

3. A. H. Robins Company—Agency Martin & Woltz, Inc. Product—Robitussin DM, Entozyme, and Exna—attached is copy of our letter of December 28, 1966. None of these have run as ads in our journal.

4. Pharmacia Laboratories Inc.—Agency Paul Klemtner & Company—Product Azulfadine. Attached is copy of our letters of December 14, 1966 and December 20, 1966 indicating their willingness to comply.

5. Organon, Inc.—Agency Erwin Wasey, Inc.—Product Accellerase. Attached note dated December 15, 1966—Did not comply with suggestion so agency cancelled contract.

6. Massengill Laboratories—Agency Ramsdell Buckley & Company—Product Obedrin LA. Attached is letter of November 23, 1966 speaks for itself.

7. Lederle Laboratories—Product Levoprome submitted for exhibit. Rejected by committee because no reprints were submitted to substantiate claims made.

8. Key Pharmaceuticals—Product Nitroglyn. See attached letters dated January 13, 1967, to the company and letter of January 24, 1966 making changes requested.

9. Bristol Laboratories—Product Prostaphlin—Agency Sudler & Hennessey. This is the one I mentioned at the hearing. I was in error at the time this occurred and also that they cancelled all ads with us. They only cancelled the ads for Prostaphlin but continued advertising other products namely, Kantrex—January to June, 1967 and April to November, 1968—Polycillin—all of 1967 and January, 1968; May & October to December, 1968. Attached letters explain our impasse over Prostaphlin.

Memo to me October 18, 1963

Letter to Mr. Phillips, A.C.P. Advertising Manager from Mr. Wilkins.

Letter, October 28, 1963 to Mr. Wilkins from Mr. Phillips.

Intermittently we had inquiries about again considering a Prostaphlin ad—My letter of March 18, 1968 is self explanatory.

Finally my letter of March 19, 1969 resolves the problem because the company has submitted copy satisfactory to the committee.

If there are other questions we can answer please write me.

Sincerely,

EDWARD C. ROSENOW, Jr., M.D.,
Executive Director.

Memo to: E. C. Rosenow, Jr., M.D.

From: Andrew P. Phillips.

Date: October 18, 1963.

Re Bristol Laboratories, Prostaphlin advertisement scheduled for the November issue.

In reviewing the November proofs sent from Lancaster Press I noted that the changes which the committee requested has not been made. The changes are as follows:

The heading of the advertisement reads "Whenever You Suspect Staff", the committee suggested that this copy be changed to read "In Staff Infections." Also the word "suspected" appearing on the first line in the first paragraph would be changed to the word "present" and that the asterisk appearing in the close of the first sentence and foot note at the bottom of the page be deleted.

I immediately called the agency regarding these changes. After a lengthy conversation, the agency called Bristol Laboratories and they had informed us that no change would be made in the copy as it is a repeat of the October advertisement. Their interpretation of our letter was that they felt this being a repeat would not require a change. However, they are aware that all future advertisements must be approved by the committee before they procede in preparing plates.

The complete issue is at Lancaster Press and locked-up to run. If we cancelled this spread it would have meant using College ads, which unfortunately we cannot supply. Therefore, I informed the agency and client that we would run this advertisement for this issue.

I realized our instructions could be interpreted as future copy as opposed to *New Copy*, to future advertisement which could be repeats of previous insertions.