

up of editorial comments that occurred in the GP, or American Family Physician. I am puzzled by the purpose of it. It says, "News and Views of Interest to the Pharmaceutical Industry."

Why would you be interested in publishing a brochure that recites a group of editorials, all of which, as I read them one way or another, defend the pharmaceutical industry position? What is the purpose of the brochure?

Mr. CAHAL. Dr. Shapiro has asked that I comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

This brochure was published for the very reason you stated, sir, that we thought it would be of interest to the pharmaceutical industry, the things we had to say about this matter. By the same token, the pharmaceutical industry sends to our office many of its publications. The pharmaceutical companies regularly send us their annual reports, because the pharmaceutical industry and the medical profession and the nursing profession and the hospital profession are all engaged on the same team, and I think have a natural and healthy interest in each other.

Senator NELSON. Did the PMA distribute this?

Mr. CAHAL. No, they did not distribute the original.

Senator NELSON. Did they reprint it and distribute it?

Mr. CAHAL. I would not know. I doubt it without our permission.

Senator NELSON. What was the circulation of it? It is printed, and it is the views of the pharmaceutical industry—how many did you print?

Mr. CAHAL. I cannot answer that at this moment, Mr. Chairman. A few hundred, I presume.

Senator NELSON. And it was sent to the pharmaceutical manufacturers?

Mr. CAHAL. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. You don't know whether the PMA circulated it themselves or reprinted it and circulated it?

Mr. CAHAL. Of my own knowledge I do not, sir.

Senator NELSON. Does anybody?

Mr. KEMP. I do not believe that they did, sir, I do not know that they did.

Senator NELSON. I am still puzzled by the purpose. The editorials appeared in GP and the American Family Physician. They all defend, directly and frankly, right down the line, the manufacturer's position on every issue that is discussed. And looking at it as an outsider, if I were in business, I would say that it is a direct and blatant appeal to the industry for more advertising. What other purpose does it have?

Mr. CAHAL. Mr. Chairman, it has been some time since this was published, and I do not remember all the editorials that were in it. I would like to repeat what Dr. Shapiro said in his direct testimony, that our journals, GP and American Family Physician, have from time to time published articles and editorials quite critical of the industry and of individuals in the industry. And I would like to report to you, sir, and for the record, that some of these editorials have resulted in a cancellation of heavy advertising schedules.

Senator NELSON. Who has canceled because of some editorials?

Mr. CAHAL. One that I specifically recall is Wallace Laboratories. Another, I think, was Pfizer—for editorial comments we made, as a