

of this statement was sent to the Eli Lilly & Co., to various newspapers, and the New England Journal of Medicine where it appeared in the letters column on March 13, 1969; 45 students in our class signed the letter.

The New England Journal of Medicine reported that the following students had notified the journal of their intent to return or refuse their bags: 16 at Johns Hopkins, 25 at the University of California, and 57 in the fourth year at Temple, and we have heard from other people today that bags have been returned elsewhere as well. By our count about 200 students have actually returned bags so far that we are aware of.

We would like to make several recommendations. First, that information about drug users, drug makers, and drug distributors, and the social and economic implications of this information, as described in the report of the Task Force on Prescription Drugs, should be a standard part of the pharmacology course at every medical school.

Mr. POHL. I would like to add something here. A lot of the information that we got during our pharmacology course came actually out of the testimony heard by this committee. And we have been accused by Eli Lilly, among others, of seeking wide publicity just to become sensational.

Now, we feel that we have sought wide publicity but not to be sensational but to get this information to other doctors, to other medical students because this is the only way this problem is going to be confronted. This information in testimony as heard before the committee has to be examined by all physicians and medical students, and this is why we have sought this type of publicity.

Mr. NATHAN. As our second recommendation, we feel drug companies should give no free gifts to medical students. Medical students should refuse to accept such gifts and should request the medical school administration not to distribute them.

Third, if a drug company produces an educational aid, such as a book, record, device or model, which is of exceptional educational value and cannot be obtained elsewhere, then the company should place that item on the market along with all other such aids customarily produced by publishing houses or instrument manufacturers. If students, faculty or libraries need the item, they will buy it. If no one wants to buy the item, then its manufacture was probably a waste of money in the first place.

Mr. SPIEGEL. One member of our class, who actually refused to accept the bag in the first place, is the only one of us, a year ago, first-year students, who sought to buy "Auscultation of the Heart" commercially rather than accept it from a drug company. He found out that most of the companies that made these records had ceased making them commercially because they had been run off the market by the drug companies. He received the record approximately 3 months on order after he put in the order and much too late to use it.

So I would like to point out that when the drug companies claim that they are performing an educational function, what they are doing often is driving legitimate producers of educational material off the market so that a student who wants unbiased information is unable to get it.