

direct interest, a financial interest, in a particular subject, he excludes himself from participating in any debate—as in Congress—or any decision which concerns it.

Dr. PITTMAN. Where are you going to draw the line? I don't believe any particular drug product was discussed at these meetings, so that you wouldn't say that it was this man's company.

Mr. GORDON. I know, but these are drugs.

Dr. PITTMAN. These are generalities, though. I think that is a difficult item. If you try to set up a committee of people who have nothing to do with the industry, then probably everybody on this committee would be excluded, because all of us, including me, have received grants and things from—

Mr. GORDON. That is another story. But here we have five members who are directly connected with the industry. They represent the industry, and to them the profits and sales of the industry are important. Their own companies' products are involved. How can they be objective?

Dr. PITTMAN. I don't believe anybody is objective except in that they can base their arguments on data. And this is my complaint in the PMA responses, that they are not based—

Mr. GORDON. There is no data; PMA didn't submit data, and the AMA didn't submit data.

Dr. PITTMAN. That is what I mean. The only data shown were those which came from the APhA.

The CHAIRMAN. On the very issue we are discussing—antissubstitution laws—of course there is a specific, important direct economic interest by any brand name company in seeing that the antissubstitution laws are not repealed, because prescribing drugs by their brand name freezes them in. So there is a very strong economic interest, and no matter what the argument is, you are unlikely to get prominent brand name companies to agree that their products are substitutable.

Dr. PITTMAN. I would only point out that at the March 14 meeting, again with all those individuals present, they voted 13 to 1 in favor of the resolution. I think it is a difficult issue which simply has to be resolved by the people running the meeting as to whether this is directly connected enough to require the individual to absent himself from the room.

Mr. GORDON. I refer to Dr. Drill's proposed paragraph in which he states that the physician should retain the responsibility for drug selection and that, "the Drug Research Board adopted no position with respect to the changes in, or repeal of, drug antissubstitution laws."

How do you interpret that to modify, if it does, the resolution that was actually adopted?

Dr. PITTMAN. I think it is incompatible. I think it doesn't make sense. I go on to say here, I was so irritated by that last statement here, the Drill clarifying statement, that I went home that night and wrote a letter back to Dr. Shideman requesting that this last statement be deleted, and that the Drug Research Board be polled by mail.

Now, I think cards were sent out. But I don't think any action has been taken on that. However, this clarifying statement was sent the following Monday, March 17, to the Assembly of Life Sciences, and