be an interpretation of paragraph 5 (of the resolution) to require that all physician's prescription forms contain two boxes, one labeled 'Substitution Authorized', the other labeled 'Do Not Substitute', with the physician required to initial one of the boxes in order to make the prescription valid." That mechanism, in fact, was precisely the one most favored at the meeting of 26 September, with PMA, APhA, and Dr. Hussey and myself present. I think this would be a reasonable mechanism and one not particularly burdensome to the physician. I would suggest, however, that the wording beside the two boxes be "Substitution of equivalent drug product permitted" and "Substitution Prohibited," respectively.

Interestingly, the copy of the resolution attached to Mr. Stetler's letter bears the heading "Resolution of the Drug Research Board with Regard to Drug Product Antisubstitution Laws." How anybody can now say that the DRB "took no position with regard to state antisubstitution laws" is really beyond understanding.

The PMA Newsletter of December 2, 1974, reported Mr. Stetler's letter of protest and complained that the statement was "ambiguous" and clearly handed the APhA "an important new weapon in its nationwide campaign to generate state legislation transferring drug product selection authority from the physician to the pharmacist." Thus, the DRB found itself cast in the role of arbiter between claims of the PMA versus those of the APhA.

In view of the confusion and activity I have just described, Mr. Trexler sent a memorandum to the members of the DRB (dated December 20, 1974; attached) in which he (a) again noted that the ALS had approved the resolution on 19 November, and (b) stated that "it (the resolution) may be the subject of an NAS press release in the near future." This was Mr. Trexler's second memorandum to the members of the DRB on the resolution, so that there really should be no complaint about their not having been notified. I presume they also received the minutes of the meeting itself

Shortly before that Mr. Trexler had telephoned me and requested that I prepare a brief resume of the reasoning which had led to our adopting of the resolution and the history of the development of that position. I did this and sent it to him in a memorandum dated December 4, 1974, with the subject given as "SUBJECT: Suggested narrative to accompany distribution of DRB resolution on drug antisubstitution." In other words, I was perfectly aware that this material might be used as the basis for some sort of background statement, contrary to the statement made in an editorial in the April 28, 1975, issue of the JAMA (Journal of the American Medical Association 232:381).

On 21 January 1975 the press release was made public (attached). Objections immediately began to appear, coming chiefly from the industry, I believe. Complaints included the following. One was that the DRB had not been warned that a press release would be made. As I have just pointed out, that is incorrect. Another was that the printing layout of the release implied that the DRB had endorsed the specific wording of the "background statement" as well as endorsing the resolution itself, and that complaint is correct. In addition, statements in the introduction such as "the DRB pointed out" and "the DRB said