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Roussel Uclaf Donates U.S. Patent Rights for RU 486 to Population Council

HHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala announced today that French pharmaceutical company Roussel Uclaf, at the encouragement of the Clinton Administration, is donating, without remuneration, its United States patent rights for mifepristone (RU 486) to The Population Council, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation.

RU 486 has been marketed for non-surgical termination of pregnancies in France, the United Kingdom and Sweden. The drug is also under study for labor induction, contraception, Cushing's syndrome, endometriosis, meningioma and breast cancer.

"We strongly believe that women in America should have access to the full range of safe and effective alternatives to surgical abortion. The donation announced today is a step forward in that process."
May 16, 1994

NOTE TO CAROL RASCO

For our conversation, here is the letter. Also please find some background materials.

[Signature]

Kevin Thurm

Attachments
Dr. Edouard Sakiz  
Chairman of the Board  
Supervisory Board  
Roussel Uclaf  
35, boulevard des Invalides  
75323 Paris Cedex 07

Dear Dr. Sakiz,

It is important for the health of women in the United States that they have access to the widest possible range of safe and effective medical treatments. In support of that goal, in January 1993, I asked the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promote the testing and licensing of mifepristone (RU 486) and other antiprogestins in the United States.

I understand that since at least that time, your company has been in negotiations with The Population Council, Inc., a non-profit organization with whom you have had dealings on mifepristone since early in the last decade. Those discussions, I understand, have been directed toward the purpose on which I charged the Secretary. I am grateful for the effort those negotiations represent.

In order to permit the appropriate testing, development and distribution of your product, I urge, at the conclusion of your negotiations, that you bring your plans to fruition. I understand that your company will assign without remuneration your United States patent rights on mifepristone to The Population Council, Inc. which has been studying this product since 1982 and which would take all necessary steps to file a new drug application with the Food and Drug Administration, so that the agency can determine whether the drug is safe and effective for use in the United States.

On behalf of the government of the United States and for the women in America, I thank you for your work.

[President Clinton]
On January 22, 1993, President Clinton signed a Presidential Memorandum directing the Department of Health and Human Services to assess initiatives to promote the testing and licensing of RU 486 in the United States.

Shalala commended Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council for coming to closure after months of complex negotiations amid repeated urging from the Clinton Administration.

Shalala emphasized, however, that the donation does not mean RU 486 has been approved for use in the U.S. The Population Council must conduct clinical trials, identify a manufacturer and submit a New Drug Application to the Food and Drug Administration.

"The FDA will do all it can to quickly evaluate mifepristone," said Shalala. "FDA's decision will be based solely on the scientific and medical evidence as to the safety and efficacy of the drug. That is our responsibility to the women of America."

FILE: RU PRESS
Statement
Donna E. Shalala
Secretary of Health and Human Services

May 16, 1994

I am here to announce that, with the encouragement of the Clinton Administration, the French pharmaceutical firm Roussel Uclaf is donating, without remuneration, its United States patent rights for the drug mifepristone (RU 486) to the Population Council, a not-for-profit organization.

This action is an important step toward providing the women of America access to non-surgical alternatives to pregnancy termination.

On January 22, 1993 -- President Clinton's third day in office -- he signed a Presidential Memorandum directing me to assess initiatives by which the Department of Health and Human Services could promote the testing and licensing of RU 486 in the United States.

This donation concludes months of complex negotiations reflecting the Clinton Administration's repeated urging to bring the process to fruition. We commend Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council for their achievement on this very important issue.
We strongly believe that women in America should have access to the full range of safe and effective alternatives to surgical abortion. The donation announced today is a big step forward in that process.

Although RU 486 has been used as an abortifacient in France, the United Kingdom and Sweden, I want to emphasize that mifepristone has not been approved for use in the United States.

In addition to conducting clinical trials, which will commence here in the United States in the near future, the Population Council will submit a new drug application for RU 486 to the Food and Drug Administration.

Let me make it clear: we will do all we can to evaluate quickly mifepristone. But I also want to make it clear that FDA's decision will be based solely on the scientific and medical evidence about the safety and efficacy of the product.

That is our responsibility to the women in America. Thank you.
Mifepristone (RU 486): Brief Overview

On January 22, 1993, in one of his first official acts, President Clinton issued a memorandum directing HHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala to promote the testing and licensing of mifepristone (RU 486) in the United States.

During early 1993, Secretary Shalala and FDA Commissioner David Kessler communicated with senior Roussel Uclaf officials to begin efforts to pave the way for bringing RU 486 into the American marketplace.

In April, 1993, representatives of FDA, Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council, a not-for profit organization, met to discuss U.S. clinical trials and licensing of RU 486. Over the last year, the parties continued their negotiations culminating in the donation announced today. Roussel Uclaf will transfer, without remuneration, its United States patent rights to mifepristone to the Population Council. In turn, the Population Council will take the necessary steps to bring RU 486 to the American market.

Mifepristone was developed by the French firm Roussel Uclaf. The drug has been marketed for use to non-surgically terminate pregnancy in France, the United Kingdom and Sweden. There are several investigative trials underway with FDA for other uses of the drug, including contraception, labor induction, Cushing's syndrome, endometriosis, meningioma, and breast cancer.

It must be recognized that termination of a pregnancy is not a simple medical procedure whether it is done surgically or through a medical regimen. In France, the United Kingdom and Sweden, where RU 486 has been administered to approximated 200,000 women, the procedure requires several visits to a medical facility, a precise dosing scheme using two different drugs, and close monitoring to care for women who may experience excessive bleeding or other complications. Any use of mifepristone in the United States would have to follow the same type of strict distribution and use conditions.

File: RUFACT
TO: Carol Rasco

FROM: Kevin Thurm

SUBJECT: RU 486

Background

Roussel Uclaf, a French subsidiary of the German company, Hoechst, holds two United States patents for its product, RU 486, which has abortifacient and potentially scores of other medical uses. The French company has engaged the Population Council, a not-for-profit organization, in over 14 months of negotiations designed to transfer Roussel Uclaf's United States patent rights to the Population Council which would then take steps to bring RU 486 to market in this country. Those negotiations are on-going.

On May 9, 1994, Roussel Uclaf wrote a letter to Secretary Shalala stating the company's wish, instead, to offer the RU 486 United States patent rights to the American government insofar as the abortifacient and other gynecological uses are concerned. The company proposes voluntarily to assign its patent rights, as so limited, to the government free of charge, asking nothing in return.

Were the government willing to accept the "gift" offer, negotiations with the Population Council would be discontinued, and the patents, as so delimited, would be made available for assignment to the United States.

Alternatively, Roussel Uclaf has advised that should its bilateral negotiations with the not-for-profit be resolved, the deal cannot be finally closed unless and until the President of the United States writes a letter to the French company asking, on behalf of the women in America, that the patents be assigned to a non-profit entity in this country.

Roussel Uclaf strongly favors the gift to the government arrangement. Your advisors strongly favor the bilateral arrangement and have taken steps consistently and firmly to so insist.

Issues for Decision

One: Whether the President is willing to write a letter to the manufacturer of RU 486 asking that the United States patents for that product be assigned to a not-for-profit entity in this country. A suitable letter might read as follows:

It is important for the health of women in the United States that they have access to the widest possible range of safe and effective medical treatments. In support of
that goal, in January 1993, I asked the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promote the testing and licensing of mifepristone [RU 486] and other antiprogesterons in the United States.

To permit the appropriate testing, development and distribution of RU 486 in the United States, I ask that your company give its mifepristone patent rights in the United States to a non-profit organization that would take all necessary steps to file a new drug application with the Food and Drug Administration [FDA], so that the FDA can determine whether the drug is safe and effective for use in the United States.

Two: If the bilateral negotiations between Roussel Uclaf and the not-for-profit entity fail, and the only option then currently on the table is the gift offer, is the government of the United States willing, and if so, under what conditions, to accept the offer of the patent rights for RU 486?

Three: If the government is not willing to accept the offer of the patent rights, on what is that decision to decline based, and how will it be communicated to the American people?

