heard volumes of testimony. Introduction of the legislation has heightened the importance of your work and the conclusions you reach.

We urge you to be wary of over-simplified answers to very difficult questions, and of highly colored expressions of opinion, betraying extreme prejudice on occasion.

The miracle of modern medicine owes much to the pharmaceutical advances of the last 30 years. An amazing 75% of the 200 drugs most commonly prescribed today were unknown just a decade ago. The products of quality-conscious, research-oriented manufacturers have all but revolutionized the practice of medicine, relieving suffering, prolonging life and serving as a boon to patients everywhere in the treatment of their ills. Quite frankly, we are fearful of any developments that seem to threaten the future of this unrivaled pharmaceutical system by relegating quality and drug innovation for tomorrow to secondary consideration, by placing unwarranted and unscientific emphasis on cost, and by insisting all drugs must be the same, regardless of the manufacturer's standards or the conditions under which they are produced.

As physicians, we cannot stand idly by while the nation is urged to embark on what we are convinced would be an ill-conceived therapeutic misadventure. Our purpose here has been to offer our views on this subject, the administration of drugs, which has been a major factor in professional lives for a great many years.

Again, we urge you to support our serious judgment that the relative efficacy of drugs has no scientific basis, and that required generic or formulary prescribing would be detrimental to the public health and welfare.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. HOWARD, M.D., *President.*

APPENDIX II

CORRESPONDENCE FROM JOHN L. LACH, PROFESSOR OF PHARMACY, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, TO SENATOR NELSON, DATED JUNE 16, 1967, WITH ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT AND BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, July 16, 1967.

HON. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: You are no doubt aware that, subsequent to my correspondence with you requesting an opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee on Monopoly on June 7 and 8, I phoned your office on June 5 to determine whether it would be possible to accommodate me on either of those dates.

In your absence on the date of my call, I talked with Mr. Cherkasky of your staff who informed me that the schedule of hearings as presently planned would not permit an appearance prior to my departure for Switzerland on June 21. It is my understanding from conversation with Mr. Cherkasky that additional hearings will be held in the month of June and that hearings may be continued throughout the next seven or eight months.

I am disappointed that it will not be possible for me to appear before your Subcommittee at this time. As indicated in my letter, I deem it to be of great importance to the conduct of these hearings that experts in the scientific and technical aspects of the issues under consideration have an opportunity to present their views. It is my strong conviction that the hearings, to date, have placed undue emphasis on economic factors. There are other important considerations in the comparison between drug products which must be considered by your Committee in order to establish complete objectivity and fair balance in the testimony or statements presented. The fact that it was not possible for me to appear on the dates requested does not alter my interest or concern and it is for this reason that I am writing to you at this time.

The enclosed statement was prepared for the express purpose of documenting some of the scientific evidence which exist concerning comparative quality of drug products. It is a statement which I believe deserves very careful consideration by you and the members of the Subcommittee. Because of its importance, I respectfully request that the statement be made a part of the official records of the hearings and that appropriate reference be made to it during those portions of the hearings which may deal with the subject of generic or therapeutic equivalency. A personal presentation would, of course, be more informative for the