

I know that if they tried to raise the dues that there would be quite a "howl."

The American Medical Association solicits money from doctors to donate to medical schools. They donated a check last week from the Louisiana State Medical Society. It was a small amount. It was insignificant. I do not feel that we as physicians should finance this type of endeavor out of our own pockets. Lawyers do not "chip in" to build courthouses. And lawyers do not chip in to go around and inspect law schools and give bar exams and all of that. But doctors do.

Senator NELSON. I agree with you, I think that the function of inspecting medical schools and hospitals to see that they meet appropriate standards should be paid for out of public funds, and performed by the qualified people.

Dr. ADRIANI. Our council is writing a drug reference book. The budget for the drug department last year was close to a million dollars. This drug reference book should be given away to each doctor but we are not going to be able to give it away, because it is going to be expensive to produce. And yet we hope to have a compend on drugs that a doctor can refer to quickly. And incidentally, speaking about combinations, we list the combinations and what is in them. But we have put down "not recommended" on all the combinations in the part of the book that is finished to date.

Senator NELSON. I have raised this question before. But it seems to me the acceptance of an ad which is contrary to the scientific evidence and known position of the Drug Council compromises them in a way that they really ought not to be. And I raise the question about this close relationship between the manufacturers of drugs and the medical societies through the advertising they take. It seems to me that in subtle ways it takes away from medical societies the responsibility they have for being tough critics of bad medical practice when they are in effect endorsing in a magazine the drugs that they know shouldn't be used. I don't know whether you want to comment on that or not.

Dr. ADRIANI. I was on the editorial board of our specialty journal, Anesthesiology, for 9 years. The advertising was policed by one of the members of the editorial committee. There was a period when something happened. I think right after the Kefauver-Harris amendments went into effect, when the advertising fell off substantially in all journals, including ours. We as editors did not care. But our board of directors did. They were concerned that the income was falling off. And I said, "well, you will have to get it from some other source." And that was the attitude I took about that journal.

There is no question about the fact that an advertiser can cancel out an ad. If they are the ones that are providing your income—if I am paying you a salary, I have control over you. I hold the aces and you hold the deuces. In this particular case if a pharmaceutical firm does not like what someone does, and they have an ad, they can say, we will cancel the ad. And this means a loss of income. I feel personally that this is a bad position to be in. I would get out of such a position in some way. This is my own personal reaction. I do not approve of being in that position at all. I do not like to have someone with a knife poised in my back saying, "if you do not do such and such a thing we will stab you." I like to have the aces in my hand.