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The following tabs set forth discussion of the various factors that may be brought to bear on the decision-making:

Tab 1: History and background of RU 486 in this Administration
Tab 2: Legal issues
Tab 3: Bringing RU 486 to market [timing, available entities, administrative hurdles]
Tab 4: Political considerations
Tab 5: Press strategies and concerns

The following documents are attached for your reference;

Exhibit 1: The President's Memorandum of January 22, 1993
Exhibit 2: Roussel Uclaf's May 9, 1994 letter to Secretary Shalala attaching a draft offer of the gift
Exhibit 3: Roussel Uclaf's draft letter to the President
Exhibit 4: Minutes in French and translation of the April 26, 1994 Roussel Uclaf board meeting setting out the need for a letter from the President
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Divider Title: Tab 1
BACKGROUND

Roussel Uclaf, a French subsidiary of the German company, Hoechst, holds two United States patents for its product RU 486, which has abortifacient and various other medical uses. The patents will expire in the years 2000 and 2001. Hoechst, the parent company, is co-owned by the Celanese Corporation, whose direct or indirect product lines include Nike sneakers and seat belts; the company does about $8 billion worth of business per year in the United States.

On January 22, 1993, the President directed the Secretary to "assess initiatives by which the Department of Health and Human Services can promote the testing, licensing, and manufacturing in the United States of RU 486 or other antiprogestine" (Exhibit 1). Within the month, the FDA, through Commissioner David Kessler, requested both Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst to expedite the process and met with representatives of Roussel to discuss issues. In March 1993, Secretary Shalala wrote to the president of Hoechst urging him to eliminate all corporate barriers to introduction of RU 486 in the United States.

Roussel Uclaf identified the Population Council, a non-profit organization based in New York, as the most likely vehicle through which to produce, distribute and test RU 486; the two parties have a 1982 contract which gives the Population Council some limited rights to license Roussel Uclaf product in this country.

Over the past fourteen months, the two parties have conducted on-again/off-again negotiations over a distribution scheme, liability insurance (product and damage to property), and insurance for lost profits due to economic boycotts of non-related products. During these talks, Roussel, in addition to the three main issues, occasionally raised subsidiary matters; these bumps in the road served to delay the negotiations (some believe that Roussel was in a holding pattern in anticipation of corporate leadership changes in January and April of this year). In several newspaper stories on this issue during this period, representatives of the two parties have been quoted saying they expected a deal shortly. Obviously this has yet to materialize.

Last fall, lawyers representing Roussel Uclaf met with HHS officials to discuss ways the federal government might help the negotiations. Over a series of meetings, the corporation's lawyers presented a variety of requests, including whether the Administration would seek legislation indemnifying Roussel for all potential damages or would seize the patents. HHS officials repeatedly told Roussel's lawyers that neither was a possibility, and that the deal should be done through the private parties.

On April 14, 1994, the Secretary, along with other HHS officials, met with representatives of the two parties, including Professor
Ernst Afting (current CEO of Roussel), Dr. Edouard Sakiz (past CEO and current Board Chair of Roussel), and Margaret Carlson (head of the Population Council). The Secretary stated that the U.S. government would neither seek legislation indemnifying Roussel nor seize the patents. She made clear to the parties the importance she attached to the introduction of the product in the U.S. through an agreement between them. She ended the meeting by imposing a May 15, 1994 deadline for successful completion of their negotiations.

In light of this deadline and hearings scheduled by Congressman Ron Wyden for 10:00 a.m. on May 16 to obtain a status report, the parties have continued their negotiations. Although many issues have been resolved, some remain: the extent of insurance coverage for product liability and damage to property, and a "pull the plug" option which would give Roussel the authority to require the Population Council to withdraw the product from the market if the potential liability from all lawsuits exceeded a specified amount.

On April 26, 1994, the Board of Roussel Uclaf passed a resolution authorizing under certain circumstances the assignment of patent rights to either the United States government or to a non-profit organization (Exhibit 4). If the rights are to be given to a non-profit, the President of the United States must so request by letter on behalf of the women of the country (see draft letter in cover memo).

By letter of May 9, 1994, Roussel notified the Secretary that it was prepared to assign the patent rights (for abortifacient and other gynecological uses) to the government and attached a draft letter to the President from Professor Afting, the president and CEO of Roussel (Exhibits 2 and 3). This draft letter closely mirrored an earlier informal draft discussed with Kevin Thurm, Harriet Rabb and David Kessler during the prior week.

Discussions between the parties are scheduled to continue through the end of the week. If the private arrangement is not concluded, we must be prepared to have an answer to Roussel's letter which we believe the company would send (or at least publicize). There is some "buzz" among pro-choice and women's groups about this issue so there is a chance developments will leak before the deal is finished or the letter is formally sent.
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LEGAL ISSUES DISCUSSION

I. Gift Acceptance. The first question is whether the government should insist that any gift be for all known medical uses, not just abortifacient and gynecological [including, perhaps, "morning after"] uses. On the one hand, the broader rights may make the patent more attractive to potential licensees. On the other hand, some potential licensees may be appropriate repositories of the government's patent rights for the designated uses, but not the full range of known medical uses. Finally, the burden of testing and bringing forward the product for abortifacient and gynecological uses may be more than enough obligation. The responsibility of pursuing research and testing on all the known medical uses to bring the promising ones to fruition may be more than the government and any licensee want to assume.

The Secretary has statutory authority to accept a gift, such as a patent, on behalf of HHS's Public Health Service. Alternatively, the directors of the national research institutes at HHS's National Institutes of Health (NIH) have statutory authority to accept gifts to support the activities of their institutes. Each option has pluses and minuses.

A. Secretarial gift acceptance. Because patents are intangible property, by statutory directive, the evidence of the gift (in this case, the original patent assignments), must be lodged with the Department of the Treasury. Treasury has the discretion to hold the property or liquidate it at HHS's request. There is unlikely to be a problem raised by Treasury, but, to date, that Department has had no part in the RU 486 issue and must be consulted should this route be chosen.

B. NIH gift acceptance. No involvement of Treasury is required. Gifts to NIH institutes must be made to support the activities of the receiving institute - so a showing of such purpose would have to be made. This is not likely to pose a problem, but no work has been done to identify a likely institute recipient or to prepare the gift justification.

Finally, with regard to gift acceptance, since Roussel Uclaf is an entity doing business with HHS, including specifically the Public Health Service and its components, the government will have to be sure that accepting the gift does not give rise to a public perception concern. There is no ethical impediment to accepting gifts from entities so positioned, but care must be taken to weigh the benefits and consequences so that the public can be assured that no favor has been curried or promised. In fact, it has not.

II. Transfer of the Gift. Roussel Uclaf has offered to assign its rights to the abortifacient and gynecological patent uses to the government. Were the United States to accept the assignment
from Roussel Uclaf, the government would in turn find a licensee or licensees willing and able to take responsibility for obtaining FDA approval and bringing the product to market. Although it is conceivable that the government could perform these tasks itself, only the Department of Defense now manufactures drugs on a large scale.

Since, by law, federal agencies are authorized to grant licenses in federally owned patents, were the government to have the patents by assignment, subsequent licensing arrangements are possible. Additionally, patent law provides the patent owner (or, in this case, the patent assignee) with the right to sue for patent infringement. Such capacity to bring suit could be consequential if counterfeit product began to appear in the United States.

III. Licensing the United States Patent Rights. Government agencies are authorized by law to grant non-exclusive, exclusive or partially exclusive licenses under federally-owned patents. Licenses to PHS-owned inventions are negotiated by the NIH Office of Technology Transfer in accordance with government-wide regulations.

Under the regulations, non-exclusive licenses can be given by the government relatively easily and directly to any applicants, generally speaking, whose capacity to act responsibly regarding the license has been demonstrated.

Exclusive or partially exclusive licenses are subject to a different, but not much more difficult process. Notice of the patent's availability must be published in the Federal Register, and a sixty day period for filing written objections must be allowed. No less than three months after the date of publication, and after consideration of any objections received, an exclusive or partially exclusive license may be granted. In that event, the agency must make determinations regarding the necessity for an exclusive license, rather than a nonexclusive one, the effect of the license on competition, and whether small business firms have been given first preference in accordance with the statute and regulations.

If and once the United States accepts the gift, it will be critically important that some bidder(s) come forward seeking a license to bring the product to market. Roussel Uclaf's efforts to shop this product around to United States pharmaceutical companies to get one or more to take up the responsibility of bringing RU 486 to market have been unsuccessful. Roussel Uclaf reports that the reluctance reflects other companies' unwillingness to bear (i) the product liability risks associated with the abortifacient or (ii) the political pressure from anti-abortion forces.

