

gress as far as content to protocol, relative to the criteria that we have set up, and those criteria are included in our format. This is an unbiased third-party situation, hoping the lack of bias comes from the broad base from which the PMA springs.

Mr. GORDON. So the PMA is really performing the review process?

Dr. KELLY. No; the PMA in concert with the Academy Scientific Assembly Committee is doing the review.

Mr. GORDON. Then you regard the PMA as an unbiased reviewer, is that it?

Dr. KELLY. Well, if you had a group representing multiple facets of any industry, and one had a chance to be one up, I think that the leveling of an all-over inclusive look would tend to make that oneupmanship a little bit less.

Senator NELSON. I am still puzzled as to how you could accept the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association as an objective reviewer of any scientific matter affecting drugs, since they are owned by, controlled by, paid for by, hired by, et cetera, by the pharmaceutical manufacturers.

I think it is obvious, don't you, from the beginning, that in any event nothing critical of the drug industry or any method, any advertising, any promotion that they do would ever appear in any educational format in which they participate, is that not correct?

Dr. KELLY. I would agree with that, except for one simple fact—the criteria being established are our criteria, and not the pharmaceutical manufacturers criteria. The academy sets the protocol. They have been asked to observe and comment on that protocol; but the protocol is ours and not the PMA's.

Senator NELSON. Well, I do not know what the protocol is.

Dr. KELLY. The protocol for review, sir, is in part of the exhibits that we have attached.

Senator NELSON. I see.

All I know is that the AMA had a protocol for advertising in their journals. It read very well and was very specific—we had hearings on it—except they violated it continuously and finally decided to throw out the protocol so that they could continue to accept advertising which, if they had adhered to their protocol of standards, they should have totally rejected.

Dr. KELLY. That may be true, sir. But we are not discussing advertising at this point in time. We are discussing the relevance of scientific exhibits, which are specifically based on the Academy's protocol, prohibited in advertising. This is one of the reasons for the PMA's involvement.

Senator NELSON. All right.

Go ahead.

Dr. KELLY. The fifth point that you asked us to address is the convention and the dependency on drug support. I would like to have Les give us some basic numbers on that.

Dr. HUFFMAN. Actually, of the nine elements of the annual meeting, which I outlined to you previously, it is interesting that only three of these elements have funding in part or supported in part by educational grants from pharmaceutical firms. The remaining elements are dependent upon registration fees which are charged for the seminars; registration fees are charged for the continuing