

not—the inception of this kind of an approach with this magazine. This magazine goes to something like 17 million people, and I do not know how many others, whose hands it comes into. But we did not want them writing to the PMA for copies of reprints, not for any deceptive reason, but just because it would be very tough to handle our mail if it came that way. I understand it is not unusual in getting a post office box to use some other word than the name of the corporation or a long name. Once again, I do not think anybody was deceived by that. And certainly nobody that has written in for a reprint has indicated a problem with it.

But if that creates a problem——

Senator NELSON. Do you really mean if an ordinary reader looked at this, and it says "Write to Health," he wouldn't have the impression he is writing to some independent health publication?

Mr. STETLER. I don't know what his impression might be. All I know he is writing for a reprint. When he gets it he will know what this is and what it says. It is clearly indicated.

Senator NELSON. On page 24 it says, "If your copy has been removed," and if it has been removed, there is nothing to tell them anything about an advertisement.

Mr. STETLER. As you would label this as propaganda—there is no propaganda on this page, either. He has to write for the reprint. When he gets the reprint it is clearly identified.

Senator NELSON. No. When he gets the reprint, very carefully the words "Special Advertising Section" have been removed. Why is that done?

Mr. STETLER. It is indicated where it was in the journal—on the back—that it is part of a series from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

Senator NELSON. You are saying here that if your copy has been removed write to "Health." On this opening page the words "Special Advertising Section" appear. Then on the reprint that you send them "Special Advertising Section" has been removed, so that you receive a reprint that says "Why have many dread diseases vanished, what is the drug name, what are the drugs that reach troubled minds, where are prescription prices going?" And it says "Medicines and Your Family's Health," reprinted from the November 1967 issue of the Reader's Digest.

Now, Mr. Stetler, you know that every single person in the United States, with the rarest of exceptions, is going to say "Well, this is a very interesting little objective health article." I am not talking about the quality of it. You may defend that or not. But the point is that the reader, the doctor, the pharmacist, the patient, is going to look at that and say "This is a very nice little article about drugs." And he is going to be misled. I think that is clear as a bell.

Mr. STETLER. Well, I hope that is not so. It was not intended. I have had nothing to indicate that that has happened. I think it would have been really in many ways—I suppose it would be difficult for us to tell our story where somebody would not feel that we were trying to be deceptive. But this was a very honest, sincere effort for the first time to get a message across to the public, and we have not communicated with the public before. I am sure somebody would find fault with it, no matter how we prepared it.