

Senator LONG. In other words, until you do this you never can have real, honest competition for business among these manufacturers?

Dr. ADRIANI. You are not going to "lick" this problem until you name all the drugs by their given names and get rid of the aliases. Drugs should be called just like every other commodity on the market, by its name. Why should the drug house have preference?

Senator LONG (presiding). I think you are 100 percent correct.

Is there any other point you would like to make? Mr. Gordon is going to ask a few additional questions. If there is some point that you want to highlight, I would suggest you do that. Otherwise, I am going to ask, if Senator Nelson doesn't object when he gets back, that your statement be printed in full exactly as you prepared it, at the end of today's proceedings.

Dr. ADRIANI. You will find, Senator, that those who are sincerely interested in this problem, those who teach, those who stock drugs, those who buy them, and so on, will be delighted to see a uniform nomenclature. You have a good group naming drugs (USAN). You have got a Government representative, a USP man, an NF man, and one from AMA. They can attack the problem of "jawbreaking names".

Mandatory generic naming will give the smaller firms, if they want to qualify, the chance to compete with the larger ones. The small business can compete.

The corner grocery is still here with us, because they give service and stay open until 10 or 11 o'clock at night and the others close.

This is the basic plea I am making. The advertising does not concern me at all; nor the fact that the AMA accepts advertising. They need money. They are not going out having a good time with that money, they are using it for a good purpose. If the advertising is curtailed and does not pay for AMA activities then another way must be found to subsidize them. It is a very important venture. And the AMA are the ones that should keep on doing what they started.

Senator LONG. You say in your concluding statement:

In advocating uniform nomenclature I am not castigating or opposing the pharmaceutical industry. One must remember that the pharmaceutical industry operates in a manner similar to any other industry and its primary goal is profits. It has, however, a greater responsibility to the public than any other industry.

And then you go on down here to say in your statement:

I am sure that you have information from your hearings which indicates that some pharmaceutical firms have been ruthless, have fixed prices, and have committed acts which have not been in the public's best interest.

Some time ago I was discussing that matter with a major drug manufacturer who, so far as I know, was one of the "white hat" boys. The firm, so far as I know, has never done anything ruthless or corrupt or against the public interest, although, of course, it likes to use brand names.

And he said that he thought in fairness his firm could never have been accused of being a pirate, or a corruptionist, as some people in the industry have been accused of being.

I said, "You may quote me when I make this statement. Let me just give you a few examples." And I proceeded to list him a few examples.