to others, getting this very potent, dangerous drug. It wouldn't have been stopped by FDA; it wouldn't have been stopped by the AMA, which would continue to take ads for chloramphenicol saying, "When it counts, use chloramphenicol."

I think the whole business is a disgrace and a real shocker that ought to scare every person in the United States.

Now, what has the FDA got in mind about suggesting what we do about controlling the advertising so it does not overpromote and controlling what the detail man says to the physician? On that aspect of it, at least, we ought to get some recommendations from FDA.

Now, the continuing education of the doctor, that is something that I don't expect is your business. That tremendous failure is the fault of the medical profession, and it is a terrible indictment in my judgment. But I would like to know what we are going to do to keep another chloramphenicol case from occurring in this country, and with the present company saying, "Well, the usage of the drug dropped off because of the hearings but it will come back again." What he means to say is, "We will promote it again, and we will have people dying from aplastic anemia for a prescription of chloramphenicol for an infected tooth or acne or hangnail." That is what was happening, and the company is willing to do it again. I don't know what kind of standard of ethics is followed by this company, by business people, but it seems to me the FDA has got some positive responsibility to take this fight head on, if you are going to protect the public interest. I don't know who else is going to do it.

The Congress isn't qualified to do it. It is just by accident that this chloramphenicol case came up at these hearings, but it takes the expertise of the people in the field to do this, and I don't know how it is going to be done. It seems to me the FDA ought to do something about it. You have the expertise. I would like to know what you think ought to be done about it. The advertising of this drug is ridiculous. The FDA knows about the testimony before this subcommittee by Parke, Davis that: "We don't list any side effects at all of Chloromycetin in England because the law doesn't require it. We don't list any other country because the law doesn't require it."

When we asked "Why not," the company's representative said, "We comply with the law of the country in which we sell," all of which means, "We can promote it over there and make a profit on the deaths of other people."

I think something has got to be done about this business, and I would like to know if FDA has some ideas about controlling the promotion of these drugs so the doctor isn't misled, because the fact is, the hard, cold, sad fact is, that the great, distinguished American medical profession in substantial numbers is being misled by promotional advertising and detail men, and the proof is in the record abundantly. This is a grave reflection on the American medical profession, not all of them of course, but it is a reflection on the medical profession just in the chloramphenicol case alone. How do we know that there isn't another case like this coming?

I would like to know what the FDA's ideas are for legislation or something, regulations to be proposed to the Congress. You have got the expertise. We don't.

Maybe that isn't your function. It may be an unfair question. I address it to the whole of FDA. I suppose it is Dr. Ley's responsi-