

page of the journal. It kills more people each year than chloramphenicol in its whole history.

I think your point is that we, in reviewing the Federal Register, have not given this information the circulation it deserves. May I ask Dr. Hayes how we handle such routine things—I do not want to say this is routine—how we handle such matters when they appear in the Federal Register, whether it is chloramphenicol or any other drug. Although I am not aware of it myself, I know that they have a regular way of handling reports of this kind. It may be helpful in clarifying **the point that has been raised.**

Senator NELSON. I shall be glad to have him respond to that, but let me say, you raise the question of alcohol. Alcohol is not advertised in JAMA. The point is that chloramphenicol is.

Dr. ANNIS. Correct.

Senator NELSON. And it is a—

Dr. ANNIS. I am talking about putting on the front page of JAMA the dangers inherent in a drug.

Senator NELSON. This is actually what puzzled me about the whole thing. I cannot find in journals, in the medical newspapers, big headlines emphasizing what has happened here. That is why I think Dr. Goddard had to say, "I am at wits' end on how to handle this."

But it raises the question then, one, is the medical association being effective in informing the doctors; and, two, what question does that raise about heavy advertising in these journals when there is a big criticism to be made of a drug which is advertised there? That question has been raised by distinguished doctors in this country. Dr. Console raised it in his statement to the committee this week.

Mr. HARRISON. Senator, the Register statement indicated that this drug had some limited uses and that some labeling changes would be required. That was the extent of it. It did not contain the other information that you speak of, except that perhaps it contained some information that other documents were available upon request.

From that, to draw any implication with respect to influence, or undue influence by advertisers would appear to me, at the very least, to be unwarranted. Nor could the public accept such an assumption. Earlier I stated that the amount of Chloromycetin ads—and if you are going to be influenced, there has to be a substantial amount—represents something like 0.3 of 1 percent. That was the figure over a period of 5 years.

Now, when we start looking for conflicts of interest, Senator, I think we have to recognize that they have to be of some merit or of some substance.

So, first, I do not believe that the implication is warranted at all, because all the Federal Register contained was some changes in labeling and we would examine the ads to see if they complied with our own requirements for advertising; secondly, we are talking about an ad that appeared in the Journal over 5 years at such infrequent times that perhaps to infer that the public would draw an inference of conflict, even with all other things not being known, would be totally unwarranted.

Senator NELSON. I do not say there is necessarily any intention about it. I just say it is, I think, recognized as implicit in the case, that newspapers are very reluctant to run critical attacks on their biggest advertisers. Everybody knows that.