

Mr. HARRISON. It is possible, but let me go beyond that again, Senator, if I may. Advertising is primarily part of the labeling provisions of the law. The labeling provisions are exactly spelled out in the law and the regulations. The manufacturers advertising then must conform with those provisions. Now, generally, then, we might say that the advertising claims as such have been screened by way of the requirements of the law and the regulations.

If a manufacturer were to go totally beyond that which has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration—I cannot imagine that kind of possibility with any kind of responsible manufacturer, because it would soon be withdrawn from the market—then it is possible that such a matter might not come to our attention. But remember, if you would, that the advertising as such is part of the labeling provisions and that these are screened in advance. However, if a claim is made which is not provable or, what more often happens, additional information which comes to the attention of the Food and Drug Administration after the initial approval of the application indicates that there has been a change in use or there have been new contraindications that have been discovered then the Food and Drug Administration will require that the advertising be changed to reflect this, as well as the labeling.

Senator HATFIELD. I believe Dr. Simenstad has already said to us that the Office of Advertising Evaluation does require the listing of the scientific ingredients or the chemical ingredients for all advertised drugs. Now, the question is, are these any requirements over and above what would normally be printed in or on the label of this description or this drug that is given to you?

Dr. SIMENSTAD. No.

Do you want to answer?

Mr. HARRISON. The answer is "No."

Senator NELSON. In other words, it is basically that which is already going to be revealed by the manufacturer in any of his marketing program?

Mr. HARRISON. As he is required to do by law.

Senator HATFIELD. Getting back to the fundamental question, Dr. Parrott, is it a real basic question whether or not a physician is introduced to a new drug through an advertisement? The physician, as you indicated, I believe, is going to make his own judgments and his own diagnosis and evaluations over and above merely reading about a drug, but is there anything basically wrong about a physician becoming acquainted or introduced to a drug through an advertisement?

Dr. PARROTT. None whatsoever.

Senator HATFIELD. There is nothing antiethical in that, is there?

Dr. PARROTT. Nothing whatsoever.

Senator HATFIELD. There is nothing what you would call unscientific or nonscientific about being introduced to a new drug through this medium?

Dr. PARROTT. No. Many times a physician could be introduced to a new drug in this way, but I believe the competent physician would go far beyond that.

Senator HATFIELD. That is the point. It is not the question of introduction, it is a question of the judgments made following this introduction, is that not true?