

liberations of the Drug Research Board than was just presented in testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. If you would like, you can either respond now, or if you would prefer to look at the record itself and draft your response later and submit it in a week or 10 days, you may do that, either one.

Mr. STETLER. With your permission I would like to do a little of brief, because this is a complex and complicated issue. And I think you probably can detect that from what you have heard already today.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, it will get more complex as you deal with it.

Mr. STETLER. No, I am going to try and clarify it for you a little bit.

The CHAIRMAN. You may handle this in any way you desire.

Mr. STETLER. I will give it to you right now. It will be brief.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We would like to have it, I suppose, juxtaposed with the previous testimony. Go ahead.

Mr. STETLER. First of all, the issue of substitution law repeal or retention was an issue that was brought to the Drug Research Board's attention by the PMA. But we did not approach them. The PMA was invited by the Drug Research Board to have a meeting with the DRB to discuss a variety of subjects. In response to that invitation, we prepared an agenda with Duke Trexler, their executive secretary. And one of the items on that agenda was the effort to repeal State drug ant substitution laws. And we did discuss it.

Subsequently at a later meeting of the Drug Research Board, a resolution was presented which would have attempted to sustain the present laws. A representative of the American Pharmaceutical Association asked for an opportunity to comment, and they were given that opportunity, and properly should have been. They had a meeting, a separate meeting with Dr. Pittman and Dr. Hussey, a committee of two were appointed by DRB to consider it. On that occasion they were invited to submit material, which they did.

Later, representatives of the PMA and APhA met with Pittman and Hussey on September 26th. The resolution that was discussed, although not agreed to at that time, was different from the resolution that went to the Drug Research Board on October 25th. I didn't attend the meeting on October 25th, although our representatives were there.

You asked a question which I think deserves clarification. Was the resolution adopted tantamount to an agreement in support of generic prescribing? It is important to know that on October 25th, Dr. Azarnoff, a member of the Drug Research Board, moved that the resolution be amended to be very specific in support of generic prescribing. That amendment was specifically rejected by the Drug Research Board. Since there was a vote on that issue, I think it is clear that they didn't mean to endorse generic prescribing.

I would agree that the "resolved" at the October 25th resolution is ambiguous. And I think the trade press account that interpreted it in very different ways indicates that it has been read by different people differently.