

I wrote to Dr. Shideman long before the January 21st press release came out. I wrote to him twice in November 1974 indicating that I thought the resolution was confusing and that the intent of the Drug Research Board was not clear. I asked that it be reconsidered and clarified. Although we raised the issue, if they wanted to take a position in support of repeal of the drug substitution laws, so be it. But I frankly couldn't tell from the resolution which side of the issue they were on.

Although a meeting was set for March 14th, the subject was not on the agenda. There was a motion made by Dr. Kohlstaedt that it be made the first order of business. And under Robert's Rules of Order that was put to a vote by the chairman. And every member had to vote unanimously that this become the first item of business. They also voted, including Dr. Pittman.

Now, that issue was discussed for 3 hours and 15 minutes on March 14. And at the end of that time two actions were taken. They reaffirmed the resolution of October 25, and they adopted a clarifying statement to say what they meant by the resolution.

The vote to reaffirm the resolution was 13 to 1. The vote on the clarifying statement was unanimous by all present, including Dr. Pittman's vote.

Now, they said some things in that clarifying statement—and incidentally, it was adopted as one statement—the first part of it was authored by Paul Calabresi. The last part of it was authored by Dr. Drill, with an assist from the Chairman of the Board, Dr. Shideman.

They voted on one clarifying statement and they agreed unanimously. What they said was that the doctor should have the prerogative of selecting the product; that each time he writes a prescription he should make a conscious decision whether to retain that prerogative or delegate it, and should so indicate.

They also said in the final paragraph of the clarifying statement—we do not intend this resolution to be used to change or repeal State antisubstitution laws.

Now, that wasn't an idea presented just by Dr. Drill, an industry representative, as it is now depicted. It was a statement authored by him and adopted unanimously by everybody there.

When this came up 3 days later on March 17, the Assembly of Life Sciences saw fit to accept the reaffirmation of the resolution, and they summarily rejected the clarifying statement.

Now, that confuses me somewhat. I don't know what body has the authority, God given or otherwise, to tell somebody else what they meant when they described their action in plain English. But that is where it is now. It will be discussed again on May 29.

Incidentally, that is an executive session. I won't be there. But I guarantee you if Ben Gordon is there, I would like to be there, too. I think it should be an open meeting. I don't think this thing should be discussed in any star chamber proceedings. Whoever has an idea or comment on it should be there.

Finally, I disagree completely with Mr. Gordon's summation of what happened as a result of the deliberations of the Drug Research Board. They did not on two occasions vote unanimously to have the