

the documents submitted.) with improved chloramphenicol labels and the beginning of an adverse reaction reporting system.

Our experience, beginning with the Warner-Lambert Annual Meeting, suggests that perhaps basic information on just exactly what kind of labeling abroad, at least for Chloromycetin, the Parke Davis Company was producing was not known to top officers, stockholders, and most likely Board Members. When this was brought rather forcibly to their attention, even though the vote against the proposal was 97%, steps were taken in the case of Chloromycetin to rectify the inadequate label. I do not know what other response was made by the company.

Mr. Squibb's conjecture that the vote could only have happened if the Directors were not really aware of the issue, that they did not realize fully the problem, in essence may be right in terms of the deeper issue involved, that of a pharmaceutical company providing objective, scientific, and complete information on its products whether at home in the United States or abroad.

We heartily endorse Mr. Squibb's recommendations that Boards of Directors must act more responsibly, "must question precisely the way their organization is carrying out its social responsibility and set specific standards and guidelines for the promotion of its products" and that "corporate officers and directors should be held personally responsible for all the actions of their companies and particularly those which affect the health and welfare of their customers" and that such responsibility should be strictly enforced.

The information given or not given by a pharmaceutical company about its product can and does always very directly mean life or death, health or sickness to its consumers and whether it is one or the other depends basically on the integrity and vigilance of the Board of Directors, the officers, and the personnel of the company. Otherwise, as Mr. Squibb said, "If the pharmaceutical industry cannot find within its own operations the solution to the obvious problem it creates for itself by promotional practices which set different standards for different peoples, then a solution will be forced on it in one way or another from outside."

Also the failure, from our point of view, of the Parke Davis Company to produce a Chloromycetin Monograph for its international locations comparable to the one worked out with the FDA for United States makes one seriously question whether even with the best of intentions a pharmaceutical company can give objectives, scientific, and complete information on its products when it must also serve its other commercial responsibility to its stockholders.

Will there continue to be unnecessary deaths such as the one of a young woman, a Mrs. Anderson, who followed almost exactly in our Judy's footsteps the following summer and died the same way—slowly, painfully, and unnecessarily—but in her case the coroner has the bottle containing chloramphenicol which she bought over the counter in Spain for a minor "smokers" cough? Or will these hearings spur action to bring about necessary change?