IV. Possible United States Tort Liability. The likelihood of United States tort liability depends, in large measure, on the
government's role in bringing RU 486 to market. Through sovereign immunity, the United States government is not subject to liability except to the extent that it consents to be sued. The Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) is a statutory limited waiver of sovereign immunity and, thus, acts as consent to being sued. Under the FTCA, the government is liable for personal injury caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of a Federal employee under circumstances where the government, if a private party, would be liable to the plaintiff. It would be unlikely for a court to allow a suit to go forward against the government under the FTCA if the government merely performed the "discretionary functions" of accepting a gift, licensing the patents, and acting on an application for FDA to approve a drug.

However, were the government to become enmeshed in facilitating or playing a direct role in the transfer of the technical background information that makes it possible actually to make RU 486, for example, the government risks being drawn into liability. An approach which limits the government's role in bringing RU 486 to market, while solving the lion's share of the potential government liability risk, creates other problems. Without the backup technical "know how," it would be years before any government licensee could create the product. Since it is unlikely that a licensee would bid for these patent rights without the actual prospect of bringing the product into existence, the United States could be left holding the patents with no licensee willing to step up and take them.

Alternatively, if a European or other off-shore manufacturer made the product in a fashion that meets FDA standards, the product is potentially importable by a government licensee. One wrinkle on this process results from the technology transfer regulations referenced above which note that normally, licensees of United States patents have to agree that the product will be produced substantially in the United States.

In short, to the extent the government refuses to become involved in actually transferring the technology, tort liability is kept at bay. But licensees may be kept at bay as well, leaving the government holding the patents with no prospect of bringing RU 486 to the women in America.
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BRINGING RU 486 TO MARKET

A. Direct Patent Transfer to Population Council

If Roussel Uclaf agrees to license its patent rights in RU 486 to the Population Council, the Population Council would then have to take the following steps:

- Locate a drug manufacturer that would be willing to manufacture RU 486 for the United States market (we are advised that such a manufacturer has been identified by the Population Council).

- Obtain information from Roussel Uclaf on how Roussel Uclaf manufactures RU 486 and on its testing of the drug, so that the new manufacturer could follow parallel processes and the Population Council could refer to Roussel Uclaf's animal and human testing of RU 486 in any submission to the Food and Drug Administration. If Roussel Uclaf provides this information and technology transfer, it will significantly shorten the amount of time it will take to bring the drug to the United States market (assuming the drug is found to be safe and effective by FDA). With Roussel Uclaf's information, it might take six to twelve months for the Population Council's manufacturer to begin production of the drug, and for the Population Council to file its marketing application with the FDA. If Roussel Uclaf refuses to provide such information, it will take the Population Council eighteen months to two years to begin production, and up to five years to repeat the animal and human tests that show whether the drug is safe and effective.

Roussel Uclaf has stated that they will transfer the technology to the Population Council, but we do not consider this a strong assurance.

- Begin some clinical testing of the drug in the United States. Clinical trials, though not absolutely necessary for FDA approval, would permit women in the United States to have access to the drug, and for United States physicians to become familiar with the drug, while the Population Council prepared its marketing application for the FDA.

If Roussel Uclaf were to provide French-made RU 486 to the Population Council for the clinical trials, such trials could begin in the United States in approximately six months (five months for the Population Council to design its trials and find physicians willing to do the trials, and one month for FDA approval). If Roussel Uclaf were not willing to provide the drug for clinical trials, such trials would have to wait until (1) the Population Council's manufacturer could begin production of the drug, and (2) either Roussel Uclaf gave the Population Council its animal studies or the Population Council did its own animal studies.
Roussel Uclaf has stated that it would provide the French-made RU 486 to the Population Council for the clinical trials, but again we do not consider this a strong assurance.

- File a marketing application with the FDA. As indicated above, if Roussel Uclaf provides information and transfers its technology to the Population Council, a marketing application could be filed with the FDA within six to twelve months. FDA review would take no longer than six months. Many of the scientific decisions on the proper use and distribution of the drug have already been considered by the FDA, based on information already provided to FDA by Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council. Roussel Uclaf would not need to finish its United States clinical trials before filing a marketing application with FDA; such trials could be used to refine the use of the drug at a later time.

B. Patent Transfer to the United States

If Roussel Uclaf gives its patents to the United States, the United States would have to take the following steps:

- The United States would have to determine the scope of the rights given to the United States -- are the rights only in the abortifacient and other gynecological uses of the drug, or in all uses of the drug (e.g., gynecological uses, Cushing's disease, breast cancer).

- The United States would then need to transfer its rights in the patents to a third party. This process is discussed at Tab 2, and would take at least six months.

- The license holder would then need to take all of the steps outlined above, i.e., find a manufacturer, conduct the necessary tests, and file a marketing application with the FDA. The length of time these steps will take depends on whether Roussel Uclaf is willing to transfer its information, technology, and the drugs necessary for clinical trials to the license holder. Roussel Uclaf has advised the government that it would provide the information and French-made RU 486 for clinical trials to the United States' licensee, but it could change its mind.

It is difficult to determine whether the United States's license holder would take appreciably longer to bring RU 486 to market than the Population Council would need if the Population Council received a direct transfer of rights from Roussel Uclaf. Obviously, if the United States licensee is the Population Council, little time will be lost above that associated with the transfer of the patent rights from the United States to the Population Council. If another group becomes the United States's
licensee, that group might be able to bring the drug to the United States market slightly faster than the Population Council (if the group chosen was very familiar with the drug, had a good manufacturing facility, the cooperation of Roussel Uclaf, experience in FDA marketing applications, and excellent contacts with United States physicians) or much slower (if the group falls short on any factor).

We anticipate that if Roussel Uclaf gives its patent to the United States, it will add at least six months, and quite possibly twelve to eighteen months, onto the time needed to bring the drug to the United States market. This estimate excludes any additional time generated by litigation (see Tab 2).
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POLITICAL ISSUE DISCUSSION

In viewing the various options, it is important to place them in a broader political context, particularly as they relate to health care reform, given the likelihood that Congress will narrow the current Health Security Act provisions that provide for abortions under pregnancy-related services.

Because of this situation with the Health Security Act, the introduction of RU 486 will be of greater significance to the pro-choice and women's groups. If the Administration is viewed as closing the door or rejecting an apparently reasonable offer on RU 486, then the path toward reaching a non-confrontational agreement with the advocates on the Health Security Act could become much more difficult. It is, therefore, extremely important that the decision concerning RU 486 be placed in the context of promoting women's health and maintaining the close relationship of the Administration to these groups.

With regard to other political considerations, the acceptance of RU 486 by the federal government, as opposed to by a private non-profit organization, would most certainly lead to a floor amendment on the Labor, HHS appropriations bill, or other legislative vehicle to prohibit federal funds from being used in conjunction with RU 486. It is difficult to predict the exact nature of the amendment. However, in the last Congress, Representatives Dornan, Dannemeyer, Lent, Bartlett, Bunning and Hunter co-sponsored a bill to prohibit federal funds from being used for clinical studies of RU 486 as an abortifacient. Given the likelihood of another Hyde-type amendment on the House and Senate floors this year, as well as the expected abortion-related amendments on health care reform, the members of the House and Senate will be frustrated at having to face another abortion-related vote (on RU 486 appropriation limits). The outcome of such a vote is difficult to predict.

To date, we have worked very cooperatively with Congressman Ron Wyden, the chief Congressional advocate in providing access to RU 486 to women in this country. We expect to be able to continue this close working relationship through the upcoming hearing on May 16. Because Congressman Wyden has postponed past hearings, and is very frustrated by the fourteen months of negotiations, it is unlikely that he would be willing to postpone the May 16 hearing. He is convinced that Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst have been stalling for time, and that it is important to remain firm on the hearing date in order to force agreement or to make it clear to the American public that the companies have no intention of providing RU 486 to the American market.
Finally, regardless of the precise wording of the President's January 22, 1993 memorandum, the expectation it created among the pro-choice and women's groups is that the federal government will do everything possible to get RU 486 introduced in this country. Leaders of these groups will be concerned with Administration action on health care reform and other issues, including the choice to replace Justice Blackmun. Saying "no" to a facially reasonable offer by Roussel Uclaf weakens our political base and may subject the President to criticism that he is not sticking to his original position.

