

made on tolbutamide. They are the only manufacturers, and they took the standards of USP which were, in fact, the standards of the company, because it was the only product in the market. And they set up a comparison making some variances in the production of the drug product, yet staying within the USP standards which, as I say, were the standards of the company, and those were the only standards there were. They came out with a result which showed that the two drug products were not equivalent. And the Journal of the American Medical Association on November 18, 1968, ran an article entitled "The Generic Inequivalence of Drugs."

Did your publication treat with that at that time?

Dr. ROSENOW. I don't know without looking. You mean on this same subject?

Senator NELSON. In other words, did your journal report this finding which was reported in the American Medical Association?

Dr. ROSENOW. It would be unlikely, Senator. If the article was published in another journal, they would not submit it to us as well. It is seldom that an original article is submitted—it may be submitted to several journals, but the editors do not particularly like to publish it. They have a little pride of ownership, as they call it. So I do not think there would be any likelihood that it would be published in two places. The one thing that might happen in our journal is—and I do not know whether it did in this instance—is that someone else might refer to this article in, say, Clinical Notes, or something like that. But it would not be an original article.

Senator NELSON. And you do not know whether your publication commented on that editorially or otherwise?

Dr. ROSENOW. No; I do not.

Dr. POLLARD. I am not familiar with it if they did.

Senator NELSON. That occurred November 18 in JAMA. Would you mind just checking since November to see what coverage your publication gave to it, if any?

Dr. ROSENOW. Yes; I would be glad to.¹

Senator NELSON. I want to thank you very much for your testimony. I just make this point. You have been raising the point here, and others who testified have expressed the view that the relationship between the pharmaceutical manufacturers and the medical profession is not an unhealthy one. I think there is some question to be raised about that. But we notice in the testimony we have had that you have pharmaceutical manufacturers starting out at the medical school level and supplying various things to the students, stethoscopes, medical bags, research grants, and so forth; most of the journals receive substantial support in advertising from the pharmaceutical manufacturers; they provide income from exhibits at conventions; that they, in fact, in some instances—in one instance that we know of, paid part of the cost across the board in sponsoring of conferences, the medical conference itself, that there are free samples directly to doctors; that detail men see the physicians regularly, and \$4,000 to \$5,000 per year is spent in advertising per physician in the country; that the medical press, as contrasted with the journals, many of them are 100 percent supported by advertising by the pharmaceutical manufacturers; that you almost never see a critical editorial of the pharmaceutical manufacturers themselves.

¹ See p. 4734, *infra*.