for its stockholders. But, equally, it has ethical responsibility to present to all physicians and pharmacists objective and complete information on the utility and the dangers of its products. Every physician knows that, on occasion, a dangerous drug must be used because the potential benefits outweigh the risks, but that is no excuse at all for downplaying those risks or exaggerating the benefits. Human considerations must come before profit considerations, yet the record developed at your own earlier hearings, Mr. Chairman, carries overwhelming evidence of the callous way such distortions have been carried out, and the situation has not changed.

What can the U.S. Government do? I am told by my colleagues in the Pan American Health Organization and World Health Organization that our Food and Drug Administration has cooperated with the international health organizations in supplying information and providing technical advice and consultation. FDA should be supported in these efforts and we should look for means to obtain more cooperation in relation to health considerations from other branches of government, including those branches dealing with commerce and industry.

I understand that there is no way to compel U.S. companies to change procedures of subsidiaries in other countries, that carry out all of their operations within other countries. Furthermore, the situation that we are discussing here is by no means unique to U.S. companies. Swiss, German, French, and other manufacturers are no different in their operations. It is a shameful posture, however, for a nation that prides itself on leadership, to say that, because one's competitors engage in reprehensible practices, one is justified in following suit (or in showing the way!). Is there not some way to approach U.S.-based, multi-national corporations,