

do in identifying a program subject at normally the meeting, say, held at our offices, they will then say Dr. Jones is very good in this field, and if you cannot get Jones get Smith. And then our staff will be in touch with, let us say, the recommended physicians. If it turned out that neither of them was available to appear in the program, they might look for an alternative. If they found an alternative physician, they would then go back informally to the Medical Advisory Committee, in this case, by telephone, and say we have found Dr. Brown, Jones and Smith being unavailable. What do you think of him? And if the committee says, oh, he is a splendid man, so we would proceed with him.

Mr. GORDON. I see. The committee merely gives suggestions and recommendations, but your staff makes the final decision as to what programs will be shown, who participates, and so on. Is that correct?

Mr. RAEBEN. I do not think I would say it that way, particularly as the subjects, first of all, are pretty much determined by the advisory committee. They pick the subjects, not we. The only area in which we exert discretion—I guess there are two—if the physicians that they recommend are unavailable or if they are unavailable to appear on the day scheduled, then we have to find a physician, and, by phone or correspondence say here is someone who has been identified to us as a good presenter. What do you think? And if the committee then endorses him, we proceed with him.

Mr. GORDON. Do you or your staff exercise any editorial review?

Mr. RAEBEN. Only in respect to, you might say, the television verities. There are some subjects, which do not seem to do well on television, for which print, I would say, is a far better medium to present certain conceptual subjects which are hard to justify television for. Television is best for procedures or behavioral matters. In that sense then we might vote against doing a program, or maybe having developed a program, not go ahead and release it because it would just turn out to be boring.

Mr. GORDON. Well, let me ask a specific question.

Suppose that you had a program—or perhaps you would avoid it completely—which denigrates the product of a particular advertiser. Would you run it? And have you ever run such a program?

Mr. RAEBEN. Well, over the years there are denigrating statements in our programs about the products of many, many pharmaceutical companies, including those of Roche Laboratories, which has been the sponsor of NCME. I do not believe there has been, let us say, one program whose title would be, oh, I do not know, "What is Wrong With the Drug Industry," something of that sort. But there are many unfavorable comments made about the products of our own sponsors as well as others.

Mr. GORDON. Do you have any specific examples?

Mr. RAEBEN. Well, I did not bring any. I would be very pleased to assemble I think probably a very, very long list of such for you subsequent to today.

Mr. GORDON. Did you ever have any programs on diabetes, for example?

Mr. RAEBEN. Oh, we have had a number of programs on diabetes.

Mr. GORDON. Did you ever have a review of the UGDP study; that is, what it found, and any of the confirmatory studies which