

a drug." Now, there is enough of this occurring already. In my own private practice of medicine years ago I had patients come in and say, "I need a shot of penicillin." And some of them flatly told me if I would not give it to them, there was another doctor down the road that would, and he did.

So I let him do it.

But the promotion of drugs to the public I find very distasteful and an unfortunate step forward. I am saying we are seeing signs of this occurring.

Now, it is quite proper that the public have early information, because they are keenly interested, on new developments in medicine. The press does an outstanding job on this. And it is indeed a fine balance between what represents promotion of the specific product, whether it is for a new treatment for arthritis, which involves so many millions of people, or this type of publication, which is an ad by, not a company, but by an organization made up of companies.

Senator NELSON. I suppose there is some kind of qualitative distinction between an institutional-type ad which promotes the industry as a corporate citizen in a public ad vis-a-vis an ad that picks a specific drug and promotes it in the public media. Is that correct?

Dr. GODDARD. Yes, sir; that would be true.

Senator NELSON. Now, this is a case here, in the Reader's Digest, where the PMA selects chloramphenicol, and on page M-3 they print a special section, as they did on a previous occasion, as you are aware.

Dr. GODDARD. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. And this ad does have "advertisement" printed on each page now. The line at the top is, "There was nothing anyone could do to stop them from dying until the American doctor came down from the sky with a new drug." Then it goes on to say the things you mentioned in your prepared remarks.

We have a copy of a letter here, signed by Mr. Stetler, from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, addressed to "Dear NARD Members"—National Association of Retail Druggists.

Dr. GODDARD. I know the association, Senator.

Senator NELSON. I knew you were familiar with it.

Dr. GODDARD. Yes, sir; I am familiar with that group.

Senator NELSON. But I thought some of the rest of the audience and the record may not be. But this reads—and I will submit it for the record—"Dear Member, as you may know, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association recently launched a major advertising program with the Reader's Digest." They mention that the response from the general public was indeed gratifying, "and over 1 million reprints of the ad were distributed to the public through various sources, among them the community pharmacy."

Then it goes on to suggest that the PMA has more copies available. They say:

A copy of the February insert is enclosed, along with a prepaid postcard requesting 50 copies of the reprint. Present inventory precludes us from offering more. However, if you would like more than 50 copies of the June reprint at no cost, please indicate and we will forward them in the latter part of May.

Quite obviously this is part of a program of reaching the public by giving 50 to a pharmacist, for distribution to whomever he pleases—and I suppose particularly the general public.

(The letter referred to follows:)