

Strong, Cobb & Arner, I understand, sells to many companies and, from everything I have heard, has a fine reputation.

Dr. KRANTZ. That is right.

Senator NELSON. As to your item No. 2, what risk would there be to a pharmacist who announced, as Peoples & Gray's did, that we are going to stock a brand of generics by Strong, Cobb & Arner because we know that they are a distinguished company with good quality.

Dr. KRANTZ. None whatsoever.

Senator NELSON. Thank you.

Dr. KRANTZ. You say I qualify this by stating that unknown reputation.

3. There is no substitute for integrity and pharmaceutical expertise of the manufacturer. To be sure, the originator of the product would be the most likely source of a dependable, uniformly formulated and active product.

Notice I say, most likely. To assert that skilled pharmaceutical scientists employed by reliable manufacturers cannot formulate efficacious and uniformly dependable dosage forms of medicaments is equivalent to saying that pharmacy and biopharmaceutics do not exist.

As a member of the Committee on Revision of the U.S. Pharmacopeia, I have also advocated the use of trade names in the monographs. But there are those who stated if, for example, the title Capla-Wallace were used in an official compendium, the trade mark rights would be abrogated. I have recently read the law pertaining to these matters and am of the opinion that this was an unfounded judgment. The advantages of this suggestion are as follows:

1. One name for each drug enhances safety and ease in prescribing.

If we stop right after "safety," this justification is enough for doing this.

2. The manufacturer is always identified with the product.

3. The manufacturer stands to gain by such a process of simplification by having his name or insignia attached to the only name of the drug.

Senator NELSON. Well, I would certainly agree that from the evidence we have had over the past 2 years from other distinguished witnesses, that the question of simplifying the names in identification of the drugs is an important question.

I would certainly agree with you, based upon other witnesses, like you who have testified on this question, that it ought to be done. I do not know the best way to accomplish it, I am not certain in my own mind, but I think the present system is, as you say, very cumbersome and confusing.

Well, I thank you very much.

Mr. GORDON. Do you have that list of drugs you talked about before?

Dr. KRANTZ. It is the only list I have.

Senator NELSON. Doctor, what is the significance of—I have not had a chance to study it—the document you have submitted with the list of drugs?

Dr. KRANTZ. Well, the statement was made this morning that these generic-equivalent drugs are always, or generally, the therapeutic equivalent of the trade mark item. I simply stated that a colonel from the Army—I suppose it would be their purchasing agent——

Mr. GORDON. Do you know his name?