

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know. I am just indicating that the emphasis appeared to be on the detail men, not on the advertising.

Second, this is a study which related to learning, which is introduction for the first time.

Senator NELSON. The study deals with prescribing practices, not just learning. Senator Dole observed that he felt, apparently, that some people in the public feel there is some kind of giant conspiracy between the medical profession and the drug industry. I suppose he may very well be correct. Some people think that. I have never said it or implied it. When Dr. Annis was here, I raised the question and discussed at some length the question of advertising in the journals. We discussed it at some length also with Dr. Ingelfinger, the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine.

The point I raised with Dr. Annis was to say that when such a substantial portion of the income is based upon advertising and there is a very friendly relationship, it is human nature to be less critical of your friends. This is true of every aspect of life, whether it is the newspapers or personal relations. I have always found that when somebody I like very much did something wrong it was never half as bad as when somebody I did not like did it.

Reference was made to the integrity of the physicians by Senator Dole. I endorse that. I have said the same thing many times. My profession is the law. In the years that I have practiced and in the years that I have developed acquaintanceships with people in a wide variety of professions, I have said any number of times that I thought there were more dedicated people in the medical profession, in my judgment—just my feeling from those people I have known over the years—there was a higher percentage of genuinely dedicated people in the medical profession than in any other profession. I think this is so for a very special reason. Not that there are not a large number of dedicated people in the law and engineering and elsewhere. But the desire to serve mankind can be, I think, more directly satisfied by being in the medical profession, where you are dealing directly with patients and accomplishing cures, and therefore, I think, that is the reason there is a tendency, in my judgment, to attract more dedicated people than you might find in some of the professions where service to mankind may not be as direct as in medicine. I would like to make that clear.

With respect to the possible consequences of heavy dependence on revenue from drug advertising, if you want to take a look at the reports of our hearings in medical news publications, you will see that they are about 99 percent loaded toward the drug industry. Any innocent child would come to that conclusion. In fact, many very important things said before this committee just are not reported in the medical journals or in the medical press.

The point we are getting at here is when you have this heavy financial reliance, does it affect unconsciously or consciously—let us say unconsciously—the treatment of the news that is important and that is critical of the drug industry?

Let me cite an example and make an inquiry about it, because it puzzles me very much. I think most people agree that the only comprehensive evaluation of drugs made, or perhaps the most comprehensive one, has been the one made by the National Academy of Sciences—