

can say, as a result of my own direct experience with "detail men," that rarely, if ever, do drug company representatives mention, let alone stress, the known side effects of the product they are promoting.

I must also say, at the outset of my statement, that I really cannot blame the pharmaceutical manufacturer for trying to promote his product for profit; profit is primarily why he is in business. If someone has a product to sell, it is only natural that he wants that product to be known as the best there is and not, willingly, disclose any defects. But before you refute this opinion with still another cliché that drugs are different because they effect a person's health, think how the law allows, and even excuses, "puffing" in real estate sales where an entire family's health and well-being can virtually be destroyed because no one dares stop a real estate agent from grossly exaggerating the merits of a home that, after purchase, turns out to be a real "dud."

So it is that I feel strongly that if drug companies are going to be forced to be completely honest, the way to achieve this goal is not primarily through legislation but through a form of professional control that is respected and followed by the medical profession. You have had legislative controls of drug ads on the books for years now and, even including the ones that went into effect last month, the result of the laws has not brought about any improvement as shown by lessened drug reactions, hospitalizations as a result of over-use, and misuse, of drugs and really, what is worst of all, failure to be cured because of use of the wrong, or ineffective, drug (an example might be the use of an antibiotic against a bacteria that is resistant to the drug, or the use of a drug without providing the proper environment). What we have not had, however, no matter what you may hear, is absolute professional control over the way a drug is advertised; control that is depended upon by physicians because they respect the authority in control.

Again, it is my opinion that the majority of physicians learn about new drugs through advertising as opposed to postgraduate courses on drugs or scientific articles in medical journals. And the relation of drug information on advertising pages compared to editorial pages offers a good example of what I mean. A randomly selected issue of *JAMA* (as *The Journal of the American Medical Association* is best known) contained advertisements for nearly 100 drugs and other therapeutic products. Within that same issue of *JAMA*, the editorial section contained only five specific references to drugs, four of which were letters to the editor. I probably should mention how I "randomly" selected the particular issue of *JAMA* (May 26, 1969); it arrived in the mail on the same day I received your request to testify.

But returning to the "editorial" material within a medical journals pages, it must be stressed that insofar as editorial material is concerned (the scientific article or report on a case) if the title of the article does not catch the doctor-reader's eye because he cannot see any relationship to his own immediate needs, then he is not as apt to read the article—even if it contains extremely essential information about a drug from the strictly scientific point-of-view. In contrast, advertisements for drugs make a direct appeal to the doctor-reader, implying an answer to his most commonly seen patient-problems.

At this point I should like to take a "typical" ad, from the same randomly selected issue of *JAMA*, and demonstrate just how misleading it can be (Exhibit A).¹ This ad appeared right up front in the magazine, within the section I and many other physicians turn to first: "Medical News."

The product advertised is Ananase, a tradename for an enzyme product claimed by the manufacturer to: "reduce inflammation and edema," and to speed up the healing process. As you know, inflammation is the way the body—or more specifically some tissue of the body such as skin—reacts to injury. We say a tissue is "inflamed" when it is red, hot, swollen and painful. More often than not these are the symptoms complained of by the patient. This particular ad makes a distinctly separate claim that its product is effective against edema, or swelling of tissue usually without redness or heat. I am sure you are all familiar with the fact that a swelling on your skin can be quite painful even if not red or hot. At the same time, edema can also be simple swelling of tissue filled with fluid as is seen when the ankles become swollen as a consequence of heart or lung disease, varicose veins, or just standing too long. The eyelids can be edematous, or swollen, after rubbing, lack of sleep or too much liquids and/or salt.

¹ Exhibits retained in committee files.