

process. One method for making an assessment of this influence is to attempt to determine its effect on the efficiency, competence, and sensitivity of the medical profession.

Is there listed anywhere in the methods and forms of influence described in the five categories an industry expenditure which will make me a better doctor, which will during my professional life benefit those whom I may treat?

I believe not.

I believe these forms of influence have a goal contradictory to the rational application of pharmaceutical therapy and quality patient care.

In a conversation with a representative of a pharmaceutical company concerning my attitudes about promotional practices, the detail man said: "What is it that you do want that I can do for you?"

I responded to that question by saying that I want the pharmaceutical industry to make the best possible products available at the lowest feasible price.

I will take the responsibility for acquiring the materials for my education and the tools of my trade.

I thank you.

(The exhibits attached to Mr. Payton's statement follow:)

EXHIBIT A

[From Medical Care Review, Vol. 26, No. 3, March, 1969, pp. 249-252, Published by the Bureau of Public Health Economics, School of Public Health, the University of Michigan]

DRUG INDUSTRY GIFTS

Richard D. Lyons, "Medical Students Plan to Return Gift Instruments," New York Times 118:72 February 2, 1969

"Forty-five students at the Harvard Medical School, who said they believed that 'an unhealthy relationship exists between the drug industry and the medical profession,' decided . . . to return a \$40 bag of diagnostic instruments that each had been given by a pharmaceutical company.

"The second-year students, who conceded that they had invited the offer last year, said in a statement that 'we now feel that we made a mistake and think it proper to return the instruments' to Eli Lilly and Co. of Indianapolis.

"In a letter to the company, the students said that such gifts undermined the 'objectivity' of doctors and medical students because such gifts 'engender a sense of familiarity and gratitude' toward those companies that dispense them. 'In a subtle but real way these attitudes can undermine the critical objectivity which must underly both the medical and economic decisions of prescription writing,' the letter continued. 'In an analogous situation, it is universally recognized that an official who awards contracts should not accept gifts from bidders. Our aim is to establish good habits of ourselves early in our training and to promote discussion of the relationship between the drug industry, the medical profession and the patient,' the letter said.

"Richard Pohl . . . who acted as a spokesman for the group, said the instrument package consisted of a black bag, a stethoscope, a tuning fork, a percussion hammer and a tape measure that, together, retail for about \$40. Mr. Pohl said there were about 125 students in his class, some of whom did not choose to accept the instruments when they were distributed last year. 'We want to make this a national issue if possible,' Mr. Pohl said, adding that the Harvard group was talking to medical students at Tufts and Boston University in an attempt to have more instruments returned.

"Last November, 36 students at the Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine in Cleveland returned similar gifts from a drug company whose name was not announced at the time. . . .*

*See: Medical Care Review, January, 1969, p. 32.