

result of the editorial comments we made critical of them or the industry, they have canceled out.

Senator NELSON. When was this?

Mr. CAHAL. Well, they were at different times, different occasions.

Senator NELSON. For how long did they cancel them?

Mr. CAHAL. I think Wallace is still canceled.

Senator NELSON. When did they cancel?

Mr. CAHAL. I think about 2 years ago.

Senator NELSON. Do you have file copies of the editorial comments that caused them to cancel?

Mr. CAHAL. I shall be glad to send them to you, sir.¹

I remember one editorial of ours which offended some of our friends in the industry. It was one in which we stated that we were suspect of any pharmaceutical company which manifested an interest in a scientific article we were preparing to publish in our journal, that we were sacrosanct in our scientific and editorial material and we did not want any pharmaceutical company to have any interest in it, and if they manifested one, it would put us on guard that they had an interest.

Senator NELSON. Did some company cancel based on that, do you know?

Mr. CAHAL. I suspect they did. I do not know that they told us, frankly, that they were canceling because of that editorial attitude of ours, but I know that it resulted in critical and complaining comment in the industry.

Senator NELSON. How many times has any drug industry, any manufacturer canceled, based upon critical material in the publication?

Mr. CAHAL. Well, Mr. Chairman, we were not always certain of the reason for the cancellation of advertising, or a failure to buy advertising. But from our intimacy in the field we have reason to believe that sometimes our editorial posture has resulted in a loss of advertising sales in our journals.

Senator NELSON. But do you have any specific case that you know of where the industry did cancel because of a specific adverse editorial comment in either of your publications?

Mr. CAHAL. Yes, sir. I refer to Wallace Laboratories, which advised us that they were canceling because of an editorial.

Senator NELSON. Pfizer and Wallace?

Mr. CAHAL. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. Are those the only two specific cases?

Mr. CAHAL. That I can recall at this moment, sir.

Senator NELSON. And they were how recent?

Mr. CAHAL. Wallace was 2 years ago, at least 2, maybe 3.

Mr. KEMP. Closer to 3, I think, on Wallace. I do not remember when Pfizer did.

Mr. CAHAL. The two had no relation to each other, they were two different episodes.

Senator NELSON. The point that this whole issue continues to raise, it seems to me, and I am saying this not just as to your publications, but with regard to all journals and all medical news publications, some of which are 100 percent supported by advertising from phar-

¹ See pp. 4779-4781, *infra*.