Given the expression of Presidential support for RU 486 in January 1993, a "yes" adds marginal political cost (separate from issues like health care reform). For 1996 purposes, we probably lose few friends and anger few voters not already positioned on this or related issues.

A "yes", however, also means the Administration will have this issue on its front burner for a significant period of time. Anticipated floor amendments in Congress, rallying at HHS or other government buildings by pro-life groups, and the necessarily public process to secure licensees will provide ample opportunity for Republicans and others opposed to the Administration to focus attention on this decision and on its aftermath.
LIST OF MEMBERS INTERESTED IN THE RU-486 ISSUE

HOUSE

Ron Wyden
Henry Waxman
Michael McNulty (D-NY)
Jim Bunning (R-KY)
Robert Dornan (R-CA)
Duncan Hunter (R-CA)

SENATE

Carol Moseley Braun (D-IL)
Paul Simon (D-IL) (wrote on behalf of constituent)
John Breaux (D-LA) (wrote on behalf of constituent)

BACKGROUND

For five years Wyden has been by far the most active and vocal Member on RU-486. He has held numerous hearings and cosponsored a bill with Waxman in the last Congress to overturn the FDA import ban. Also in the last Congress, 6 Republicans (Dornan, Dannemeyer, Lent, Bartlett, Bunning, and Hunter) cosponsored a bill to prohibit federal funds from being used for clinical studies of RU-486 as an abortifacient. No one in the Senate is consistently active on this issue.

Obviously, the women's caucus will be interested in any actions taken on Ru-486 as will the pro-life caucus (especially Hyde, Helms, and C. Smith). However, in the last four years the Department has not received RU-486 letters from either group.

Very little mail has been received by the Clinton Administration on RU-486. A typical letter is the attached C. Moseley-Braun letter inquiring as to the status of the President's Directives.

In the Bush Administration a typical letter is the attached California delegation letter on RU-486 as an important option for American women. Also, letters often stressed the importance of allowing research on RU-486 to go forward in areas of breast cancer, glaucoma, Cushing's disease, etc.

Please let me know if I can get additional information for you.
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PRESS ISSUES DISCUSSION

If negotiations with the Population Council collapse, the Clinton Administration will be left with two possible courses of action. The following is an examination of the public relations ramifications of both choices:

If the Administration decides to accept the gift of the patent from Roussel Uclaf, for purposes of insulating the White House, it should be accepted by Secretary Donna Shalala at the direction of the President of the United States and on behalf of the women in America. This could be done in a press conference on Friday, May 13, 1994, with up to four principals: Secretary Shalala, Roussel Uclaf President, Population Council (if they would agree to run the clinical trials) and possibly Congressman Ron Wyden (who has been pushing this issue on Capitol Hill).

It would be made very clear that this step is the result of the process that was set in motion by President Clinton's memorandum of January 22, 1993, and that it is being taken because it was impossible for Roussel Uclaf to come to closure with a private sector entity. Because a non-surgical (and sometimes safer) abortion alternative would thus be available to women in the United States (as it is to many women in Europe), accepting the patent gift should be touted as a reproductive rights victory for American women and another example of the Clinton Administration's commitment to deliver on its promises. However, Secretary Shalala's remarks would be tempered by caution about the long and difficult road ahead and the potential roadblocks to bringing RU 486 to the marketplace.

While it should not be a part of the formal press conference, there should be a concerted effort on the part of the HHS Public Affairs team to place stories that outline the hurdles that must be overcome to shield the Administration against the fallout from our allies in the event efforts to get RU 486 to market become stalled in bureaucratic process, in Congress or for other reasons.

Because the Clinton Administration would actually be in possession of the RU 468 patent for a period of time while the licensing process moves forward, during that time, the Administration may well be the focus of protest by conservative organizations that have become increasingly vocal and militant. These groups have suffered recent setbacks in court (e.g. a ruling that has imposed massive fines and barred them from physically blocking access to abortion facilities). They would welcome an extremely high visibility focal point for their activities. Protest marches in front of the White House and HHS are imaginable, and the conservative talkshow circuit would help to sustain the furor. This could go on while other abortion-related issues are before Congress, including debate on the Health Security Act and the FY 1995 enactment of the Hyde
Amendment. In the worst case, it could put the abortion issue center stage, with the Clinton Administration as a high-profile player right up through the kick-off of the 1996 re-election campaign.

It would also be necessary to recruit a cadre of lawmakers, pro-choice and women's advocates willing and able to speak up for the Administration over the course of this heated debate. That is critically important for holding our own on the conservative talkshow circuit.

If the Administration decides to reject the gift of the patent from Roussel Uclaf, news of that decision should be disclosed in a press conference on Friday, May 13, 1994, by Secretary Shalala and FDA Commissioner David Kessler. It will be necessary to construct a rationale for why that course of action is better than the alternative one for American women. The argument will have to be that giving the patent to the United States government does not speed the drug to the American marketplace. In fact, it does just the opposite. Administrative regulatory process and the potential for legislative stonewalling could be very time consuming and could ultimately prevent the women in America from gaining access to RU 486.

We should also highlight in the Secretary's statement the unprecedented nature of what Roussel Uclaf was attempting to position the United States to do. Never before has a patent been accepted by the government. The novelty of the situation makes the issue potentially more likely to be tied up in litigation or legislative maneuvering. One of the speakers would provide details of the formidable obstacles that may delay or even prevent the United States from moving the drug onto the market.

If Roussel Uclaf is willing to grant the United States patent rights for using RU 486 only for abortifacient and other gynecological purposes, another potential argument we could embrace is the position that we wanted more than the rights they were willing to grant because our interest in this drug goes beyond the issue of abortion, the need for which we are committed to making as rare as possible.

We would stress that a private sector deal is the only viable option for getting RU 486 quickly through clinical trials and into the market place. We should outline in detail all that the Population Council did to try and close the deal during the 14-month negotiations with Roussel Uclaf. The message, either implicitly or explicitly, is that Roussel Uclaf does not really want to close a deal with an entity that clearly has the potential to bring RU 486 to the marketplace because the company fears pressure from American conservatives.
Our position should be publicly to challenge Roussel Uclaf to go back to the bargaining table with the Population Council or to open negotiations with another entity; to stop playing games; and to get serious about responding to the request that President Clinton made of them almost a year and a half ago.

Without a doubt, a "no" will subject the Administration to a firestorm of protest by pro-choice and women's groups; and there will be few natural political allies vocally defending this decision, particularly in light of the relative difficulty of explanation.

* * * * * * *

It should be noted that Roussel Uclaf has already begun, informally, to circulate word of its potential offer to the United States. Many representatives of the pro-choice community already know about the potential gift offer. We may be forced to confront a news account of the issue prior to the Congressional hearings on May 16, 1994. Such a story will, undoubtedly, be presented from the Roussel Uclaf perspective as opposed to the Administration's point of view.
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MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Importation of RU-486

In Import Alert 66-47, the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") excluded the drug Mifepristone -- commonly known as RU-486 -- from the list of drugs that individuals can import into the United States for their "personal use," although the drugs have not yet been approved for distribution by the FDA. (See FDA Regulatory Procedures Manual, Chapter 9-71.) Import Alert 66-47 effectively bans the importation into this Nation of a drug that is used in other nations as a nonsurgical means of abortion.

I am informed that in excluding RU-486 from the personal use importation exemption, the FDA appears to have based its decision on factors other than an assessment of the possible health and safety risks of the drug. Accordingly, I hereby direct that you promptly instruct the FDA to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant exclusion of RU-486 from the list of drugs that qualify for the personal use importation exemption. Furthermore, if the FDA concludes that RU-486 meets the criteria for the personal use importation exemption, I direct that you immediately take steps to rescind Import Alert 66-47.

In addition, I direct that you promptly assess initiatives by which the Department of Health and Human Services can promote the testing, licensing, and manufacturing in the United States of RU-486 or other antiprogestins.

You are hereby authorized and directed to publish this memorandum in the Federal Register.

[Signature]
This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: Exhibit 2
Paris, May 9, 1994

Honorable Donna SHALALA
Secretary of Health and Human Services
Room 615 F
Hubert Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue SW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201
USA

Attention: Mr. Kevin THURM

Dear Secretary Shalala,

Following various meetings with your Staff and with FDA officers, the latest on May 6, 1994 with Dr. Kessler, we would like to confirm that we are ready to assign our US patent rights on RU 486 in accordance with the attached draft letter from us to the President of the United States of America.

