

Moving from the general to the specific, the two major university-related non-profit organizations in Alabama which might fittingly establish the research foundation to which we have referred, are the Auburn University School of Pharmacy and/or of Veterinary Medicine and the University of Alabama Medical School. The authorities of the University of Alabama Medical Center and Medical School have, however, stated that directing and operating such drug testing programs is not within their sphere of interest. On the other hand, they would be happy to do all that they reasonably could do to aid in providing proper medical care to the prisoners and in protecting them from the possible harmful effects of drug testing. Preliminary discussions with Auburn University have been encouraging since this University has all the necessary potential and excellent leaders. This committee thanks both universities for the interest and attention they have given to this matter.

We are thus suggesting that all research protocols from drug companies and others be submitted to a new research foundation (hopefully sponsored by Auburn University) which would review these protocols.

After approval by the Foundation Controlling Board (with advice from the Prison Experimental Review Committee) the Board of Corrections would consider the proposal from the point of view of prison organization; and if they approved, submit it to the Medical Director and Warden of the Prison in which the experiment is to be conducted. Any one of these groups or individuals would have the right to reject the program with *written* justification for their decision. (This might reduce the number of programs or participants from the present excessive level, but it would introduce adequate safeguards for the health of the prisoners.)

Note that we have refrained from mentioning Southern Food and Drug Research and Dr. Stough. Obviously such a proposed system of controls would require considerable changes in his present operation. In a free enterprise system properly regulated he would have every right to submit his programs to the research foundation for consideration. Other interested parties might do likewise. No firm or individual should hold an exclusive contract to conduct experiments within the prison system. Each would be judged on its merit, safety and efficacy.

We are assuming, however, that in the vast majority of instances the research foundation would be asked not only to review the protocol, but also to undertake the research envisaged in the protocol. It would seem reasonable to assess the firms submitting research projects not only for direct costs, but also to cover the costs of the additional safeguards to the prisoners (including those of the Prison Experimental Review Committee) required by the research foundation and the Board of Corrections.

Pursuant to an amendment of the initial request made by the Board of Corrections, this committee has considered what it believes to be suitable alternatives to the present drug testing procedure in whole—or certainly in part—where needs are apparent.

These suggestions have been incorporated in Figure 1. Admittedly, both planning and money will be needed to implement an ideally structured program. The numbered items are discussed further in the text of this report, following immediately after Figure 1.