This legislation, Sen. Thaler said, got a "little farther." It passed the Senate, but was defeated in the state assembly. He has reintroduced the measure and called for public hearings on experimentation in the state.

MAJOR CRACK

By scheduling hearings at which state hospital officials, medical associations and individual doctors can testify, Sen. Thaler may have opened the first major public debate on the need for legislation to control human experimentation.

It is a debate in which Dr. Saul Krugman feels his position is already clear.

"The most important factor in assuring ethical and careful medical experimentation is to have physicians with great integrity."

Dr. Krugman is the physician in charge of the Willowbrook experiments and to him the attack levelled by Sen. Thaler and the news media was uninformed and ruthlessly harmful to medical science.

"No one ever came to me and asked about our work. Sen. Thaler never called me. The first I heard of the charges was when a newscaster called me at 11 a.m and asked me to prepare a retort by the 6 o'clock news."

SCIENCE

According to Dr. Krugman, the Willowbrook experiments were approached with the greatest of scientific care and responsibility.

He claims the project was cleared by University Hospital officials, state school doctors and review boards of Federal agencies and that furthermore the physicians had permission of the parents.

Dr. Krugman acknowledges that the method of obtaining consent has changed, and now reports that a doctor takes time out to brief parents carefully on all aspects of the experiment before consent is asked. It is still obtained in writing, he said.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 26, 1968]

SELF-DISCIPLINE OR FORCE OF LAW?—THE RACE IS ON TO REGULATE MEDICAL TESTS

(By Nicholas Horrock)

The Department of Public Welfare this week is expected to release a new policy proposal governing the use of human beings under its care in medical research.

The policy review was instituted by Dr. Jack Kleh, Welfare medical director, after a series of articles in The Washington Daily News revealed that retarded children, juvenile delinquents and the elderly were being used in tests of such drugs as a diet pill compound, tranquilizers an acne treatment and a patent medicine.

In many of these cases, the department could not document that it sought or received the consent of the patient or the family; in other cases it acknowledged it did not.

In its reviews, the District's Welfare Department has embarked on a problem which has received ever-increasing attention by legislators, physicians, and the general public.

Thru a series of interviews with doctors here and in other states, lawyers, and legislative experts, The News developed these points of stress.

Consent—The bulwark protection encompassed in all treatises on human experimentation since 1946 is "consent." It is a philosophy that a person must understand the hazard of the drug or operation he will undergo and must "consent" voluntarily to take part.

Many research physicians argue that the layman cannot truly comprehend the risks of an experiment and that "informed" consent is often impossible, yet it has remained an unwavering requirement.

Institutionalized guinea pigs—Medical researchers as well as many other sources contacted maintain that the human in an institution, (the prisoner, the mental patient, the retarded), present special problems to a reseacher looking for subjects for an experiment.

The British, for example, virtually exclude all these persons from medical experimentation at all.