

free drugs during his days at medical school. And more, "If the student's wife needs a birth control pill prescription or his mother-in-law requires diabetes medication, he merely has to tell a drug company 'detail man' (salesman) to get the drugs free."

Dr. Joseph W. Gardella of Harvard School of Medicine stated: "Students believe the patient is a pawn between the doctors and the drug companies * * * They feel the responsibility for the patient's welfare—holding down the cost of drugs—has gone begging."

It is interesting to note that at least one drug official has been quite candid. Dr. Harold Upjohn, Vice-President of the Upjohn Company of Kalamazoo, Michigan recently told a group of medical students: "You know why they give them (gifts). No question about it. They want doctors to be interested in prescribing their brands."

I commend Dr. Upjohn on his forthright statement. It is, indeed, gratifying to note that so many of our prospective physicians are equally well aware of this and concerned enough to take strong and positive action to halt this type of activity on the part of the pharmaceutical industry.

I will place the letters and newspaper articles dealing with this subject at this point in the hearing record.

[From the New England Journal of Medicine, Nov. 14, 1968]

(Editorial)

COST OF DRUGS

To the Editor: The undersigned students in the second-year class at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine have not accepted a drug company's gifts of an instrument bag and diagnostic tools, and believe that merely returning the gifts is not a sufficient action. We should like to make this action and the reasons for it public. Below is the letter we sent to the drug company.

We are returning these gifts because we feel they are not gifts but rather are inappropriate advertisements. Although many of these gifts are useful, all but the most naive realize that your motivation in giving them to us is to influence our future choice of drugs.

We are struck by the fact that ultimately it is the consumer who pays for these gifts in the form of higher prices.

Returning these gifts demonstrates our disapproval of the relationship which they foster. This relationship is one which has as its goal the mutual benefit of both the doctor and the drug company, with consideration of the patient relegated to a place of secondary importance. In so failing to consider the patient, both the drug company and the doctor are not properly serving the public to whom they are responsible.

MICKEY EISENBERG
BERNARD ROAZAN
JIM MAHER
SIGNE DYSKEN
BETSY LOZOFF
TERRY STEIN
DICK GLENDON
WILLIAM R. BEARDSLEE
MARTIN FOSBURG
NORMAN R. GORDON
JOHN R. NEVILLE
GEORGE E. MILLER
MARGARET C. MCBRIDE
RICH FRIEDEL
PRISCILLA WARE
STEPHEN CANTRILL
BARRY J. RICHMOND
MING WANG

GORDON LAKE
HENRY BRODKIN
NEVIN KATZ
JUDITH GOODRICH
MICHAEL D. KLEIN
JOHN MCBRIDE
H. M. SLYTER
SCOTT C. MCCUSKEY
WILLIAM HARMON
JULES R. LODISH
THEODORE J. STRANSKY
WILBERT C. JORDAN
ROBERT E. GOULD
GARY M. BRITTENHAM
RICHARD R. LOVE
JERRY J. ROBBINS
JEFFREY J. WISNIESKI
JEFFREY TEICH