This document is substantially similar to the draft that was given to Mr. Kevin Thurm, on April 29, 1994, by our counsel Lester Hyman, to allow a review of the situation by your Administration.

Of course we will continue to work with you and all relevant people in a constructive spirit and we look forward to meet you personally by the end of this week, as planned.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Pr. R.G. AFING
President & CEO

cc. Dr. KHSSLER
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Paris, May ..., 1994

Honorable William J. CLINTON
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500
USA

Attention: Ms. Nancy HERNRICH

Dear Mr. President,

You have requested that ROUSSEL UCLAF allow the RU 486 compound to be used in your country.

We have been working to react to that request in a responsible manner.

I now am pleased to inform you that we have decided to contribute mifepristone (RU 486) for abortifacient purposes (and other gynecological uses) to the people of the United States of America, completely free of charge, by voluntarily assigning our relevant patent rights to the US Government.

This an unconditional gift, we ask for nothing in return.

Sincerely,

Pr. E.G. AFTING
President & CHO
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PROJET 89.01.84

ROUSSEL UCLAF
Société anonyme à Directoire et Conseil de Surveillance
au capital de 544.760.300 F.
Siège social : 36, Boulevard des Invalides 75007 PARIS
R.C.S. Paris B 543 089 081

Entrée du Projet de Précis-Verbal
de la séance du Conseil de Surveillance du 6 Mai 1984
à 17 h 30

Présents

Membres du Conseil de Surveillance :

Dr. H. SAKIZ, Président,
Dr. M. FRUEHAUF, Vice-Président,
MM. P. ROBSON, C. de CROSBET, le Pr. J. DAUSSET, R. EBAMBERT,
le Pr. G. MILHAUD, N. MONOD, E. de ROYERE, le Dr. E.G. SEPRERT.

Sans voix définitives :

Pr. K.G. APTING, Président du Directoire,
M. C. JACQUINSON, Directeur Général, Membre du Directoire,
M. D. CAMUS, Membre du Directoire,
M. D. WANGI, Membre du Directoire.

M. J.P. CHAVANCE et Mme D. PERRON, Délégués du Comité Central d'Entreprises.

M. F. DESSOIRS, Secrétaire du Conseil.

Absents suivis :

M. le Dr. G. METZ, Membre du Conseil de Surveillance,
M. Y. MIRCHE, Membre du Conseil de Surveillance,
MM. P. BRECHARD et D. GAULT, Délégués du Comité Central d'Entreprises.
MIFEPRISTONE - ÉTATS-UNIS

Le Docteur E. SAKIZ informe le Conseil de Surveillance que son assentiment est demandé sur les décisions que le Directoire va être amené à prendre à propos de la mifepristone aux États-Unis d'Amérique, compte tenu des exigences pressantes formulées au plus haut niveau par les autorités gouvernementales fédérales de ce pays.

Étant donné les caractères très particuliers du système médical des États-Unis par comparaison à celui des pays d'Europe où la mifepristone est actuellement utilisée, et considérant également le climat hautement conflictuel créé autour de ce produit aux États-Unis, le Directoire estime que ROUSSEL UCLAF ne saurait en aucune façon s'impliquer elle-même dans la production ou la diffusion de la mifepristone aux États-Unis.

Toutefois, prenant acte de la volonté du gouvernement américain de procéder aux citoyennes des États-Unis cette alternative médicale à l'interruption chirurgicale de la grossesse, le Directoire s'est résolu à offrir au gouvernement des États-Unis de lui céder, sans rémunération, les deux brevets référencés "U.S. Patents Nos. 4,386,085 and 4,447,424".

Au cas où ce gouvernement déclarerait cette offre pour lui-même tout en la jugant recevable par une institution qu'il désignerait à cet effet, ROUSSEL UCLAF accepterait de poursuivre dans cette voie et de passer les accords nécessaires, à condition d'en être formellement requise par une lettre officielle, portant la signature du Président des États-Unis, et d'obtenir un certain nombre de garanties contractuelles.

Le Conseil de Surveillance prend acte de cette position qui n'appelle de sa part aucune objection, et manifeste ainsi au Directoire l'assentiment de principe sollicité.
MIFEPRISTONE - UNITED STATES

Dr. E. SAKIZ informed the Supervisory Board ("Conseil de Surveillance") that its assent is requested concerning decisions that the Director ["le Directoire"] is being led to take a propos mifepristone in the United States of America, taking account of pressing exigencies formulated at the highest level by authorities of the federal government of that nation.

Given the very particular characteristics of the U.S. medical system, in comparison to that of the European countries where mifepristone is currently used, and considering equally the highly conflicted climate created around this product in the U.S., the Director deems that ROUSSEL UCLAF would be in no way implicated itself in the production or distribution of mifepristone in the United States.

Nevertheless, considering the wish of the American government to procure for U.S. citizens this medical alternative to the surgical termination of pregnancy, the Director has resolved to offer to cede to the government of the United States, without remuneration, the two patents referred to as "U.S. Patents Nos. 4,386,085 and 4,447,424."

In the event that the government should decline this offer for itself and at the same time judging it receivable by an institution that it would designate to this end, ROUSSEL UCLAF would accept this path and would adopt the necessary agreements, on the condition of being formally required by an official letter, bearing the signature of the President of the United States, and of obtaining a certain number of contractual guarantees.

The Supervisory Council acknowledged this position, which generated no objections, and manifested to the Director its assent to the principle being offered.

[translated by L. Bachorik, 5/10/94]
Meeting of RU486
Wednesday, May 11, 1994

Participants:
- Kevin Thurm +5
- Joel Klein
- Nancy-Ann Min
- David Gergen or Jody Greenstone
- Bill Galston
- Greg Lawler or Jennifer

George S. will be with POTUS and unable to make this meeting.
Dr. Edouard Sakiz
Chairman, Supervisory Board
Roussel Uclaf
35, boulevard des Invalides
75323 Paris Cedex 07
FRANCE

Dear Dr. Sakiz:

It is important for the health of women in the United States that they have access to the widest possible range of safe and effective medical treatments. In support of that goal, in January 1993, I asked the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promote the testing and licensing of mifepristone (RU 486) and other antiprogestins in the United States.

I understand that since at least that time, your company has been in negotiations with The Population Council, Inc., a nonprofit organization with whom you have had dealings on mifepristone since early in the last decade. Those discussions, I understand, have been directed toward the purpose on which I charged the Secretary. I am grateful for the effort those negotiations represent.

In order to permit the appropriate testing, development, and distribution of your product, I urge, at the conclusion of your negotiations, that you bring your plans to fruition. I understand that your company will assign without remuneration your United States patent rights on mifepristone to The Population Council, Inc. which has been studying this product since 1982 and which would take all necessary steps to file a new drug application with the Food and Drug Administration, so that the agency can determine whether the drug is safe and effective for use in the United States.

On behalf of the government of the United States and for the women in America, I thank you for your work.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton
(1) Do the gout.

Letter from POTUS back

(2) Patent to private

H.I.S. Sees, accepts on behalf
MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Importation of RU-486

In Import Alert 66-47, the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") excluded the drug Mifepristone -- commonly known as RU-486 -- from the list of drugs that individuals can import into the United States for their "personal use," although the drugs have not yet been approved for distribution by the FDA. (See FDA Regulatory Procedures Manual, Chapter 9-71.) Import Alert 66-47 effectively bans the importation into this Nation of a drug that is used in other nations as a nonsurgical means of abortion.

I am informed that in excluding RU-486 from the personal use importation exemption, the FDA appears to have based its decision on factors other than an assessment of the possible health and safety risks of the drug. Accordingly, I hereby direct that you promptly instruct the FDA to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant exclusion of RU-486 from the list of drugs that qualify for the personal use importation exemption. Furthermore, if the FDA concludes that RU-486 meets the criteria for the personal use importation exemption, I direct that you immediately take steps to rescind Import Alert 66-47.

In addition, I direct that you promptly assess initiatives by which the Department of Health and Human Services can promote the testing, licensing, and manufacturing in the United States of RU-486 or other antiprogestins.

You are hereby authorized and directed to publish this memorandum in the Federal Register.
need to be consulted on these issues, and your counterparts in France and Germany may also need to be involved. We think that someone familiar to these circles would advance the Administration’s goal to bring a safe and effective abortifacient to the U.S. market.

