Dr. CROUT. At this point I want to turn to the subject of industry-sponsored seminars. The drug industry sponsors numerous medical symposia and seminars. These have been discussed in *Pills, Profits, and Politics*, by Silverman and Lee, as follows:

> One customarily practiced device is the drug industry sponsored conference or symposium devoted either to a particular new drug product or to a clinical problem in which the product may seem to have value. The nominal host may be a medical group, a medical school, or a medical or scientific academy. The speakers may include various Americans, although European participants supposedly provide desirable glamor. It is generally considered useful to include a hundred or more physicians in the audience of newspaper, magazine and trade journal writers. The indoctrination of the doctor in the audience is viewed as helpful, but more importance is placed on the accounts filed by the press representatives present and on the formal published proceedings of the conference, which may be used for months as "scientific" background.

Since the publication of the Silverman and Lee book, the live audience has been extended by the use of closed-circuit television. In January 1976, Pfizer Laboratories, division of Pfizer, Inc., sponsored such a closed-circuit nationally televised seminar on the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes mellitus. The program seminar provided a learned discussion of this disease but attempted to steer clear of the findings of the university group, diabetes program and the resulting adverse publicity surrounding oral hypoglycemic drugs, including Pfizer's Diabinese.

Without debating in this testimony the merits of the UGDP study, it is difficult to imagine how a modern discussion of diabetes treatment fail to emphasize its findings. I am aware of at least one roundtable discussion in a controlled circulation journal, Patient Care, which discussed the implications of the study in a balanced way, ultimately taking a middle-of-the-road position which suggested that many physicians who treat diabetes felt the oral hypoglycemic drug should be used more sparingly. This certainly seems a minimum position. The Pfizer symposium, however, largely avoided the whole issue.

Another example is a symposium sponsored by Wyeth Laboratories which was devoted entirely to its product Serax—oxazepam—a benzodiazepine tranquilizer similar to Librium and Valium. The proceedings of this conference were published as a supplement to the May 1975 issue of *Diseases of the Nervous System*. The special issue did not reveal the symposium's sponsorship, but contains articles which suggest special advantages that the Wyeth product may have over the other benzodiazepine tranquilizers.

I want to emphasize again that medical investigators must be free to write whatever they wish about drugs and to speculate about advantages one drug may have over another. In this case, however, the investigators were selected by the manufacturer to participate in an industry-sponsored meeting, the proceedings of the meeting were published without reference to such sponsorship, and the papers all turn out to be favorable to Serax.

Even if the investigators, who are well-known physicians in their field and investigators of known integrity, are accurate in everything they say, the process through which this supplement to a medical publication was produced is cause for concern.

The fastest growing areas in continuing medical education today are audiovisual materials and multimedia learning systems.