

priate if the balance of the statement would appear as if it had been read.

Senator NELSON. I would be glad to have the Doctor read it if he prefers.

Dr. PARROTT. No, sir, I would just as soon have it presented. It is clear in the manuscript, probably much more clearly stated than I could pronounce it.

Thank you.

Senator NELSON. It will be printed in full in the record.

STATEMENT OF DR. PARROTT

You ask for the names of the products and the companies together with detailed reasons for the rejection.

Although we have rejected some advertisements during the past 5 years, and have caused some advertising claims to be revised, we cannot provide the information you seek since we maintain no list. In most instances, the problems revolve around a choice of words and are easily resolved.

Since the passage of the Kefauver amendments to the Food and Drug Act in 1962, the FDA—not the AMA—has the power to regulate prescription-drug advertising. Before his ad is submitted to AMA, the advertiser and his agency has reviewed it for compliance with FDA regulations. It may happen that an ad is completely acceptable to FDA and not acceptable to the AMA. In these cases the advertiser has little choice. He must conform to FDA's interpretation of the law and forgo the opportunity to run his ad in JAMA. It is in this light that our advertising evaluation activities must be viewed.

Thus, it is misleading to talk about ads "rejected" by AMA and meaningful numbers are not available. Many ads are never submitted to AMA because the advertiser knows that AMA and FDA interpret the regulations differently. But given its police powers, the FDA interpretations must prevail.

Your third question relates to grants and other contributions received from drug firms and their foundations for special purposes.

The American Medical Association receives no grants or contributions from drug firms or other industry or foundations. However, such contributions are received by the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation. These are the figures since 1962.

From 1962 to 1968, inclusive, the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation has received a total of \$16,066,298 in contributions. Of this amount, nearly \$8 million has been designated for the Medical School Fund, nearly \$4 million for its student loan program, \$2.9 million for the Institute for Biomedical Research, \$50,000 for medical journalism, \$143,000 for categorical research grants, and \$1.2 million, unrestricted.¹ The amount received from pharmaceutical firms and foundations has been 14 percent of this total. Physicians, who are the largest contributors, gave to the AMA-ERF, during the same period, \$6,986,755 or 43.5 percent of the total. The AMA Woman's Auxiliary contributed 14.3 percent of the total, other industry 4 percent, and the AMA itself and the remaining contributors the balance or 24.2 percent of the total.

¹ Footnotes at end of statement.