

on the proposition that we will send drugs to Tanganyika, we will send to Latin American countries, we will send drugs to all the underdeveloped countries in the world and since they do not have any standards, we will fool them all we can and make a great big profit and never tell the doctors that there is a risk of serious blood dyscrasias. Is that what you are telling the committee?

Mr. CUTLER. No, sir. I think you know that, sir. This is a British Medical Society. The British doctors are sophisticated doctors, just as sophisticated as the doctors in this country. This meets all their requirements. This is, of course, only a small part of the information that goes to a British doctor.

Senator NELSON. That is not the testimony.

Mr. CUTLER. You are indicting every drug company in Great Britain and the United States.

Senator NELSON. Any company, drug company or any other kind of company, that would do that, I would be pleased to indict on moral grounds. I think they ought to be indicted on moral grounds. Your testimony is that you will meet the standards of the country in which you are advertising, not the standards of safety which the witness has testified is a proper standard, the proper ad which gives this warning that is put in ads in this country. But in countries where the people do not know any better, where the country is not protected by laws, you will tell us that you have no compunction about running an ad that will fool a doctor, as you did in California in 1961.

I will read this to you. I would think you would not sleep at night, frankly, you or any drug company that would do that.

On page 11 of "By Prescription Only," by Morton Mintz, it says that Dr. L. A. M. Watkins, La Canada, Calif., physician, prescribed Chloromycetin to his own son. In 1952, the boy died. In November 1961, the physician went before a California Senate committee and testified: "I do not know of one single victim who would not be alive today had he only been permitted to get well by himself; by nature without the use of antibiotics." Here is an American doctor. I do not know what he read about chloramphenicol. But if he read these ads without any warning, he might very well prescribe it and lose his own son. I do not understand what standard of ethics would govern a great industry of this country that would find it satisfactory to finally, under compulsion in this country, warn the public and warn the doctors about serious blood dyscrasias and then cavalierly advertise in another country without telling those people about the risks. I should think you people would not be able to sleep.

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think you are reaching awfully far to criticize a witness and a company that brought you some evidence that you have been asking for, for months, about therapeutic equivalency of various drugs. It so happens that the pharmaceutical industry, as you know, has believed that advertisements of drugs are not the primary source of information on which the doctor relies. In 1962, this issue was fought out in this Congress and it was decided by the Congress that all advertisements should contain brief summaries, warnings, of complications and side effects, and the FDA was given power to regulate in that area. These companies have done their very best to live up to that law, the need for which they did not agree