

Yes, this was one of the suggestions that came out of that meeting.

Q. All right.

Were you at that meeting in Chicago?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Doctor, I will ask you, at this meeting, and I'm reading from Defendant's Exhibit Q—this statement was not made by Dr. Mitchell at the meeting:

"Dr. MITCHELL. Could I come back to this?

"As you have referred to anticoagulants, the reason why I am so unhappy about Dr. Tietze's study is that I had the privilege of serving on the Medical Research Council study group on long-term anti-coagulant therapy, and I have seen some of the difficulties that arise. Dr. Tietze makes the point that the answer is wanted two or three months before yesterday. Is it better to get a real answer from a well-planned prospective study taking three years, even though it costs two and a half million dollars, than a rapid answer from not such a well-planned retrospective study, costing much less? Which is going to give the answer?

"Surely it is the right answer we want, not the quickest or the cheapest or the most convenient."

A. I don't remember the exact words, but I'm willing to accept the fact that he did say it just that way.

Q. Well, do you have any question about that statement?

A. No, sir.

Q. I will hand you Defendant's Exhibit Q. Doctor, and ask you if those words do not appear in the first paragraph on page 66?

(Defendant's Exhibit Q handed to witness.)

By the WITNESS:

A. Yes, sir. This is as read.

By Mr. MAY (Continuing):

Q. Did you ever obtain any requests of Dr. Sise or any recommendation from a Dr. Sise about the best way to tell about this thing would be a prospective study?

A. I don't remember exactly that, but I think everyone agrees that this would be the best way to carry out such a study.

Q. All right.

And you never carried on a prospective study, as requested by these gentlemen, did you?

A. No, sir.

Q. I notice in Dr. Mitchell's statements he said the cost would be two million dollars.

Would this be an accurate estimate in your opinion as to the cost of this prospective study?

A. I really have no way of knowing, but I think it would be probably on the meager side.

I think probably it would cost more than that.

Q. Well, at that time, during 1963 and 1962, '64, '65, even, G. D. Searle and Company had money to spend for a prospective study of this type?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But they never spent it?

A. Not for that reason, though, no, sir.

Q. All right. Okay.

Doctor, are you familiar with the recommendations of the Wright Committee or the Ad Hoc Committee that was formed in 19—rendered in 1963?

A. I read them.

Q. Okay. I will ask you if this was not one of the recommendations:

"Any firm reliance on the risks as calculated is tempered by the assumptions made. This Committee recommends that a carefully planned and controlled prospective study be initiated with the objective of obtaining more conclusive data regarding the incidence of thromboembolism and death from such conditions in both untreated females and those under treatment of this among the pertinent age groups."

Do you recall that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did G. D. Searle Company conduct such a study after this recommendation was made?

A. We discussed it at great length, but no, we did not.