

have not gotten the message through to some members of the profession. I still do not know whether it is the same ones that were using it because they were happy with it 10 or 15 years ago.

My point is we have to step up the means of communication. My analogy with the polio effort is merely what can happen when every medium of communication is concentrated and where what they are selling has merit, where the problem we are facing is a serious one, and where those who are the potential victims as well as those who are their protectors share a common interest.

And this, I am satisfied, is what you are seeking. That is better medical care, better drugs, safer drugs. And in the instance of a drug that may have to be kept available for its very limited use, what you want to do is to see to it that all physicians get this message, that they are motivated by it, having received it, and that in the future, they prescribe this drug only when it is needed. We are in total accord.

Now, the question is what's the best way to do it? But do not say what we have done wrong 5, 10, 15 years ago. Many of the drugs that are in here were not available 5, 10, 15 years ago. We are not carrying an ad today that has not carried the tacit approval of the Food and

Senator NELSON. I might say that in the past 2 years, you have carried 10 for which a remedial "Dear Doctor" letter was written. We will look at those later—the FDA forced the company which misrepresented the drug in your publication, as well as in others, to write a letter to every doctor in the country.

Dr. ANNIS. But you just admitted, Senator, that there is a contract by regulation between the FDA and the company. You admitted, to, that the ad that was carried was a violation of that contract on the part of the company. And if we carried it, and I willingly admitted that we have human error occasionally on matters of this kind, too, where things get through occasionally that we would not want to have gotten through had we had all of the facts—but I think you will have to admit that if there is an understanding between the Food and Drug Administration and any producer, this, in effect, establishes through that company and their advertising agency the basic principles that they should not violate.

Senator NELSON. The question was raised, and as you will recall, it was raised around the question of whether advertising or promotion is effective. Something is effective.

Dr. ANNIS. I do not think anybody in America can deny the important role of advertising in any area.

Senator NELSON. My committee counsel advises me—this does not have a date on it; we will recheck it to see if it is correct—but this is a 1968 ad.

Dr. ANNIS. I would not be surprised, and I have already indicated—

Senator NELSON. This was carried in 1968.

My point again is what you said in your articles did not work. It seemed to me that there should have been a meeting, a public meeting in every State in the Union saying that this company's drug is being misused.

Dr. ANNIS. Senator, I just asked Dr. Hayes how long we have carried the contraindications on chloramphenicol, and he said since 1952. What you and I agree on is that some doctors either do not read it or having read it, they do not comprehend it, or having comprehended