

Prisoners often covered up severe reactions in order to keep on with the tests, and several told The Montgomery Advertiser that they shammed taking pills and later spit them out. The medical group said of one inmate:

"He had hung on to the end [of a test] although he had been feeling very ill and had not complained of this illness because it would have meant his losing the pay which he was hoping to receive for his participation."

One conscientious experimenter who has gone deeply into the question of fees believes that a prospective subject should be offered no more than two or three times the amount he would receive without taking part.

NUREMBERG CODE CITED

The medical investigators underlined the importance of the fees and inadequate explanations of the tests by attaching to their report the Nuremberg Code, developed after the concentration camp excesses of Nazi doctors.

The code calls for "free power of choice" and holds that a subject "should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision."

The Alabama committee also inspected Dr. Stough's laboratory. Its role in analysis samples taken from the inmates was especially important since the direct medical observation was rated low.

In one instance the group found an error of about 40 per cent in the control agent against which laboratory samples from about 20 prisoners were being measured. The investigators said:

"This was pointed out to the laboratory director and he excused it [on grounds that the committee rejected]. His attitude to us was unacceptable and reflected poor technique."

The operation "probably compares favorably with many small hospital laboratories in Alabama," the group concluded. But it "lacks the better qualified personnel and more careful quality control seen in better run laboratories."

The committee reported that on top of the other problems, both Dr. Stough and Dr. Long had "limited training in basic pharmacology." The available biographical information shows they had no formal education in the field at all.

"You might say they have had a lot of on-the-job training and background," one clinical pharmacologist said. "But this is a weak argument. Nowadays, with the sophistication of modern drugs, you need more than this."

Last May, after the State Board of Corrections had a look at the committee's report, Dr. Stough received another eviction notice and started to close down the drug studies in Alabama.

Thus, Dr. Stough suffered another setback. As before, a state saved its prisons from any further trouble. But as usual, the Federal authorities and the pharmaceutical companies remained silent.

ONLY ONE PHYSICIAN

The single physician employed by the Food and Drug Administration to investigate drugs tests throughout the United States has visited Dr. Stough's operations twice, an agency spokesman said.

Some citizens tend to think of the agency as an eternally vigilant organization, and in his dealings with local officials and newspapermen Dr. Stough has turned this misapprehension to advantage.

"They [F.D.A. officials] love to close people down," he said in the brief telephone conversation in which he refused to grant an interview. "So if I was off-color, they'd be on me like a hawk."

"That's one of the reasons the [Alabama Corrections] Board wasn't concerned," explained Frank Lee, the state's commissioner. "We knew they [F.D.A. officials] came in here and looked into the operation."

Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., the F.D.A. Commissioner, branded Dr. Stough's assertion "a non sequitur."

The Food and Drug Administration's lone medical inspector is alert to "flagrant" dishonesty, and there have been men who tested drugs on nonexistent people and who produced imaginary results.

But an inspection is limited mostly to checking data that have been submitted to the sponsoring drug company to insure that it agrees with data sent to the agency. There is little or no effort to look behind the figures.