Mary Pendergraft

For David A. Kessler, M.D.

Attachment: Contract

cc: Dr. Philip Lee
    Mr. Kevin Thurm
The speculation is fueled by the essentially unanswered question—as to why Roussel Uclaf is willing to manufacture and sell RU-486 to some markets (England, France, and Sweden) but not to others (e.g., the United States). The common thinking is that Hoechst is only willing to permit Roussel Uclaf to sell RU-486 in a country when Hoechst is forced to do so politically, and, therefore, the only way to get RU-486 onto the U.S. market is to exercise political pressure on Roussel Uclaf and on Hoechst.

This thinking appears borne out by the circumstances here—Roussel Uclaf was willing to come to the table (at FDA) when it had received pressure from President Clinton (the January 23, 1993, Executive Order), you (your March 12, 1993, letter to Prof. Hilger at Hoechst), and FDA, but that since that pressure has waned the incentive to come to an agreement has also waned.

Another possibility is that the Population Council is simply attempting to reach an agreement that leaves Roussel Uclaf with too little, and that if the Population Council were willing to settle for less (e.g., the ability to study, but not to market the drug or to indemnify Roussel Uclaf) then a deal could be reached.

IV. Recommendation for Expert Advisor

This situation calls for someone of Felix Rohatyan’s caliber for several reasons. At the outset, we must make it clear that the FDA cannot take this issue too far without compromising its role as objective reviewers of the safety and efficacy of the drug. But equally as important is the fact that this is an issue where business and politics intersect quite dramatically. Because of the abortion debate, Roussel Uclaf is left alone to promote its drug. Other major U.S. drug manufacturers have, to date, refused to join forces with Roussel Uclaf—either by agreeing to go forward with their own abortifacient drug products, or by agreeing to be the manufacturer or distributor of RU-486. Therefore, Roussel Uclaf feels isolated (and vulnerable) by the U.S. demands. It will take an experienced person, familiar with the drug industry, to sort out these issues.

Second, there are pragmatic, economic concerns to be faced. Roussel Uclaf’s concerns about indemnification are realistic concerns that need to be satisfied. Someone with extensive experience in the business community (in France and Germany as well as in the United States) will have a better understanding of the various ways this concern can be overcome.

Finally, there are diplomatic issues that may need to be addressed. It may be that France and Germany would be unhappy to learn that their companies were not accommodating a request made by the United States Government. The U.S. Ambassadors to France and Germany will
In mid-September, Roussel Uclaf hired legal counsel (allegedly, Lester Hyman and John Hoff of Swindler and Berlin) to lobby the federal government at levels above FDA to obtain legislation protecting the company from potential losses, as described above.

III. Analysis

The FDA’s principle objection to Roussel Uclaf’s request for indemnification and related relief has been pragmatic—we did not (and do not) think Congress would ever pass such legislation. Having said that, we also think that there are other policy reasons for refusing to seek indemnification of a drug manufacturer, for example:

- It would create an unacceptable precedent for any manufacturer of a significant vaccine or drug to seek indemnification as a condition for bringing the product to market. There is little basis to distinguish RU-486 from a breakthrough AIDS drug or unique vaccine. The swine flu indemnification plan proved very problematic for the United States Government.

- If public health problems were to occur post-approval, the interest of the United States as an indemnifying party would be to disprove that problems had occurred, while FDA’s obligation would be to objectively investigate and take appropriate actions to protect the public health. This would be an untenable conflict for the United States Government.

Roussel Uclaf’s liability and boycott concerns should not be underestimated. Because Roussel Uclaf is willing to give the Population Council a royalty-free license, it wants to eliminate any potential for expenses due to the drug’s introduction into the United States market. Roussel Uclaf has also expressed its willingness to give a royalty-free license to any other major U.S. pharmaceutical company, but has found no company willing to take the license. Roussel Uclaf could, possibly, sell the drug to the Population Council (or to others) but it appears unwilling to do so, perhaps because the drug may have important other therapeutic benefits in the future, and it may want to maintain the right to sell to those markets. However, Hoechst may be willing to simply abandon the patent or give it to the United States.

There are some that suggest that Roussel Uclaf is simply playing a delaying game—waiting until the very staunchly Catholic Hoechst CEO (Prof. Wolfgang Hilger) retires in April 1994—so that then Roussel Uclaf would be free to exploit the drug in the United States and elsewhere for all uses. Others suggest that Roussel Uclaf does not want to reach agreement with the Population Council, but is merely stalling until an international foundation is created by Dr. Etienne Balieu, the inventor of the drug and a former Roussel Uclaf employee, to which Roussel Uclaf could then sell the rights to the drug.
That the Population Council would ultimately submit an NDA to FDA, based on the results of the clinical trial and on other studies that have been conducted by Roussel Uclaf; and

That the Population council, with the concurrence of Roussel Uclaf, would choose a new manufacturer for the drug, and that Roussel Uclaf would transfer its technology for making the drug to that manufacturer, because Roussel Uclaf does not want to manufacture the drug for sale in this country.

It was then left for the Population Council and Roussel Uclaf to revise the terms of their contract, while Roussel Uclaf began sending scientific information to FDA and the Population Council. The contract negotiations continued from sometime after the April meeting until recently. As of late July 1993, the Population Council thought the contract negotiations were proceeding smoothly, though slowly. In those negotiations the Population Council was represented by Jim Boynton of Christy and Viener and Roussel Uclaf was represented by Joe Orsini, its corporate council in Paris.

On August 2, 1993, Jim Boynton, the Population Council's lawyer, notified FDA that Roussel Uclaf had recently demanded that the Population Council obtain a commitment from the U.S. Government that the U.S. would enact legislation that would protect all persons who had anything to do with RU-486. This was described as similar to "right-to-access" legislation that would make it a crime for any person to hurt or harass any doctor administering RU-486, their patients, and the manufacturers, distributors, and salespersons for the drug. Roussel Uclaf also demanded that the Department of Justice promise to expend its resources to enforce this law, if enacted. Roussel Uclaf also asked for legislation that would indemnify Roussel Uclaf against any product liability exposure as a result of the use of RU-486 in this country or, as an alternative, that would ban any product liability actions against Roussel Uclaf for RU-486. Finally, Roussel Uclaf asked for legislation that would indemnify Roussel Uclaf against consequential damages. Roussel Uclaf's principal assertion is that it is willing to give the Population Council a royalty-free license, because it has decided (given a push by Hoechst), that it will forego any monetary gain from entering the U.S. market. In short, because Roussel Uclaf does not expect to make any money off of RU-486 in the U.S. market, and sees itself as permitting RU-486 to enter the U.S. market only because asked to do so by the United States Government, then it should not incur any liability exposure on account of the drug.

FDA advised Mr. Boynton that the FDA could not make a commitment to seek such legislation, pointing out that Congress had recently reenacted the Hyde Amendment and that, other than the swine flu situation, the United States had never agreed to indemnify any drug manufacturer. The FDA further explained that it would go far beyond FDA's appropriate role to seek such protection for a drug company. The FDA offered to advance the idea within the Department, but was advised by Mr. Boynton that the answer given was sufficient.
submit a marketing application for RU-486, other Congressional members have written to Hoechst expressing their strong opposition to the marketing of RU-486 in this country. This, and the well-publicized activities of anti-abortion groups, have provided Hoechst and Roussel Uclaf with evidence that the U.S. population lacks cohesiveness on this issue and that the abortion debate continues.

II. Summary of Discussions with Roussel Uclaf Regarding Testing of the Drug

In April 1993, FDA arranged a meeting between Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council to attempt to get those parties to agree to work together to test RU-486 and file a new drug application for the drug. The Population Council was identified as the most likely group to work with Roussel Uclaf because the Population Council had a contract with Roussel Uclaf which required Roussel Uclaf to give the Population Council sufficient amounts of the drug so that the Population Council could conduct clinical trials. The contract also appeared to require Roussel Uclaf to license the drug to the Population Council if Roussel Uclaf was unwilling to sell the drug in the United States. A copy of that contract, which must remain confidential, is attached.

