

ing that the DPSC does not do a good GMP inspection. But if you ask the question on the basis of this piece of paper that you have supplied to us, the answer is "no" in our view.

Mr. GORDON. Well, that is what they supplied to us in response to our request.

Now, Mr. Loftus was in Philadelphia. Perhaps he might tell us what they are doing there and the significance of what they are doing.

Mr. LOFTUS. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, when I got these answers I sent wires out to six of our field district offices and I said, the Department of Defense has furnished us this information. DPSC has furnished us this information. They furnished it to the Nelson subcommittee, and we sent it out to you. What did you do about it? What did you think of it in your judgment?

These people are professionals. They have been in Food and Drug a long time. They are management people. They have been in a lot of drug firms. And I have wires back from four of those districts, and I have telephone reports from the other two. I believe there are 25 of these reports here, and I think I have 18 or 19 reports back. Some of them we never got. One involved a foreign firm that we did not inspect.

But what comes out of it is that in one instance the district said in response to a recent inspection that was reported to us by DPSC, yes, Mr. Feinberg was right. We have documented what he said and we are going to do something about it. You will get a regulatory recommendation of some sort. I got that telephone report.

In the main, they said, we either made an inspection as a result of the report or we had already made an inspection or we evaluated it, and in our opinion it was either not a GMP problem at all, or if it was, it was a minor GMP problem.

What I am saying to you is that representatives of six different field districts of the Food and Drug Administration—I am talking about management people who have been in the Food and Drug Administration a long time—arrived at value judgments that in the main—not in every case, but in the main—these are relatively minor things.

Now, I do not want to put this, or take this thing out of perspective. Nothing, nothing is completely minor. What we aim for, Mr. Feinberg aims for, is absolute perfection. Absolute perfection does not exist in a drug firm. It does not exist in this room. It does not exist in my home or yours. But we aim for it. We do not minimize and we do not belittle what Mr. Feinberg has reported to us. We are glad to get it.

As a matter of fact, when we make an inspection, at the end of that inspection our inspectors do precisely what Mr. Feinberg's inspectors do. They write down on a piece of paper a list of everything they find wrong in their opinion with the firm, including, if it is so, an unscreened window that has been locked for years. They will report that, too, for the edification and the knowledge of the management, a goodwill gesture. We do this. We are not required by law to do it. We do it as a simple gesture of goodwill toward the industry, here is what our inspector found. Look to it.