

Mr. NATHAN. Also, a tape of "Heart Soundness," which is equivalent in quality to this record was available through the medical school and we just want to emphasize that none of the items or gifts or books was essential to us. Most of the information could be more easily and reliably obtained elsewhere. And we think it was superfluous.

Our fourth recommendation: If drug companies wish to support scholarships and fellowships for medical students, they should do so by contributing to a collective fund at each medical school. The names of the companies contributing to the fund should be made public, but the donor of a given scholarship dispensed from the fund should be anonymous.

Finally, Congress should restore the full funding of the health professions student loan program and the U.S. Public Health Service medical student training research program.

I will read the letter that we sent to Eli Lilly Co.

Shall I read the letter that we sent to Eli Lilly & Co.?

Senator NELSON. We will print it in the record.

Mr. NATHAN. OK.

Senator NELSON. Right here at the conclusion of your statement. (The letter referred to follows:)

ELI LILLY & Co.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

JANUARY 30, 1969.

GENTLEMEN: A year ago, as first year medical students, we invited drug companies to provide us with a variety of instruments, like those commonly distributed at most medical schools. As second year students, we now feel we made a mistake, and think it proper to return the instruments for the following reason.

We believe an unhealthy relationship exists between the drug industry and the medical profession. The profession is largely responsible, because it does not maintain a proper distance from the industry. This distance is essential for the doctor's objectivity. Since the doctor is in a unique economic position, namely that of directing what the consumer will buy, strict objectivity is his obligation to the patient.

This objectivity is endangered when medical students accept instruments. Naturally, such gifts engender in the student a sense of familiarity and gratitude toward the houses that can afford to give them. In a subtle but real way, these attitudes can undermine the critical objectivity which must underlie both the medical and economic decisions of prescription writing. In an analogous situation, it is universally recognized that an official who awards contracts should not accept gifts from bidders.

It is also clear that the cost of these instruments and other elaborate promotional campaigns is paid by the consumer. We view our action in returning the instruments as a signal to the industry that as future doctors we would applaud a deescalation in the ever-mounting tide of promotional campaigns.

Our aim is to establish good habits for ourselves early in our training, and to promote discussion of the relationship between the drug industry, the medical profession, and the patient. We support the thirty-six Western Reserve medical students who first returned drug company instruments and urge others to follow their example.

Senator NELSON. I thank you very much for your excellent presentation, all three of you.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. DUFFY. I just have one question.

What do you think to the cost of medical education if your suggestion that the drug companies not provide fellowships, grants and so on were followed, particularly if the Government were not able to respond to your call for an increase in participation on their part?