

different opinion is always essential. After that, if there is still room for use of the product with advantage to the patient, it is clear there should be opportunity to do so.

For honest men of good will the problem is exquisitely difficult. Such scientists do not accept the automatic infallibility of government regulators, nor do they accept the limitations placed by arbitrary controls on their own conclusions.

Dishonest men who deliberately exploit ignorance to their own advantage by offering hope of cure without concern for anything except the monetary return to themselves are the object of our efforts here today. Just where and how to separate the two groups should be easy, but in fact gets more and more difficult as medicine increases in its potency and complexity.

As far as the established companies of the American Pharmaceutical industry are concerned, and it seems that all too often they are the ones that are concerned with the problem under discussion here, the solution ought to be found right in their own internal operations. The industry constantly claims for itself high standards of ethics and close attention to its admitted unique high degree of social responsibility, yet all too often it seems to fail in this regard in promotional matters. It would seem that as a matter of policy, if the question were effectively put, no Board of Directors of a responsible American Pharmaceutical house in this day and age of sensitivity to