

Clearly, an attempt has been made here to use the wide circulation of the Reader's Digest to convince a large segment of the public that an advertisement written on behalf of the drug industry and paid for by its trade organization is an ordinary unbiased magazine article. The implication, of course, is that the PMA is supporting an objective discussion of health problems as a matter of public service, rather than an advertisement calculated to serve the interests of its member firms.

I am sure that the PMA was aware of the implications of the ad when they inserted it. I think that as a matter of public interest this ad ought to be discussed here at some stage, because I am of the opinion that a vast majority of the public would not recognize the insert in the Reader's Digest and certainly not the reprint as in fact an advertisement. And whereas PMA is entitled to advertise. I think the public is entitled to know whether an article is an independent objective research article written by an independent individual or whether it is an advertisement sponsored by a trade association.

That is why I have brought this out today.

I do not by any means want to preempt all your time—but I shall preempt some of it.

One other matter I want to raise, which I shall not raise immediately, is the question of your obvious strong feeling that there has been a distinct bias against the industry in the witnesses who have appeared here. I would like to take up that question, but I will defer that to a later moment.

How long is the summary that you have there, Mr. Stetler?

Mr. STETLER. My summary will take between 15 and 20 minutes.

Senator NELSON. Well, I have not in the past permitted witnesses to summarize for the very simple reason that I have questions to ask about the full statement as I go along. What happens is that if a summary is given and the statement is merely printed in full, I have to go back to the statement and go through it to ask questions which occurred to me in my reading of the material.

Now, I am willing to try that, if you prefer. I am not sure it will shorten the time. A couple of weeks ago one of the witnesses wanted to summarize, and I declined because what happens is that we print your summary, then we print the whole testimony. Then after it is all printed we start asking questions about the full text, which appears somewhere else in the record. So the reader has to jump back and forth from the questions to the testimony itself, whereas the only way it is really understandable is if as your presented statement appears in the record, the questions are raised and answered at the appropriate place.

Don't you suppose that you could start reading, and at various places where you elaborate, just suggest that you would like to summarize in a sentence or two, and if I do not have any questions, we can skip a page here and there.

Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. STETLER. Senator, I will be delighted to do it any way you want it done. I can do it either way.

Senator NELSON. Let us try it that way. I think it will make a better record.