

As for the UGDP study itself, I am not at this point going to discuss its scientific flaws in detail. Although I am a lawyer, not a scientist, I would emphasize, however, something which strikes me as very important; and it is the final paragraph of the UGDP study, which reads: "It should be noted that any conclusion reached in this study pertains only to the type of patients studied"—and a very particular group of people were studied—"and only to the specific hypoglycemic agents used. Extrapolation of findings obtained in the UGDP to other dosage schedules of the same drug"—and dosage schedules other than those used in clinical practice were used in that study—"or to other chemically related hypoglycemic agents not included in this study, must be made on a judgmental and nonstatistical basis."

Now, those are the words of the study itself. And yet, in spite of these words, we see an unfortunate extrapolation contrary to the very words of the UGDP study; and I would only say, Senator, that questions of—

The CHAIRMAN. May I say, just a moment? I was looking at the final paragraph, and the final paragraph, as it reads to me, is: "In conclusion,"—this is the—

Mr. CHAYET. Excuse me, Senator; it is the next-to-last paragraph at page 814 of the study. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me say this, so they juxtapose. "In conclusion, we consider, in the light of the UGDP findings, it remains with the proponents of the oral hypoglycemic to conduct scientifically adequate studies to justify the continued use of such agents."

Mr. CHAYET. Unfortunately, you are reading from the wrong study, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the Biometric Society Study.

Mr. CHAYET. I know. I am not talking about that, sir. What I said very clearly is that I am talking about the UGDP study. You see, this is how it goes.

The CHAIRMAN. I misunderstood.

Mr. CHAYET. This is how the confusion escalates.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry I misunderstood you. We will put the two together, so that everybody can read them. Go ahead with your testimony.

Mr. CHAYET. That will be fine, Senator.

As I said, I am not going to concentrate on the UGDP study itself, or even the specifics of the Biometric Study. I only want to make one point, and I would like to make it as clearly as I can. There is great controversy in this situation, and it is not going to go away. It does not matter how many people are lined up on either side—and I am perfectly cognizant of the fact that the press releases describe the blue-ribbon jury of experts who are for the UGDP, and when anybody on the other side is mentioned, they are referred to as a group of practicing physicians. I realize these are subtleties, but they are subtleties that have resulted from the fact that the Government has made a fundamental error in this situation; that is, it has tried to muzzle a controversy, which has been put forth in good faith by very eminent, very learned, and qualified people.

Now, I know that \$8 million and 10 years is a long time, and a lot of money, and criticism is difficult. It is not to be given or taken