

was a change of 45 percent. In fact, the techniques you suggest were in changing the mood of the legislature and induced it to defeat any changes in the ant substitution law.

This gives you an example of how that kind of technique can be used, not only to do things for the public but also—to do what I would regard and I think what you would regard as contrary to the public interest.

Dr. SIMMONS. Well, Mr. Gordon, the techniques we are talking about here obviously have potential benefits and potential harm to them.

My plea would be that clearly there has to be a balance. Everybody has a right to get their message across in this country as best they can. I personally would fight very hard to preserve that.

My concern is that in answer to the question possibly one view is getting across more than another, some people have suggested that we ban the individual's ability to give his view. And one case in a hearing just here 2 weeks ago, I guess, before this committee suggested that part of the answer may be to limit the educational material flowing to physicians or to place some controls on that.

Now, my plea is that is one approach. You know, the answer may well not be that is the best one. It may be to enable others to make their message heard also. And in that debate that ensues, perhaps the public's interest will really be better served. In other words, I do not believe that the answer may simply be to band anybody's ability to tell anybody about what he does, whether it is a major corporation, the drug industry, or Government as far as that is concerned. And if we could get some balance into that, the balance could be brought by raising the ability of those who have information and technology—NIH, FDC, CDC—to be heard equally well. And I do become a little concerned that the answer may be merely to inhibit the ability of one side to give its message. I am not sure that is the best answer.

Mr. GORDON. All right.

Now let us take this specific case. The forces to retain the ant substitution laws had a lot of money. This is a very expensive campaign. Those who wanted to change, to remove, the ant substitution laws had very little money. The public is unorganized. How can a public, which is unorganized, compete against well-organized, well-heeled private interest groups using these techniques?

Dr. SIMMONS. Well, that is always going to be a potential problem. That is what Government is here for, to bring some balance into the arena in the public interest. Further in my statement I make this plea.

Mr. GORDON. Do you think the Government could have interfered in this local matter of ant substitution laws?

Dr. SIMMONS. Well, I am not sure that that is a governmental problem. But that was the right of a particular person to espouse his views. And I do not think that anybody is recommending that we eliminate that right.

Mr. GORDON. It is certainly one sided.

Dr. SIMMONS. In that instance, it was. And the answer is not necessarily to eliminate that individual's ability to say that but to enable someone else with an opposing view to add his to the debate. And that really is, I believe, another possible solution to this.