At the April meeting, Dr. Edouard Sakiz, president of Roussel Uclaf, raised the issue of federal legislation to indemnify Roussel Uclaf from any damages it might suffer from permitting RU-486 to go onto the United States market. Dr. Sakiz was worried about product liability actions against Roussel Uclaf if a woman had an incomplete abortion and a deformed fetus. Dr. Sakiz was also concerned about consequential damages, such as the economic costs from boycotts of Roussel Uclaf (or Hoechst) products, bombings of Roussel Uclaf/Hoechst facilities, etc. by right-to-life groups. Dr. Sakiz’s view was that if the United States Government wanted RU-486 on the U.S. market, then the United States Government should make Roussel Uclaf whole for any damages Roussel Uclaf might suffer because it had agreed to the United States Government’s request.

Dr. Sakiz was told quite clearly at the April meeting that such legislation would never be enacted and the FDA would not support Roussel Uclaf in its advancement of that idea.

Despite being told that there was no possibility of obtaining favorable legislation, Dr. Sakiz committed Roussel Uclaf to go forward with the Population Council to bring RU-486 onto the United States market. Specifically, at the April meeting Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council agreed:

- That Roussel Uclaf would license RU-486 to the Population Council, which would conduct a clinical trial involving 2000 women pursuant to an investigational new drug (IND) application;
NOTE TO: The Secretary

FROM: The Commissioner of Food and Drugs

SUBJECT: RU-486

On January 22, 1993, President Clinton issued a memorandum directing you to assess initiatives to promote the testing, licensing, and manufacturing in the United States of RU-486 (mifepristone). The Agency has had ongoing dialogue with Roussel Uclaf to get a marketing application submitted to FDA for the drug. Both you and the FDA are on record as stating that if RU-486 is a safe and effective alternative to surgical abortion, then women in the U.S. should have access to that drug. The President also directed you to reassess whether RU-486 qualifies for importation under FDA's personal use importation policy.2

I. Current Marketing of the Drug

RU-486 is manufactured by the French firm Roussel Uclaf and it is approved to induce abortions in France, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. Roussel Uclaf has stated that it can act in the United States only with the approval of its parent company, Hoechst AG. Hoechst has historically refused to permit Roussel Uclaf to seek marketing approval for RU-486 as an abortifacient in the United States. Both you and I have asked Hoechst to permit Roussel Uclaf to file a new drug application (NDA) for the drug. Hoechst remains adamant in its refusal. While some members of Congress have written to Hoechst urging the company to

1 Although there are several investigational new drug applications (INDs) on file with FDA for RU-486 for other uses, including Cushing's syndrome, diabetes, meningioma, and breast cancer, Roussel Uclaf will not pursue marketing applications for these indications until the abortion issue is resolved. FDA representatives have met with representatives from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to discuss initiatives to promote the testing in the United States of RU-486 and other antiprogestins. NIH is limited in what it can do by the restrictions placed on its appropriation by the Hyde Amendment.

2 In accordance with the President's January 22 memorandum, FDA has reassessed whether RU-486 might qualify for importation under FDA's personal use importation policy and whether the import alert should be rescinded. There are significant public health implications associated with rescinding the import alert, especially related to whether the drug could be safely used under these circumstances; the availability of counterfeit RU-486 on the world market for which the Agency cannot attest to purity, quality, or safety; and the fact that Roussel Uclaf's RU-486 is so tightly controlled as to be unavailable for personal importation even if the import alert were to be rescinded. The Agency submitted its recommendation on this issue to PHS on July 14, 1993. Because the import alert has been challenged by a woman who attempted to bring a small quantity of RU-486 into the country, the Agency is working with the Department on an appropriate response to this ongoing litigation.
MEMORANDUM

To: Carol Rasco
From: Kevin Thurm
Re: RU-486

For our meeting on October 13, I am forwarding to you a memo from David Kessler which explains our attempts and plans to obtain RU-486 for FDA testing. Also attached is the executive order instructing the Department to move ahead in this effort.
BETSEY WRIGHT

To

Card


This will go forwarded to please handle

3/9/93
The biblical exhortation to "Be fruitful and multiply," was directed toward a small tribe, surrounded by enemies. We are long past that. Our survival depends upon our developing a population where everyone contributes. We don't need more cannon fodder. We don't need more parishioners. We don't need more cheap labor. We don't need more poor babies.

Very truly yours,

Ron Weddington

P.S. I was co-counsel in Roe v. Wade, have sired zero children and one fetus, the abortion of which was recently recounted by my ex-wife in her book, A Question Of Choice. (Grosset/Putnam, 1992) I had a vasectomy in 1969 and have never had one moment of regret.
And, having convinced the poor that they can't get out of poverty when they have all those extra mouths to feed, you will have to provide the means to prevent the extra mouths, because abstinence doesn't work. The religious right has had 12 years to preach their message. It's time to officially recognize that people are going to have sex and what we need to do as a nation is prevent as much disease and as many poor babies as possible.

Condoms alone won't do it. Depo-Provera, Norplant and the new birth control injection being developed in India are not a complete answer, although the savings that could be effected by widespread government distribution and encouragement of birth control would amount to billions of dollars.

No, government is also going to have to provide vasectomies, tubal ligations and abortions...RU 486 and conventional abortions. Even if we make birth control as ubiquitous as sneakers and junk food, there will still be unplanned pregnancies. There have been about 30 million abortions in this country since Roe v. Wade. Think of all the poverty, crime and misery ...and then add 30 million unwanted babies to the scenario. We lost a lot of ground during the Reagan-Bush religious orgy. We don't have a lot of time left.

You could do it, Mr. President-To-Be. You are articulate and you've already alienated the religious right with your positions on abortion and homosexuals. The middle-class taxpayer will go along with this plan because it will mean fewer dollars for welfare. The retirees will also go along because because poor people contribute very little to Social Security.

And the poor? Well, maybe if we didn't have to spend so much on problems like low birth weight babies and trying to educate children who come to school hungry, we might have some money to help lift the ones already born, out of their plight.
In 1989, 27 percent of all births were to unmarried mothers, a huge percentage of whom were teenagers. If current trends continue, soon a majority of the babies born will be born into poverty and one half of the country cannot support the other half, no matter how good our intentions.

I am not proposing that you send federal agents armed with Depo-Provera dart guns to the ghetto. You should use persuasion rather than coercion. You and Hillary are a perfect example. Could either of you have gone to law school and achieved anything close to what you have if you had three or four or more children before you were 20? No! You waited until you were established and in your 30's to have one child. That is what sensible people do. For every Jesse Jackson who has fought his way out of the poverty of a large family there are millions mired in poverty, drugs and crime.

If Ronald Reagan could use the media to convince the American public that a trillion dollars of borrowed money needed to be spent to combat the "Evil Empire," then you ought to be able to persuade people to only have children when they are able to afford them. Point out that only people like George Bush who inherit money can pay for more than one or two kids in today's economy. (And even then, some of the kids grow up to do embarrassing things like loot savings and loans.)

You made a good start when you appointed Dr. Elders, but she will need a lot of help. You will have to enlist the aid of sports and entertainment stars to counteract the propaganda spread by church officials seeking parishioners, generals seeking cannon fodder and businessmen seeking cheap labor that, throughout the ages, has convinced the poor that children are necessary to fulfillment as a person.

It wouldn't hurt to point out that while only 11.1 percent of three person families are below the poverty level, 20.2 percent of six person families and 28.6 percent of families of seven or more are poor. (1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States, p. 459)
Dear President-To-Be Clinton,

Some years ago another Southern Governor, when asked about the possibilities for prison reform, supposedly said something to the effect of, "Well, I don't think we're going to get very far until we get a better class of prisoner."

Well, I don't think you are going to get very far in reforming the country until we have a better educated, healthier, wealthier population.

Face it, you know that anything that even resembles the programs of Democratic Presidents in the past is going to make you a one term President. Reagan spent all our money on bombs and even if there were money for programs such as pre-natal health care, job training and day care centers it would be years before we would see any dramatic results. And, as anyone who follows education can see, more money doesn't necessarily translate into better educated kids.

But you can start immediately to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy and poor segment of our country. No, I'm not advocating some sort of mass extinction of these unfortunate people. Crime, drugs and disease are already doing that. The problem is that their numbers are not only replaced but increased by the birth of millions of babies to people who can't afford to have babies.

