

95 percent of the time. Now, the best estimates are that this involves 4 million people who were receiving that drug in 1967, but anywhere from 90 to 95 percent were for nonindicated cases. Does it not indicate obviously that the precautions of the profession itself and all the experts have just not prevailed, and is that not an indictment on three counts—the doctors who are prescribing it, continuing to prescribe it, and the company who will continue to promote it, and the journals that accept the ads despite the fact that they know it is being widely misprescribed.

Dr. ANNIS. May I remind the Senator that today, under the rule of the law, the content of the ads has to meet the many and rather stringent requirements of the Food and Drug Administration. But here is a drug, as you indicated, that was taken off the market and a drug returned to the market. The content of what they say in their ads is relatively controlled by the Food and Drug Administration. So what you are suggesting is that we had better take a look at some of the regulations and controls there.

But again, I see no evidence—I will not argue, I can't, one way or the other—that the ads in today's journal are increasing the numbers of new prescribers of this drug.

Now, we do not take ads, for example, of the most dangerous drug in the United States, the drug that contributes toward more deaths than chloramphenicol and all the rest of them put together. And I cite alcohol.

Now, here again, we educate all of our public against the dangers of alcoholism and driving while under the influence. Yet the records of the National Safety Council indicates that it is involved in 50 or 60 percent or more of the accidents: 52,000 Americans last year were killed in automobile accidents. A million nine hundred thousand were injured sufficiently to require doctors.

Now, a drug was involved, the most dangerous drug we have. Education of the masses of the people has been inadequate and we have to step up our efforts.

Senator NELSON. It is not a prescription drug.

Dr. ANNIS. In the field of medicine, we have another drug, extremely dangerous, nowhere near as dangerous in its effect on the numbers of people, nor even in its lethal effect, but one, nevertheless, that poses a very serious and continuing problem. I would again reassure you of our desire to use every reasonable means to get the message to more physicians. Admittedly, this is an area where the message has not gotten through to everybody. What I question is an indictment on the basis of an ad or a particular drug company's ad about a certain drug when the content basically is controlled by the Food and Drug Administration. What I question is the effectiveness of this or any other ad to be the prime reason for a physician practicing medicine. This is what's not in accord. They have never persuaded me to prescribe it. But perhaps I have not had the indications of others.

My only point is that an ad alone is inadequate. I would like to know if the physicians who are prescribing it today are the same ones who were prescribing it 10 or 15 years ago, or with the rare exceptions Dr. Hayes has indicated by virtue of sensitivity tests. This is merely raising a question, Senator.