Mr. Payton. Later in my testimony I have presented a letter that was written by some of the members of my sophomore medical class to the Lilly Co. at the time we returned certain of the instruments which they had presented to us. I think that the numbers related at that point, being 25 individuals from my class who signed that letter, gives you some idea of the proportion of students who support the type of statement which I am presenting today.

This, I might add, is 25 out of a class of 128. Mr. Duffy. But you are not speaking for them?

Mr. Payton. I do not presume to. However, my testimony has been seen by some of these students and read, and they have said that it would be their interest that I am representing also. However, I do not

intend to offer any names or any numbers.

During the period of formal education of health professionals, students are exposed to and subjected to direct and indirect influence by pharmaceutical companies. I have identified five categories of industry programs that I believe directly affect the education of students in the health professions. The "visibility" of a promotional effort may not be a valid measure of the return a company achieves from a particular form of advertising. I will therefore be considering some forms of industry involvement in education which would not be covered by the conventional definition of "advertising," believing, however, that the manner in which these practices are conducted represents a promotional effort by pharmaceutical companies.

In the order of their visibility, the categories I will refer to are:

1. Gifts.

2. Awards.

3. Financial aids.

4. Educational materials.

5. Teaching faculty.

GIFTS

Students, house staff, and physicians can in good conscience claim that gifts in no way obligate them to a drug company. Gifts do have the result, however, of creating an impression in the minds of some physicians favorable toward a certain manufacturer. The giving of gifts is a promotional practice. In a recent talk at the University of Virginia, Dr. Upjohn, of the Upjohn Co., explained this approach on the basis that companies "want doctors to be interested in prescribing their brands"—exhibit A.¹

An analysis of the attitude with which these gifts are received must also be discussed. The gratuities received by students at the University of California San Francisco, which is an all health science campus, represents a significant investment on the part of the pharmaceutical industry. If the industry were to have found the giving of gifts to be ineffectual in influencing the process of drug prescription and acquisi-

tion, this practice would have been discontinued long ago.

Gifts offered to medical students at UCMC during their 4 years include a stethoscope, percussion hammer and black leather bag. A full list of the items available is appended to this statement—exhibit B—and shows a retail value of more than \$67 per student.

¹ See exhibits, pp. 5542-5546.