However, the account given by the editor, Dr. John H. Talbott, was sharply challenged by Duke C. Trexler, executive secretary of the prestigious NRC.

The "white paper" attacked as irrational and dangerous the use of mixtures that combine in fixed ration an anti-biotic and other anti-infective agents. Such combinations are widely prescribed and heavily advertised in the Journal.

The authors of the paper were Dr. Calvin M. Kunin of the University of Virginia and four other chairmen of NAS–NRC panels that reviewed the products for the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA has stirred up one of the biggest controversies in medicine by moving to halt sales of the products.

The controversy between the AMA and the NAS-NRC surfaced last Wednesday when Dr. Kunin, testifying at a Senate Monopoly subcommittee hearing, said in response to a question by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) that the Journal had rejected the "white paper" without explanation.

Replying in a press release, Dr. Talbott said that the Journal accepts or rejects manuscripts only when they are in "final form," and that the NAS-NRC paper was a "draft."

In a phone interview, however, Trexler said he has correspondence showing that Dr. Talbott also said that a letter of Jan. 29 from Trexler embargoed the "white paper" until the FDA published an official notice in the Federal Register of its intent to take the products off the market. But, Dr. Talbott said, he never heard from Trexler again.

Trexler repudiated the Journal editor's version. First, he said, Dr. Talbott failed to mention that two days earlier, on Jan. 27, the editor had phoned Trexler to say "bluntly, flatly, that the paper would not be published" in the Journal. Trexler, who said this was "A total shift, in Dr. Talbott's position" so informed Kunin in a letter the next day.

In the phone conversation, Trexler said, Dr. Talbott promised to print an "editorial comment" on the "white paper," although not the paper itself.

Because the "editorial comment" drew from the embargoed "white paper," it, too, had to beheld up until publication of the Federal Register statement. That was the explanation of the letter cited by Dr. Talbott in the press release, Trexler said.

The expectation has been that the official FDA notice would be published in January, but it was not inserted in the Register until April.

Trexler said the dispute would be happily resolved if the Journal would print the "white paper." The New England Journal of Medicine will publish it May 22.

Commissioner Herbert L. Loy Jr. of the FDA said he was "very shocked" to learn that Dr. Talbott had rejected the paper. That was in January. In March, the editor told The Washington Post the paper was still under consideration. In the April 18 Medical World News, a report attributed to Dr. Talbott a statement that the report "was not submitted."

Senator DOLE. If you should hear from Dr. Kunin, perhaps you can submit his response to the committee.

Dr. TALBOTT. It is a little late. He is 2 months late already.

Senator DOLE. Maybe he is busy.

I also want to comment that the chairman has indicated some of the drug publications are about 99 percent against the committee. I think that gives a good balance, because I think it appears to be from time to time that we are in that direction against the witnesses. So this should not be disturbing to anybody.

Senator NELSON. Nothing that I expect disturbs me. It is what I do not expect that disturbs me.

Mr. HARRISON. May I add one thing? This is only so that all others understand this as I am sure the committee understands it.

We have a number of publications in the association. While the Journal of the American Medical Association concentrates on scientific matters, there are other mechanisms of communication in the association; publications such as Today's Health, American Medical News, and so forth, which may carry other kinds of communications. Some of these communications are on more newsworthy subjects.