

stantial space to attacking the conclusions of the National Academy of Sciences without presenting them in full.

This astonished me, because in reading the history and background of the legislation, and in looking at the formulation of the panels by an independent body, and noting the great distinction of the clinicians who participated on these panels, I would have thought that the scientific publications would have made front page banner headlines in great detail about what the panels said about the fixed combination antibiotics. Yet as I look at the publications I find they are still carrying full-page ads of the fixed combinations which the National Academy says ought to be removed from the market. The FDA also says they should be removed from the market. In the editorial text of the Journal of the American Medical Association itself—10 years ago there was an article signed by Dr. Dowling, who was a former chairman of the AMA's Council of Drugs, that there is no rational reason for using fixed combinations. Can you, as physicians, give us an explanation? If the medical publications themselves aren't going to carry this distinguished material what makes you think they will carry what you are talking about—which incidentally I think would be a very important advance.

Dr. BRILL. I will try to answer first, and I think Dr. Freyhan might want to get into the discussion at this point.

I had in mind perhaps a Government subsidized operation which would make use of good science writers, and make use of the best and most authentic material in the field, which would be uninfluenced by any other consideration except about medical principles and practices. I don't think that we should try to abolish differences of opinion among medical writers or within the profession, even opinions that we might disagree with, like fixed combinations. I personally am quite doubtful about the value of these combinations. I share the more conservative view on this, but I wouldn't want to foreclose the right of other people to express a contrary opinion.

Senator NELSON. I am not qualified to have a viewpoint about this particular matter but I just want to point out that the five panels on antibiotics were composed of very distinguished people and their conclusions were unanimous. The point I raise is that a good many of the medical publications—and I don't say all because I haven't looked at all of them—except the New England Journal didn't bother to present the comprehensive viewpoint expressed and the conclusions reached by the National Academy of Sciences.

Those that I have looked at ran lengthy criticisms from independent practitioners around the country attacking the National Research Council's results. And in reading the attacks it was clear to me that the physicians who were attacking hadn't read the National Academy of Sciences' conclusion, because they were attacking things the Academy had not said.

This is the point I am making. The medical profession itself is not prepared to present in great detail conclusions reached by a distinguished panel, whether they agree or not, and I am sure if there is criticism of it that they ought to run that too. However, you are making the suggestion that the Government present papers evaluating these situations by objective scientists. How would you get a more ob-