

and criticisms that PMA has, or any member of the PMA has, of the conduct of these hearings, and let the record speak for itself.

I am confident that the record will show that we have given every consideration to the industry that it is possible to give, and if there is some consideration I have omitted, I would be glad to hear about it.

I publicly invited every single member of the PMA to appear before the committee months ago. They are all free to come and make any statement that they may wish to make before this committee. Of the 136 PMA members, only two thus far have volunteered to come. Three others have come at invitation.

I would ask the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association what more this chairman can do, to give the members of the industry a chance to be heard so that their case can be fairly presented?

I now repeat my invitation to every single member company of your association to appear before this committee. If all 136 want to appear, we will hear them—if I am still here long enough to hear that many.

At the end of today's hearings, or next week, or any other time, I will accept from the president of the PMA a list of your members who want to testify. I will make arrangements for them to testify. And then, if you have any legitimate complaints against the conduct of these hearings, I think you should tell us today exactly what those complaints are, so that the committee may consider them. If not, then I think you should not make criticisms elsewhere around the country that you are not willing to make to the committee itself. I think that is fair.

So at some stage, I would like to hear the complaints you have about the hearings and if there is any way I can rectify them, I will, because I have not offered the medical profession, or the pharmacologists, or the pharmacists, or any other group, the right to send in every single member, as I have in the past to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, without any results thus far, except for the volunteering of two companies.

The amount of material that you have presented is quite massive. I am not sure what is the best way to handle it, or whether with the amount we have it will be possible to get through all of it today.

But there are a number of matters that I want to take up first. One of them is immediately current, and I would like some discussion of that sometime today. I refer to a PMA advertisement which appeared in the Reader's Digest this month. And I will read—in order to be more precise—my comments on that.

An advertisement by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association in the form of an eight-page pullout pamphlet has appeared in the November 1967 issue of the Reader's Digest. The format of the section is designed to look like part of the ordinary editorial content of the magazine. The only indication that this section is paid advertising is the words "Special Advertising Section" which appear in small print on only the first page of the eight-page section.

On the next page, the first of four articles which comprise the section begin without any further indication that these articles are, in fact, the advertising matter to which reference has been made. To further confuse the reader, ads clearly identifiable as product advertisements have