

be policed. Millions of dollars are spent on this sort of endeavor that the public throws away.

Senator NELSON. Do you know whether the law presently permits any agency of the Federal Government to require proof of efficacy for any over-the-counter drug?

Dr. ADRIANI. No, not that I know of. The only ones that are released on that are the ones that are considered to be harmless, but one is never sure about them.

For instance (referring to APC tablets) it says on here not to take more than six a day, and for not more than 10 days, because they recently found that they may produce damage to the kidney—they are not sure. So they are required to put that label on the package. The FDA requires that. But the FDA cannot stop them from putting this ad in McCall's. This is an over-the-counter drug. If they put that in the AMA Journal they could call up and say, "Hey, that ad does not meet the specification."

The FDA, incidentally, does a commendable job. The trouble is, that you fellows do not appropriate enough money for it, and they cannot get enough help. This is what they need.

Senator LONG. Doctor, it would be easy to raise the moneys for it. We are having real difficulty in raising enough money to provide for the proper inspection of drugs.

I am the chairman of a committee that handles the tax laws—we ought to put a tax on the drugs to cover the cost of inspecting them, to make sure that they are what they are supposed to be. We might make the companies pay for their own inspection.

Now, that brings up another point that concerns me. The big companies claim that they have much better quality control than the small ones, but they complain that FDA loads them down with as much needless inspection, and needless paperwork, as with their small competitors who don't have anything like the quality control that they have—they claim that, I don't know whether it is correct or not. And they will take you to their air-conditioned plant where they filter the air before it comes in, and things of that sort and try to make a great impression on you with the tremendous efforts they expend and the steps they take to assure quality control and they say we have competitors who are not doing these things.

Frankly, I haven't seen the competitors they constantly allude to. I would like to see some in order to ascertain the truth. But many of the large companies make strong assertions. The first thing you know they will start saying here is a guy that's manufacturing drugs in his garage—or worse. They will make as strong a statement as you will let them get away with as to where the fellow might have manufactured the drugs. What would be your reaction to the assertion these major companies (which have very fine plants, air conditioned with filtered air), that drugs sold at the Safeway might have been produced in somebody's garage? How would I know that it had not been produced in a garage, and what would the difference be?

Dr. ADRIANI. You do not. You will have to apply the same law to everyone, and license everyone that makes a drug. If you have a slaughterhouse it has to meet certain requirements. The meat has to be inspected and graded in a certain standard way, whether you are