

schools were rated A, B, and C. When I started medical school there were two or three grade C schools. They went out of business, and the grade B schools became grade A. Now all the schools are grade A.

These schools are inspected by the American Medical Association. They have faculties of men from other schools to form committees to inspect them.

This applies to internships and residencies and all training programs, they are inspected by the American Medical Association. This is a costly venture, you know. You gather a group of people, fly them to a particular city, and put them in a hotel, and pay for all the paper-work that is required. In addition, the AMA publishes the journal and carries on other business and correspondence, et cetera. From being on the residency review committee for anesthesiology I know the Council on Medical Education has field inspectors that go around every 2 years inspecting intern and residency programs. So this income is very essential to the association. It boils down to this, I would say, that the AMA needs every dollar it can get, to remain in the black.

Senator NELSON. I raised this question before with the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine, Dr. Ingelfinger, and Dr. Annis, and others. It still seems to me to raise a puzzling credibility issue when one of the most distinguished medical associations in the country, maybe in the world, maintains that not only are the antibiotic combinations inefficacious but that there is also a health hazard in prescribing them. Yet, they are, at the same time, willing to accept ads that promote them. As a matter of fact the advertising and promotion is more successful in persuading doctors to use them than the text material in the JAMA or the other journals in dissuading them. Doesn't that seem to you to raise a kind of a credibility question? Isn't there a great distinction given to an ad advertised in the journal? Isn't that a kind of an imprimatur of the approval in effect to the physician who sees the ad?

Dr. ADRIANI. Well, the only answer that one could give to a question like that is that the position taken in doing this is indefensible. One cannot defend it. All I can say is that if you have the scientific members of your association writing and saying that fixed combinations of drugs are bad, and you have the management particularly the lay people accepting advertising, and there is no consultation between the scientific groups in the association and those who pass on advertising and what they are publishing scientifically for their physicians is in conflict with what is in the advertising—this is indefensible.

I could not defend this for the American Medical Association. I am however not speaking for them. But you are perfectly right. This is ironical. The association needs money. I have always contended that they use the income from advertising for a good purpose. That money is well spent.

I have always felt that there ought to be another source of funds for this particular thing. It is an important function. It is important to the public. It is important to the students who go to medical school, and those who enroll in teaching programs, and in internships and in residencies. It is paid for by dues of most of us who are members.

The dues are rather high. The bulk of the cost is made up by dues. I do not know what the sources of all the income of the AMA are, but