information from the press completely and thereby run the risk that what is printed is completely misleading, as contrasted to using our best judgment as to what we should supply in the interest of a balanced presentation.

Mr. GROSSMAN. What are your general feelings about articles that reach beyond the doctor, such as this one; in other words articles directed at the general public?

Mr. GADSDEN. This is the type of article to which I am referring. So that we may be completely clear, when I say "science writers," I am referring to science writers for lay publications as contrasted to professional journals.

Mr. GROSSMAN. I agree with your point about the freedom of the press. I am just getting a general impression of what you think about this.

Mr. GADSDEN. Well, I guess I am fairly pragmatic on this subject. Regardless of whether we think it is appropriate or inappropriate, the fact remains that the public has become increasingly interested in anything to do with health. There have been any number of articles. I think that within the restraint under which we must place ourselves—one is that we must obviously comply with the food and drug regulations and other laws of the land—within our interpretation of that, we should attempt to see that what appears in print is as factual as possible.

Mr. GROSSMAN. One other question in a different area. There has been some testimony and some inference that there is no truly independent research being done, in the sense that there is an inherent conflict of interest, almost, in that you have firms to do your clinical research and report their objective findings. I wonder what comments you might have on idea that, for example, the Government might select that specific consultant for the company, the company would pay for it, and submit the findings to the FDA for approval?

Mr. GADSDEN. First, as temperately as possible, I would like to resent the implication that a company such as Merck either could or would attempt to doctor the results.

Mr. GROSSMAN. That is not my question.

Mr. GADSDEN. I realize that. I just want to get that on the record, if you will permit me, because we have been in business for a long time and we could not risk our reputation this way, even if we could "buy results."

Now, some of the previous witnesses before this committee have raised a question as to the integrity of the drug companies or the clinical investigators, who in the main are connected with academic institutions. Well, on their behalf and gratuitously, I resent it for them, too.

Also, one of your witnesses before this committee raised some rather serious doubts in his testimony about whether civil servants would assume the responsibility of making a decision if there were a gain-risk balance, and someone had to assume the responsibility.

Mr. GROSSMAN. I think this is the FDA's decision.

Mr. GADSDEN. I think what I am suggesting is that we are pretty soon in a never-never land. There may be a fourth party, but I cannot identify it at the moment. Questions have been raised as to whether the pharmaceutical companies can do it, or whether it can be ap-