

Sarah Jenkins
1201 High Green
Portland, OR 97201
(503)368-9153

May 14, 2009

Karen Schott
President and CEO
Schott, Int'l.
100 Waverly Ave
Portland, OR 97201

Dear Madam President:

With this letter, I am officially terminating my employment and tendering my resignation, effective immediately.

After working for this company since its conception twenty-eight years ago, I find it impossible to reconcile my own values to the values this company now supports. I wish it had not come to this decision, but I cannot and will not implement a policy that forces employees to put themselves at risk by taking medication.

I understand that our lawyers have done thorough research into the legality of requiring our employees to be screened for psychological disorders and take the prescribed medicine, but I question the ethics behind such a decision. Under Oregon law, a litany of proceedings must be undertaken, including an investigation and a hearing, before a judge can declare someone mentally incompetent and therefore commit the person to an involuntary treatment program (Mental Health). If the government of our state must

undergo such lengthy processes before they can consider the mental state of one individual, who are we to arbitrarily force hundreds to take addictive drugs for the sake of productivity?

Whether the Board of Directors chooses to openly admit it or not, they are instituting this policy as a result of the rising productivity of our competitors who recently implemented similar policies. These policies are akin to athletes who use performance-enhancing drugs. Once an athlete is discovered, he or she is stripped of all their awards and honors and brought before the court on criminal charges. For our company, such a move would violate the respect earned over the years from employees and would destroy the integrity we fought so hard for in the marketplace. This drug might keep us equal in productivity to those competitors who have already succumbed to the allure of such a powerful drug, but it will ultimately destroy our reputation.

A business should never ask employees to compromise their well-being for the productivity of the company. By asking your employees to choose between their own health and their jobs, you force many into uncomfortable positions. Several letters from some of our older employees (some who have been here almost as long as I have) expressed concerns that if they refuse to submit to such policies and therefore lose their jobs, they will be unable to secure new employment because of their age, but they are not in a financial position to retire. At the other end of the spectrum, several expectant mothers voiced their protests to the new policy because no testing was performed on pregnant women, and they will not sacrifice the possible health of their unborn child for

the sake of productivity. If they refuse, they can't afford the financial loss of resigning from their positions right now. The Board of Directors of a company with our reputation for employee satisfaction should not consider a policy where the health and well-being of our employees are put at risk.

The risks extend outside of just the elderly and the pregnant mothers; it extends to all who might take such a drug. This is a new drug, and while I have faith in the capabilities of the FDA to regulate medication, the long-term risks are unknown. Many drugs over the course of the FDA have been recalled when the long-term effects began to show after several years of use by the public. Vioxx, a well known prescription pain-killer came onto the market in 1999, but was recalled in 2004 because of a high risk for developing heart disease ("Vioxx"). It was reported a few months later that the drug was responsible for as many as "140,000 cases of heart disease" and "56,000 deaths" ("Vioxx"). If the unforeseen consequences of this new drug Albetanow rival even a sampling of these damages, the number of incidents of disease or death might be double or triple what they might have been had not major companies, ours included, forced their employees to submit to treatment.

I am also concerned about the potentially addictive nature of this drug. The FDA reports of this drug are not condemnatory, but they do mention that some patients suffered from "severe withdrawal symptoms" when they attempted to discontinue use of Albetanow. Today, many people suffer from addiction to drugs "such as...anti-depressants" and other prescription drugs ("Drug"). By subjecting your employees to this potentially debilitating

and addictive drug, you put not only their health at risk, but their lives as well. And, while not all employees who take Albetanow will become addicted, it is shameful that the Board of Directors would sacrifice even one life for the overall production of the company.

These risks would affect not only the people who take the drugs but the company as well. Since this drug would potentially be used as a part of a mandatory policy, the company could be held responsible for the potential illnesses or deaths caused by Albetanow in the future. The risks of this drug seem incomparably high: death and financial ruin. Why take such a careless leap for a simple rise in productivity?

I believe there is another significant question that has not been answered by our illustrious Board. Will they too be required to undergo psychological screenings? Will our President? Will the leaders of this company be subjected to the same treatment as their employees or will it simply be a matter of experimenting with the lower rungs of our business hierarchy?

On the other hand, I have watched for the past twenty years as my younger brother suffered with true depression. He suffered not only mental and physical anguish but emotional and financial troubles as well. He was never able to maintain his employment for a long period of time, or his relationships with friends and family. He sought help from many psychologists and psychiatrists over the years, but no matter how many drug cocktails he took or behavior therapy sessions he attended, he could not overcome his

debilitating mental illness until he took Albetanow. Thus, I would strongly urge any employee who has been experiencing any of the symptoms of depression- persistent sadness, feelings of guilt or worthlessness, anxiety, insomnia, fatigue, and thoughts of suicide or death- to seek medical attention immediately (“Depression”). Depression is a serious mental illness that should not be overlooked. But the ridiculousness of requiring an entire company of over seven-hundred otherwise healthy employees to be screened and potentially forced to take medication that would alter their daily lives is unreasonable.

Therefore, I refuse to be the enforcer of such avaricious and deceptive policies. I respectfully withdraw my contract of employment from Schott, International. Thank you for the opportunity to watch this company grow from a small, cramped store-front to the spacious office building we now occupy. I believe that this company has enough spirit and potential to survive the competition without the help of drugs.

Respectfully yours,

Sarah Jenkins

Cc: Company memorandum

“Depression Symptoms.” MedicineNet.com. 2000. 10 Oct. 2007. <<http://www.medicinenet.com/script/main/art.asp?articlekey=18543>>

“Drug Addiction.” Drug Treatment Centers Alcohol Rehab Dual Diagnosis and Addiction Recovery. 9 Feb. 2006. 10 Oct. 2007. <<http://www.treatment-centers.net/drug-addiction.html>>

Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities; Alcohol and Drug Abuse. 2005. Stat. 35.426.070-150.

“Vioxx Recalled-Drug Maker Sites Increased Risk of Heart Attack and Stroke.” Drug Recalls. 10 Oct. 2007 <<http://www.drugrecalls.com/vioxx.html>>