

low. Now it may be as Senator Javits pointed out, there may be some reason for very modest advertising. When I say modest, I am talking about a 10th of what they are spending.

Senator HATFIELD. Are you talking now about the economics of it or are you talking about the destructive character of it?

Dr. CHERKASKY. I am talking about both aspects. First of all, I think it is an expenditure of money which ultimately is paid by taxes or the patient, which is an unnecessary burden. It also is damaging to the practice of medicine. It creates confusion.

I noted in my statement that a very well known physician in a very well known hospital who didn't get the effect that he expected from the drug then ordered another drug. What he didn't know is that he was ordering the same drug by another name. I understand that there are drugs in the thousands. Where you have drugs in the thousands, and you only need them in the hundreds, you are talking about huge expenditures, as well as confusion for the physician.

Senator HATFIELD. Will you address yourself to the economics of advertising, are you opening up a whole field here? Your argument could be applied in the field of advertising tobacco products. Your argument could be used in the advertising for time payment sales, for people who are not economically in a position to commit themselves so deeply, and yet time payment plans are attractively presented to them by advertising.

Dr. CHERKASKY. No, I don't think so.

Senator HATFIELD. Are you opening up the question of politicians being wrapped up in pretty ribbons and being presented and marketed in the public political arena? Are you opening up the whole question of advertising in its relation to American products, other than those in the drug field only?

Dr. CHERKASKY. I would suspect that those extensions could be arranged, but I think that the problem of advertising, mind you, advertising to 250,000 doctor people, because that is all we are talking about, and to some institutions, in a highly professional area is by no means the same as advertising other kinds of products.

Senator HATFIELD. No, usually the professional people have more education, perhaps a greater ability to differentiate between fact and fancy than maybe a lot of the general public has as far as being put upon by some shrewd advertising.

Dr. CHERKASKY. I wouldn't argue with you on that one, Senator.

Senator HATFIELD. I only point up the fact that I think we are talking about—

Dr. CHERKASKY. I am moving a little bit out of my area of competence, as you know.

Senator HATFIELD. I think we get into a whole question of advertising and the ratio of costs of advertising to the product field and to its general gross income and so forth. These factors, I think, are meaningful to us on this committee, but I don't think it would be restricted just to the drug industry. I wouldn't point to the drug industry here with an accusing finger without being willing to go to the whole field of advertising and its relation to the public.

Dr. CHERKASKY. Well, I would say to you, Senator, that I haven't thought about the areas you touched on very carefully. I think that probably something needs to be done.