

on the gifts they receive. The stethoscope we receive has "Lilly" clearly engraved on it. Each book we find on our desk is clearly labeled with the name of the company that put it there. After 2 years and without any contact with the real products of drug companies, medical students are familiar with the names of and own or carry with them irrelevant products from the same group of large drug companies. We do not believe that this situation is innocuous.

Doctors prescribe by brand names in situations where that brand has not been shown to be more efficacious than a generic name drug. Perhaps this is because doctors feel more comfortable prescribing a product from a company they have come to know. Knowing the names and then the products of a drug company is the first step in coming to have the familiarity with that company that later leads to prescribing their drug. Prescribing a drug from a company that one has come to trust is reasonable, but the basis on which that trust is founded is what is suspect.

Beginning in medical school, the drug company that gives you a book or a week-end in New York is becoming known, whether the recipient wants to believe it or not. The advertising in the journals or through the 15,000 detail men, with their brochures, free samples and gifts, adds up to more than \$3,000 per doctor spent each year by the drug industry. This volume of advertising is intended to make a doctor familiar with a company or product. Since even a cursory glance at advertisements reveals that claims are ill defined or unsubstantiated to a large extent, this means that a doctor's choice of drug includes in its formulation a volume of contact with a drug company which is almost wholly irrelevant; and medical students, in fact, start out with purely irrelevant contact in the form of gifts.

Thus, when we return gifts, we are not merely rejecting an "innocent token of appreciation for the rigorous education we have committed ourselves to," as a vice president in charge of corporate affairs at Lilly characterized the gifts at a recent debate at Western Reserve. We are calling the gifts subtle advertisements and rejecting not only the advertisements, but the idea that the familiarity which advertising creates is relevant to our choice of therapeutic agent. We are questioning the ethics of trying to influence such an important decision as a doctor's choice of drug by anything other than objective, controlled trials of efficacy. When we return these gifts we are also acknowledging the primary responsibility we have to the public, for this gesture demonstrates that we feel that our relationship with drug companies is not a private matter. We want, in fact require, in order to deliver the best medical care possible, the confidence and respect of the public. Being involved in the acceptance of favors from drug manufacturers casts doubt on our position of objectivity. It is therefore proper, in order to preserve the respect of the community which we serve, to reject gifts; and it is necessary, in order to preserve our own objectivity and hence quality of professional performance, to advocate only experimental evidence as admissible consideration in the choice of drugs.

Senator NELSON. I want to thank you very much for your very thoughtful presentation.

Do you have some questions?

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Brodtkin, I congratulate you on the cogent statement of your position. However, as an attorney, I have several problems. One is, to a great degree, you are dealing with potentialities.