

testified here the other day. Let me read from something he wrote in 1960 for the AMA Journal. Now it is almost 8 years later.

He states:

By some means, whether by regulation or self-discipline, promiscuous use of the drug should be avoided and its use restricted to impelling circumstances, that for conditions for which no other antibiotic is currently effective. Among 30 cases of aplastic anemia he had seen within the previous 3 years, he said 8 had received Chloromycetin.

Almost invariably for minor infections. Of the 10 most recent cases, five had followed therapy with Chloromycetin. The tragic thing about all of these seriously ill cases, most of whom died, is that the drug need never have been given at all.

He does not come up with the statistics that the California study does, and my guess is that this is true because the California study included all the cases that were reported because they concerned cases in which the drug was indicated, or at least a lot of them did.

Dr. GODDARD. Senator, let me make it perfectly clear—I am not trying to whitewash this drug, or the excessive use of this drug by the medical profession, or be in a defensive posture with respect to the Food and Drug Administration's certification of the drug. I am simply trying to point out there are instances where it is properly prescribed, and it will still cause problems.

The agency has, since 1952, made attempts to curb the excessive usage of this drug, and we will continue to try to reduce this to its proper level of usage.

I do not want you to get the impression that I am defending improper prescribing habits.

Senator NELSON. I did not intend to leave that impression. As a matter of fact, if you do not already know it, I have very high admiration for you. I do not think any previous Commissioner approaches you in the vigor with which you protect the public interest, and in your concern about it. I mean that in all sincerity.

But the cold, hard facts are that this issue is almost 20 years old, and not a damned thing has happened, except that we prescribe more, more, more. And we heard five witnesses last week who made guesses that 90 percent of the prescriptions are being given to people who should never have it—down to Dr. Mark Lepper's estimate that only one-third of 1 percent of all the cases who get it should get it. He is saying, then, that between 10,000 to 50,000 people out of 4 million who receive it should get it. Well, this is a disaster, a catastrophe. And I do not see how we can go on for 18 years saying we are doing everything we can.

We would be better off, actually, in view of what has happened, if we never gave the drug at all. It is doing more harm than good. But the least we can do is get good and tough about how it is used, and under what circumstances. Four million people take this drug each year—it is just preposterous. And I do not understand why we just do not get tougher than nails about it.

These warnings in the package insert, and in the journal advertisements, mean absolutely nothing. A representative of that company sat right here before me and acknowledged that they ran an ad in the British Medical Journal, February 1967, without a word of warning, while they ran one 7 days later in this country with the warning.