also contribute to the best standards of medical care. To the extent that they impose an extra financial burden on the companies, they enter into questions regarding drug prices. Are these services helpful and worthwhile? Do they achieve results commensurate with their costs? I would certainly say a loud "Yes" to both questions.

The information which we are provided about new drugs—and the periodic updating of information about established products—is an invaluable aid to physicians. Without the journals, the mailings and the personal visits from manufacturers' representatives, I would be hard-pressed to keep abreast of today's rapid medical advances and still work 12 to 18 hours a day at my practice. Invention of a drug is pointless if the medical profession doesn't have knowledge of it—its indications, contraindications, dosage forms, etc.

I have noted a tendency in some of the earlier testimony to deride doctors because they deal with detailmen. I don't understand this. While I cannot speak for other physicians, I know for myself I have found detailmen helpful and informative. They bring me information on new developments. They can answer preliminary questions. They often serve for the exchange of information with other doctors. If I have a problem relating to one of their products, they can, and frequently do, contact their home offices to get me an answer.

I realize they are trying to sell me. That's their job. I don't have to be sold if I don't want to be. My feeling about them is the same as about the products of their firms. I trust them on the basis of my past experience with them and my belief in their integrity.

It is pure hogwash, of course, to suggest that any physician worthy of the name would depend on detailmen and advertising pages of professional journals for his continuing medical education. It is true the ads and the company representatives often provide the first information on a new product. If I am interested, I would turn to the package insert and the literature. Then I would check it out with my colleagues in my county and state societies and, perhaps, consult the hospital pharmacist. Finally, if the product seems to have possibilities for my practice and I am satisfied after these inquiries, I might give it a try under close observation.

This is the point where the services of the reputable companies really shine. I know that whatever the dosage form in which I want to use the drug, the company will make it available in my community in its full line. I don't have to prescribe a tablet when I want to prescribe a tablet when I want to prescribe an injection because the manufacturer hasn't found it profitable to produce or widely distribute less popular forms.

Further, if questions arise about the action of the drug, I can report promptly to the manufacturer because I know who the manufacturer is. If it is necessary, I know I will obtain the assistance of the company's medical staff in identifying and evaluating the problem, and applying the proper corrective measures. This is not only true for new drugs but holds equally well for older, established products. When I have identified the manufacturer in my prescription, I know precisely where to go if difficulty arises. This would not be true in cases of generic prescriptions filled by the pharmacist from whatever stocks he has on hand.

He might or might not be able to determine where the medicine came from. If he could identify the source, the company might or might not have a medical staff capable of advising me. If it were a small company engaged in copying successful drugs, the chances are it would have a limited staff and would not be able to support the scientific personnel to provide service.

Beyond this, it must be assumed that the originating company, whose laboratories discovered the drug, is going to be far better acquainted with its good and bad points than the secondary manufacturer who produces the imitation after the originator has already demonstrated its worth and successfully made the medical profession aware of its existence. The manufacturer who has developed a drug must keep an accurate and up-to-date record of adverse reactions and other data pertaining to its effectiveness. I know I can get the swiftest and most accurate information from him about his product when I need it. This is not true of the imitator in many cases. Moreover, the originator has every incentive to make sure his product serves the public in the best possible way to preserve his reputation among physicians and protect his name in the market place.

In closing, I should like to point out that throughout my professional life I have been concerned with the economic factors affecting the quality of medical