

Senator NELSON. Well, I have no doubt about that, but the facts are there that the medical profession—the AMA is the leading organization—

Dr. ANNIS. What would you suggest that we do, Senator?

Senator NELSON. Well, I would not run an ad, if I were in control, with a bronchoscope in it. I think it was an outright fraud. I think it was intended to be a fraud; it was intended to mislead. We received letters about people who died from it. Therefore, why should the AMA Journal be a part—

Dr. ANNIS. I have indicated that human fallibility is a part of our structure, too. We build in as many filters as we possibly can. In this particular ad, I would agree with you. This was a good Madison Avenue effort that slipped through the screen.

Senator NELSON. It has been slipping through for 15 years.

Dr. ANNIS. Oh, no. I do not think this ad has been slipping through.

Senator NELSON. I think so. As a matter of fact, if we go back—

Mr. HARRISON. Senator, perhaps I can add just a little bit to place this in somewhat its proper perspective.

Senator NELSON. I thought I had.

Mr. HARRISON. I just want to add something that I think will be of interest to the committee.

Looking through our records, I find that in the past 5 years, AMA journals have carried a total of about 84 pages of chloramphenicol ads. Since we publish 52 issues a year, or a total of 260 issues in 5 years, we have had a total of about 65,000 pages of paper. I would say that the total advertising with respect to this drug is something like less than three-tenths of 1 percent. At least here, it is indicated that we are not speaking of an advertising campaign. We have only some 85 pages over a total of 5 years, out of a total of 260 issues, and perhaps somewhere in the neighborhood of 65,000 pages.

Senator NELSON. I do not really think that answers much. If it is 85 pages in 5 years, you are talking about what, 18 pages of advertising a year—19?

Mr. HARRISON. This publication, you know, is weekly. That is 52 issues per year, with approximately 250 pages in each issue. So it is a relatively small number and I have computed it to be about 0.3 percent.

Senator NELSON. But do you think the percentage is relevant? It is 19 times a year that the ad for Chloromycetin has been in the magazine during the whole period. Experts all over this country have been tearing their hair out about the misuse of this drug and the promotion, the company has won the battle against the AMA and the medical profession consistently and continuously until they were prescribing 42 or 43 million grams in 1967. It took these hearings and wide exposure to drop that in 1968 down to I think 18 million grams. As I said before, this committee is not the expert on it. Where was the medical profession? The public is entitled to say, my heavens, the AMA carried ads and promotion of it but very, very little about how bad it was.

We cannot find very much in the last 2 or 3 years. There was very little material on our hearings. We found two or three little notes, but it would seem to me it would call for a front-page editorial, just saying, Doctors, are you off your rocker? It seems to me it would