some relationship with industry. And I think your question about consumer representation is one that concerns a number of us; and one way to handle that might be to forget this idea that everybody is simply an individual scientist and recognize their relations, and then pick some members to be public members of the committee. I have suggested that myself.

Mr. GORDON. The PMA came to the Drug Research Board to get it to endorse the antisubstitution laws. Why would the PMA come to the Drug Research Board, anyhow? Do they feel that an endorsement by a prestigious National Academy of Sciences would help them meet the attacks on the drug antisubstitution laws?

Dr. PITTMAN. I assume that was right. The DRB was founded, I think, from the initiative of the industry back in the early sixties, after the thalidomide episode. And industry has always been interested in actions of the DRB. And I think they just saw this as another channel to ward off changes in the antisubstitution laws.

Well, at the March 25 meeting the initial resolution was proposed. The APhA liaison representative, Dr. Penna, objected. And an ad hoc committee of Dr. Hussey and myself was appointed. And we met on the 21st of June of 1974 with representatives of the APhA. Dr. Hussey and I expected exhortations but instead were impressed by the data presented by the APhA representatives. And we prepared—I prepared—a revised draft resolution and sent this to Mr. Trexler of the DRB with a copy to Dr. Hussey.

On September 26, 1974, a joint meeting was held of representatives of DRB, APhA, and PMA. Another draft of the resolution was prepared and worked over in considerable detail. It contained six points, the last of which stated that any financial savings resulting from the altered procedures should be passed on in full to the patient. Despite considerable discussion of possible mechanisms, those attending this meeting concluded that it would probably be unwise to include details of operational mechanisms for the actual prescribing in the recommended resolution.

Then on October 25, 1975, a formal resolution drafted from the minutes of the meeting of September 26 was presented to the full DRB at its regular fall meeting. The anticipated presentation to the DRB had been announced prior to the meeting on the agenda, mailed to the DRB members before the meeting, as "Resolution on Antisubstitution Legislation." After further discussion and reworking of the exact wording, the resolution was adopted unanimously by the DRB, with Dr. Richard Crout abstaining because of his position in the FDA.

Mr. GORDON. May I ask a question at this point? At the top of the page you stated "Dr. Hussey and I expected exhortations but instead were impressed by the data presented by the APhA representatives."

You also stated that the PMA urged and did finally get on November 1973 a draft resolution endorsing the existing antisubstitution laws. What kind of data did the PMA submit to support its position?

Dr. PITTMAN. Well, there are four tables in the attachment here. And those are the main data.

Mr. GORDON. I am talking about the PMA. What did the PMA submit?

Dr. PITTMAN. The PMA did not submit any data.