A druggist, about 2 blocks from my office asked me "How did you happen to give him Chloromycetin?" This was in 1952. And I said, "This was the one drug that I thought was harmless."

The pharmacist told me, "I told that representative 3 days before that that the drug was harmful, that a lady had died in Pasadena"—which was about 3 miles away from my office. So the representative of Parke, Davis knew at the time he gave me that drug, he deliberately lied to me that the drug was harmless.

And as I said, I went home and some days later gave it to my son, and that was the cause.

This representative of Parke, Davis was given a 3 months' leave of absence. He later sold his home and moved out of the area. I understand his health was not too good after that.

Parke, Davis has been one of the leading grant pharmaceutical companies, but by strange coincidence these grants always seemed to go where the criticism of their product, Chloromycetin, was the hottest, as to Dr. Doan, of the Ohio State University; University of Michigan; and many, many others. Mysteriously very little criticism of Chloromycetin continued from these schools after a Parke, Davis grant. A Dr. T. E. Woodward, University of Maryland, and many others receiving substantial funds were always very vociferous in their praise of the drug in the face of evidence of its toxicity.

It is my opinion that Parke, Davis was not nearly as interested in finding out why the drug was toxic as it was in stifling criticism.

A Dr. Smith, formerly of AMA Council of Drugs, which at that time was critical of Parke, Davis promotional tactics, was given an executive position with Parke, Davis, as was more recently a former FDA official. I think he is today president of Parke, Davis. There was a rumor Dr. Welch, former head of the Antibiotics Division of the FDA, had some financial interest in Parke, Davis.

While my own lawsuit was pending, a well-known ethical writer, David O. Woodbury, Scottsdale, Ariz., came into my office to inform me Parke, Davis' chief attorney from New York had contacted Mr. Woodbury in his New England home, flew up, and had breakfast with the only purpose in mind to find out about my character. Mr. Woodbury said he found it difficult to understand the gutter tactics of such a large, so-called ethical corporation.

There has never been adequate control of this drug or its advertising. The company was guilty of withholding all reports of reactions of the drug from the time of introduction until made to do so by AMA and FDA some 1½ to 2 years after its introduction. They engaged in a series of correspondence with the families of the victims, denying any reactions and trying to blame any such reports on other products like aspirin taken at the same time.

They were always very polite in expressing their sorrow at the loss of the child or the adult and were always glad, they said, to hear from the relatives of the victims at any future date. In my case, they were not so polite but accused me of vilifying their innocent officials.

They immediately, however, notified AMA and FDA of some reported reactions, reports which they had been withholding, for the first time after hearing from me because I told them I was writing to AMA and FDA concerning these reactions—reactions which they