

sistently violating the standards it has established for itself and is contrary to the editorial that they ran in their own publication in 1957 and contrary to the position of the Drug Council of the AMA. I raise this not for any comments by you, Doctor, but because I have raised the issue of the propriety of professional journals permitting the advertising and promotion of drugs that promote bad medical practice, and here is a case where the AMA is clearly violating its own standards as well as running contrary to the judgment of—in running the ad, to the judgment of all the scientific expertise in this country on fixed combinations.

Go ahead, Doctor.

Dr. KIRBY. This spread, which has appeared on several issues of this weekly journal during the past 4 months, is sent to almost all practicing physicians in the United States.

It is well known that the American Medical Association has an advertising department, presumably with high standards, and it can reasonably be assumed that a display of the name Panalba in such a prominent fashion is not only a reminder but is in a sense an endorsement of the product. In comparison with the occasional negative statements made by antibiotic experts, the positive message of this advertisement is brought repeatedly to the attention of the practicing physician, and with the additional incentive of an implied endorsement it is not surprising that the product is widely used. Doctors do not like to admit that they are influenced by advertising but it seems to me that the facts speak for themselves. Whenever doctors tell me that they depend on the experts, I remind them of the fixed combinations such as Panalba. Here is a product that is opposed by all the experts in the field, but it still is used widely in clinical therapy. This message is apparently very clear to the pharmaceutical houses, who spend several hundred million dollars a year in advertising their products to the medical profession. These expenditures would not be likely to continue if they did not bear results.

It should not be inferred from these remarks that I am an opponent of the drug industry. For 25 years my chief research interest has been the evaluation of new antibiotics, and this has meant close collaboration with a number of the leading firms. Their development and refinement of the many antibiotics now available has been a milestone in the relief of human suffering.

In my opinion the drug amendments of 1962 have added a valuable new dimension to the evaluation and approval of antibiotics and other drugs. Their implementation in regard to fixed combinations of antibiotics has not yet materialized, but hopefully the evaluations of the drug efficacy review panels, together with the recent directives of the FDA proposing to remove them from the market, will correct this situation.

Senator NELSON. Just for the record, Doctor, we want to put in, just on the question of prices, that the fixed combination Panalba sells to the pharmacist for \$30.42 a 100, whereas the highest brand name price of tetracycline is \$11.22 a 100, whereas generic tetracycline from reputable houses sells from \$3 to \$4.50. Panalba costs from six to 10 times the cost of tetracycline sold under the generic name.