## **MARCH 1979**

VOLUME 68 NUMBER 3

## JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL **SCIENCES** 8

(ISSN 0022-3549)

MARY H. FERGUSON Editor

SHELLY ELLIOTT Production Editor

JANIS KELLY Copy Editor

EDWARD G. FELDMANN Contributing Editor

SAMUEL W. GOLDSTEIN **Contributing Editor** 

BELLE R. BECK Editorial Secretary

DAVID BOHARDT **Director of Publications** 

L. LUAN CORRIGAN Assistant Director of Publications

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

JOHN AUTIAN	HERBERT A. LIEBERMAN
NORMAN R.	
FARNSWORTH	DAVID E. MANN, JR.
WILLIAM O. FOYE	GERALD J. PAPARIELLO
WILLIAM J. JUSKO	EDWARD G. RIPPIE

The Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences is published monthly by the American Pharmaceutical Association (APhA) at 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing office. All expressions of opinion and statements of supposed fact appearing in articles or editorials carried in this journal are published on the authority of the writer over whose name they appear and are not to be regarded as necessarily expressing the policies or views of APhA. Offices—Editorial, Advertising, and Subscription: 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037. Printing: 20th & Northampton Streets, Easton, PA 18042. Annual Subscriptions—United States and foreign,

Annual Subscriptions—United States and foreign, industrial and government institutions \$50, educational institutions \$50, individuals *for personal use only* \$30; single copies \$5. All foreign subscriptions add \$5 for postage. Subscription rates are subject to change without notice. Subscription rates are subject to change without notice. Members of APhA may elect to receive the Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences as a part of their annual \$70 (foreign \$75) APhA membership dues. Claims—Missing numbers will not be supplied if dues or subscriptions are in arrears for more than 60 days or if claims are received more than 60 days after the date of the issue or if loss used due to failure to give notion of hears of

sue, or if loss was due to failure to give notice of change of address. APhA cannot accept responsibility for foreign delivery when its records indicate shipment has been mada

Change of Address—Members and subscribers should notify at once both the Post Office and APhA of any change

of address. Photocopying—The code at the foot of the first page of the the provided normalisation for an article indicates that APhA has granted permission for copying of the article beyond the limits permitted by Sec-tions 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law provided that the copier sends the per copy fee stated in the code to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., P.O. Box 8891, Boston,

Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., P.O. Box 8391, Boston, MA 02114. Copies may be made for personal or internal use only and not for general distribution. **Microfilm**—Available from University Microfilms In-ternational, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. © Copyright 1979, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20037; all rights reserved

## **RISKING PUBLIC CREDIBILITY**

"Wolf! Wolf!" they cried, and the fattened calves no longer came to market. This resulted because of fear that hormone-supplemented animal feed might lead to residues in meat and, upon consumption, such residues would induce cancer in those people ingesting such products.

"Wolf! Wolf!" they cried, and food store shelves were swept clean of cyclamate sweetener products, also out of fear of their alleged carcinogenicity.

"Wolf! Wolf!" they cried, and we witnessed the ludicrous sight of state highway crews in Maryland digging up roads in an effort to eliminate asbestos-containing gravel which also has been suspected of having carcinogenic properties.

And so on, we have witnessed a whole host of products indicted as cancer-causing agents that must be eliminated from the marketplace at any and all costs.

Initially, such accusations were made carefully, and only after reasonable proof was produced, as in the case with smoking as a causative factor with regard to lung, throat, and mouth cancer. But the movement rapidly has escalated in more recent years to the point where reckless charges are leveled and corrective actions are quickly initiated on the basis of only the most meager evidence. It is almost as if the political excesses of the French Revolution, or of the Senator McCarthy era in the United States, had been revived in the guise of misdirected science and runaway regulation.

Smoked bacon, charcoal-grilled steaks, chlorine-treated drinking water, plastic soft drink bottles, fire-resistant treated sleepwear, hair dyes, and saccharin are just a few of the many other familiar products which have been tarred with the broad brush of "carcinogenic" often on the flimsiest of grounds.

But recently there are signs that the broad swing of the pendulum may have reached its zenith and that it is returning toward reasonableness.

"Regulation" in its general sense appears to be growing less popular with President Carter and his White House advisors. The President's economic report to Congress in late January suggested that compliance with overzealous environmental, health, and safety regulations represents a big drag on productivity. Although regulation is certainly worthwhile, the report went on to declare that "regulation is very costly; benefits should be closely compared with costs."

But even more targeted to the cancer-scare phobia discussed above, we were gratified to read some words of sanity coming from a very unexpected source-the Consumer Product Safety Commission, a relative new-comer agency on the federal scene, and one that on other matters has generated a rather deserved label of being "an extremist in the pursuit of safety."

No less than the vice-chairman of the CPSC, Commissioner Barbara Hackman Franklin, has been telling a variety of public and private groups such down-to-earth things as: "You can't just ban things because they cause cancer. That's too simple."

Our scientist-readers may not be impressed with this statement, but in politically-sensitive Washington to speak such truths is seen as career-suicide or even heresy. Heads have been known to roll for much less reason.

But as Commissioner Franklin wisely has pointed out in a series of speeches she has delivered over the past year: Consumers are confused and being increasingly "turned off" by the bombardment of warnings about the cancer-causing potential of many products. People want answers about causes of cancer, but they are frustrated by the proliferation of cancer warnings.

She has been preaching a message in her talks across the country that we need to generate a unified, thoughtful, and well-reasoned approach to regulatory actions intended to protect the public against real cancer threats. She has even addressed President Carter on several occasions with specific proposals to "plot an effective course of action which would make sense for industry, government, and most of all, for consumers-those who feel increasingly confused or cynical.'

Commissioner Franklin appears to be saying to all who will listen that we can only tell people "Wolf! Wolf!" so often before both scientists and political leaders lose their credibility on the subject. Then the public will not believe us even when something comes along with a 100% fatality rate in submicro quantities! -EGF