

Senator DOLE. Do you have copies of the letters available for the file?

Mr. PAYTON. No; I do not have a copy of the letter I wrote available. I could make that available. I have a copy——

Senator DOLE. Would you make that available?

Mr. PAYTON (continuing). Of their responses. Certainly.

(The subsequent information was received and follows:)

JULY 4, 1969.

Mr. BENJAMIN GORDON,
Staff Economist,
U.S. Senate Small Business Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON:

* * * * *

At the time I was testifying before the subcommittee I did not realize that the deadline for submission of the information I said I could make available would be so short. When trying to arrange for your receipt of this information I explained that whatever was available was in my files in San Francisco and that I would not be returning to that city until sometime in September. As I inferred earlier we had left San Francisco June 12 and had arrived in Minneapolis at the time of the June 19th hearing. After returning to Minneapolis following the session with the subcommittee we resumed our trip to the East coast and I was unable to obtain the letters referred to in the testimony.

I am including a page explaining what went into the letters which I sent to several companies.

* * * * *

You are free to use any information in this letter you wish.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. PAYTON.

JULY 4, 1969.

MEMORANDUM

To: Gaylord Nelson, Chairman,

Monopoly Subcommittee of U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

From: Charles E. Payton

University of California San Francisco School of Medicine.

Re Explanation of Letters referred to in June 19, 1969 testimony.

During the fall of 1968 I had a question in my mind, whether the gifts I had already received from pharmaceutical companies were the gestures of companies wishing to facilitate my education in a philanthropic fashion, or represented an advertising venture designed to influence my prescribing habits. As I have stated in my testimony, there were only a few of my colleagues discussing this question at the time. I did not feel that my answer could be born solely from intuition, rather I had to seek data such as presented in my statement of June 19, 1969. In seeking a resolution to this dilemma, I decided to carry the question of providing instruments not already provided by the Lilly Company to other pharmaceutical firms. I hoped this would serve two purposes:

1. I wanted to ascertain what the rationale was on the part of pharmaceutical companies for allocating time and money to such a program.

2. If the collection of further information indicated that the receipt of materials provided by pharmaceutical companies did not conflict with the student or physician's commitment to

(a) scientific objectivity and

(b) the total welfare of his patients

any increased financial assistance students as a result of my efforts would have been of great value to my fellow students and myself.

I received responses to the letters in point from slightly over half of the companies addressed. It was my impression from the communication with these companies that their priority ranking for such expenditures started with practicing physicians and descended in the order of residents, interns and medical students. This happens to coincide with the proximity of medical persons to the utilization of pharmaceutical therapeutics. It would appear that funds for such programs must come under promotional categories.