

I received replies from 119 or 91.5 percent, which is a very good record, I am sure you will agree. Not one had been asked by such a manufacturer to test a new psychopharmaceutical or had received support from such a manufacturer for their research in psychopharmacology. The reason for this is simply that these manufacturers have not developed any effective major or minor tranquilizers or antidepressants. By contrast, every effective psychopharmaceutical which a physician can prescribe for our citizens has been developed and made available by the well known and research based drug houses. It is this truth which compels me to forthrightly acknowledge the debt of every American to these manufacturers for they are helping immeasurably in the conquest of mental illness. This indisputable fact merits your recognition and serious consideration.

Senator NELSON. I do not understand that last sentence.

Dr. AYD. This indisputable fact?

Senator NELSON. Yes.

Dr. AYD. Well, the sentence makes sense, sir, if you read what precedes it. What I am trying to say, in essence, is that the only drugs that we have ever had made available to us to treat the psychiatrically ill have come from the research oriented pharmaceutical firms, and no other source. They have not come from the Government, they have not come from the university centers, they have come only from the research oriented manufacturers.

We have a debt to these people. They provided the psychiatrists with the tools, not only psychiatrists, every physician in America, with the tools to take care of the emotionally and mentally ill in a way heretofore impossible. They have done this. Nobody else. And I think this fact is not only indisputable but I think it merits recognition and consideration in evaluating their contribution.

Senator NELSON. Well, I might say that no one on this committee, nor anyone who has testified, has been at all reluctant to pay appropriate tribute to the drug industry for its contribution. I do not think we have had a single witness who addressed himself to the question who was not prepared to pay the appropriate tribute. The implication is that somehow or other we have not given recognition.

It is not the purpose of these hearings to fill volumes with the laudatory things that the drug industry has done. The purpose is to explore some very serious problems which exist in the industry. And incidentally, many companies privately concede that problems do exist and some of them even acknowledge this publicly. That is our purpose here. Any time they want to come in and tell us about the great things they have done, they may do so. If there were no problems in the industry, if it were a perfect industry, if it were making no mistakes and the public had no interest in evaluating some of the things the industry was doing, we would not be having any hearings.

We are exploring the problems of the industry. We are glad to have you be laudatory of them. I am glad to be laudatory myself. But at the same time, there are serious problems which have got to be called to the public's attention and we are doing that. The pharmaceutical industry is doing things that it should not be doing and that is the purpose of the hearings.

So, I just point that out to you. There is hardly any criticism of the industry in this country. Everybody thinks of miracle drugs, and so forth and so on. We are pointing out some of the problems in it.