

Dr. PITTMAN. That is correct. So that the allegation now that the resolution has nothing to do with such laws does not make any sense.

Mr. GORDON. One other thing. Have you covered the July 11, 1973, meeting?

Dr. PITTMAN. I was reading through those seven meetings briefly. The July 11, 1973, one was the executive direction with the representatives of PMA and DRB, at which the whole question was brought up.

Mr. GORDON. As I understand it, the PMA came to the Drug Research Board and wanted the Drug Research Board to endorse the antisubstitution laws; is that correct?

Dr. PITTMAN. I was not at that particular meeting. I was at all the other six of these seven. That is my understanding, that the PMA has a list of organizations which endorses these laws and wanted the DRB to take a look at this and endorse the laws also. And initially the reaction was that these laws do protect the public, and ward off phony drugs, and therefore we ought to endorse them.

The more we studied the matter the more we thought that that was not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Dr. PITTMAN. After the drafting of this initial resolution and urging that the existing antisubstitution laws be supported, this was presented at the meeting of the full DRB at its regular spring meeting. During the discussion the liaison representative of the APhA—American Pharmaceutical Association—to the DRB objected on two grounds: that the DRB misunderstood the position of the APhA on drug prescribing and dispensing, and that the APhA had not had an opportunity to present its case, while the PMA had. Chairman of the DRB appointed two representatives from DRB, Dr. Hugh Hussey of the AMA—American Medical Association—and myself, to meet as an ad hoc committee with representatives from the APhA.

Mr. GORDON. Let me backtrack for a second. At the 30th of November 1973 meeting, which was an executive session, the draft resolution was passed which strongly endorsed the existing antisubstitution laws. Now, are these sessions open to the public? Are they announced well in advance?

Dr. PITTMAN. No, they are not open to the public officially. My understanding is that the National Academy of Sciences and ancillary organizations are private organizations.

Mr. GORDON. I thought that the National Academy of Sciences was sort of a quasi-governmental organization, whatever that means.

Dr. PITTMAN. Quasi maybe is not quite the same thing. My understanding is that they are not required by the law to function in the same manner as the Federal Government with regard, for example, to the freedom of information.

Mr. GORDON. What bothers me is that some of these issues affect the public. Would it be your opinion that consumer advocates and others representing the public should have an opportunity to attend?

Dr. PITTMAN. My feeling about that, which is strictly my own personal idea, is that everybody has a bias, and that not to recognize that is not to recognize nature. That is, the membership of the DRB is said to be drawn from individual scientists for their individual scientific expertise. Some of those, in fact many of those, have had