSON. No, but I thought that perhaps you thought that the FDA volunteered to come in, as you put it, in the indecency to rush to the assault before the company was heard. I am only saying