

Does it make sense to you to ask a doctor to prescribe a drug only because it has a nice layout in a magazine page?

It would seem to me that the only form of advertisement that is really relevant to giving good medical care to people is when you say, "chloramphenicol produced by us has been shown in every single trial in 400 patients at a certain hospital," and you give the controls, "to be better than all other drugs presently on the market."

Then a doctor is justified in choosing that company's drug. But until such evidence is presented in advertisements I suspect those advertisements. I also suspect the gifts in the same way, that this is not pertinent in the prescribing of drugs.

Mr. DUFFY. This is the problem. We all have the right to suspect. Any time I want to suspect a person's motives or the like, I may. Now, whether I have the right to take action on that suspicion is another thing.

Mr. BRODKIN. Let me be even stronger by saying I not only suspect, I know that the company is trying to get me to buy that drug, and for reasons which I do not feel are legitimate, is that not so?

Mr. DUFFY. Well, No. 1, I hedge that question by saying I am not a doctor.

I think you have presented a very cogent argument, but I still come back to the point that we are grounded on suspicion. And I think you have as much right to hold your suspicions as I hold mine. But I question whether it is advisable for you to recommend that the forces of government or some other forces enter into this area on suspicion. We have dealt with this problem a long time ago and determined the Government does not have the right to enter an area on mere suspicion.

Mr. BRODKIN. Perhaps Mr. Nathan can help you.

Mr. NATHAN. I know it would help a great deal if we had specific examples in your personal experiences how advertising has influenced us adversely. And, of course, that is hard because we do not prescribe drugs yet. But in our very narrow range of experience, I can point out the fact that because we all accept these gifts, the class of 1971 at Harvard Medical School, for that reason many of my classmates felt that it was not at all proper for them to examine the issues involved in prescribing drugs, which is certainly beneficial action for a physician. And clearly the advertising had operated to create a situation which is detrimental ultimately to the patients these people will later be treating.

Mr. DUFFY. Senator Nelson, I have some other questions but I will be happy to submit them to these gentlemen in writing for the record.

Senator NELSON. I am late now. You would be willing to respond to some questions for the record from the minority counsel if they are submitted?

Mr. BRODKIN. Yes.¹

Senator NELSON. I want to thank all of you gentlemen for your very thoughtful testimony. I think your expressions of concern demonstrate a commendable level of idealism of which we have too little in practice in this country today.

Your testimony in respect to your relationship to the drug industry is just part of a very large mosaic and I think it fits in with all the

¹ See Appendix VII, pp. 5768-5770.