There, I've said it. It's what we all know is true, but we only whisper it, because as liberals who believe in individual rights, we view any program which might treat the disadvantaged differently as discriminatory, mean-spirited and...well...so Republican.
January 6, 1992

Betsey Wright
Director for Public Outreach
Transition Team
P. O. Box 615
Little Rock, AR 72203

Dear Betsey,

Enclosed is a "letter" to your boss, which I am going to try to get published. If I am unsuccessful, I may try to raise the money to print it as an ad in The N. Y. Times and other places.

Sarah and I have been discussing the notion of our setting up a non-profit corporation to license and distribute RU 486. Being non-profit would eliminate the need for products liability insurance, which is a major hang-up for a company thinking about marketing a new drug.

It's possible that such an endeavor could be the vehicle for a number of birth control efforts. Something's got to be done very quickly. 26 million food stamp recipients is more than the economy can stand.

Congratulations on your work for Clinton. It's good to see a UT-YD doing good. I hope the new President can find the time to deal with the issues I raise in my letter. Please give it to him if you get a chance.

Sincerely,

Ron Weddington
and distribute the drug. As noted above, this option was suggested by Roussel Uclaf's lawyers in their October 5 meeting with the Department's Chief of Staff and is clearly the company's preferred approach. While the United States government has the legal authority to take over the patent, such an approach is rare and in this case is politically complex. Although legal, there are particular concerns about the political viability of this approach and the willingness of Congress to permit such an action to stand. We note that Roussel Uclaf did not demand that the governments of France, England, or Sweden take such steps.

NEXT STEPS

Unless you object, the Department plans to engage the services of Felix Rohatyn or someone comparable as a negotiator. This negotiator would require the State Department's support in making appropriate diplomatic contacts, both with the United States Ambassadors to France and Germany, the French and German Ambassadors to this country, and other high-level officials in France and Germany, such as the respective Health Ministers. The purpose of such contacts would be to assess the situation and determine what measures the United States could take to persuade Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst to make RU-486 available in the United States. The French and German governments might be displeased to learn that their companies are not accommodating a request made by the United States Government. In addition, a negotiator of Felix Rohatyn's caliber might identify means other than federal legislation to satisfy Roussel Uclaf's and Hoechst's concerns.

In order for the negotiator to succeed, the Department and the Administration must be unequivocal in the position that taking over the patent for RU-486 is not an option. To avoid any ambiguity on this point, the negotiator should have a letter signed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services making clear on behalf of herself and the Administration that the United States government will not take over the patent. In addition the letter should request on behalf of the Administration that Hoechst and Roussel Uclaf conclude negotiations for the entry of RU-486 onto the U.S. market expeditiously. Roussel Uclaf will have every incentive to delay the negotiations if it thinks that the United States will ultimately take over the patent. It is the Department's position that this option should be unambiguously rejected, not only because it is controversial, but because its continued existence will make it impossible for the negotiator to obtain any other agreement.

Donna E. Shalala
United States could exercise its statutory powers of eminent domain and take over the patent for RU-486 insofar as it covers abortifacient uses of the drug.

The Population Council appears to be attempting to meet those demands of Roussel Uclaf that do not require the enactment of federal legislation. We have been advised by the Population Council that they sent a proposed licensing agreement to Roussel Uclaf on October 11, although we do not know whether Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst will find this proposal acceptable. In addition, the Population Council's President recently met with the President of Roussel Uclaf, and is planning to send a delegation to Germany during the first few weeks of November in the hope that if Hoechst understands that the Population Council is a serious, credible organization, Hoechst will withdraw its objections and permit Roussel Uclaf to enter into an agreement with the Population Council. Despite these moderately positive developments, we do not think that the negotiations will be successfully concluded without pressure on Roussel Uclaf/Hoechst.

Moreover, we have learned that Hoechst is interested in using an American venture capitalist group as a partner for the Population Council; this group is thought to be able to secure funds sufficient to indemnify Hoechst at the level it desires. However, it is our understanding that the Population Council appears unwilling to work with this group. This issue has further complicated the negotiations.

**AVAILABLE OPTIONS TO MOVE FORWARD NEGOTIATIONS**

The negotiations between Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council have not been successfully concluded because of the insistence of Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst that they be protected from all economic harm if they permit RU-486 to be marketed in this country. There are two options for moving forward the stalled negotiations:

One option is to enlist the aid of Felix Rohatyn, or someone of comparable stature, to negotiate with Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst on behalf of the United States Government. The negotiations require a person with extensive experience in the international business community, especially France and Germany. In addition the person must understand the pharmaceutical industry and have the standing to participate in high-level discussions that might involve appropriate ambassadors, as well as the Health Ministers in France and Germany.

A second option is for the United States to exercise its statutory powers of eminent domain and take over the patent for RU-486, insofar as it covers the abortifacient use of the drug. The Government could then contract with a company to manufacture
CURRENT STATUS

On August 2, 1993, the Population Council's lawyer notified FDA that Roussel Uclaf had recently reasserted its demand for protective federal legislation. Roussel Uclaf insisted that the Population Council obtain a commitment from the United States Government that: 1) legislation would be enacted making it a crime for any person to hurt or harass any doctor administering RU-486, their patients, or the drug's manufacturers, distributors, and salespersons; 2) the Department of Justice publicly commit to enforce this law, if enacted; 3) legislation would be enacted indemnifying Roussel Uclaf for any product liability exposure resulting from the use of RU-486 in this country, or, as an alternative, a prohibition of any product liability actions against Roussel Uclaf for RU-486; 4) as part of any legislation, indemnification for consequential damages.

In exchange Roussel Uclaf would give the Population Council a royalty-free license because it has decided to forego any profit from entering the United States market. In short, Roussel Uclaf's position is that it should not incur any liability exposure as a result of making RU-486 available in this country as an abortifacient because it does not anticipate any profit from selling RU-486 for that use in the United States and is entering the American market only at the request of the United States Government. Roussel Uclaf remains willing to exploit its patent for non-abortifacient uses of RU-486, should any other use be found to be safe and effective.

FDA advised the Population Council's lawyer that it could not make a commitment to seek such legislation and that its enactment was extremely unlikely, both for political reasons and because the United States had never agreed to indemnify any drug manufacturer, with the exception of the swine flu precedent. The FDA also communicated that seeking such protection for a drug company far exceeded FDA's appropriate role, but that the agency would discuss the situation with the Department.

In mid-September Roussel Uclaf hired legal counsel, Swidler and Berlin, to lobby the federal government at levels above FDA to obtain the legislation described above. On October 5, Kevin Thurm, the Department's Chief of Staff, and Harriet Rabb, the Department's General Counsel, met with lawyers from Swidler and Berlin to discuss the situation. The Department initiated the meeting to assess how the United States Government might facilitate successful completion of the negotiations between Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council. At that meeting, the company reiterated its concerns about obtaining indemnification for potential losses and was again told emphatically that the Department would not support its efforts to obtain federal legislation. Roussel Uclaf's lawyer then suggested that the
Roussel Uclaf from any damages it might incur by permitting RU-486 to be marketed in the United States. Dr. Sakiz was worried about product liability actions against Roussel Uclaf if a woman had an incomplete abortion and delivered a deformed fetus. Dr. Sakiz was also concerned about consequential damages, such as the economic costs from boycotts of other Roussel Uclaf or Hoechst products, or bombings of Roussel Uclaf/Hoechst facilities by right-to-life groups. Dr. Sakiz's view was that if the United States Government wanted RU-486 to be marketed in the United States, it should compensate Roussel Uclaf for any damages that the company might suffer from complying with the United States Government's request.

Dr. Sakiz was clearly informed at the April meeting that such legislation would never be enacted and that the FDA would not support Roussel Uclaf in seeking it.

Despite being told that there was no possibility of obtaining federal legislation to protect Roussel Uclaf from consequential damages or product liability suits, Dr. Sakiz committed Roussel Uclaf to negotiate with the Population Council to bring RU-486 onto the United States market. Specifically, at the April meeting Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council agreed:

- That Roussel Uclaf would license RU-486 to the Population Council, which would conduct a clinical trial involving 2000 women pursuant to an investigational new drug (IND) application;

- That the Population Council would ultimately submit a new drug application (NDA) to FDA, based on the results of the clinical trial and on other studies that have been conducted by Roussel Uclaf; and

- That the Population Council, with the concurrence of Roussel Uclaf, would choose a new manufacturer for the drug, and that Roussel Uclaf would transfer its technology for making the drug to that manufacturer because Roussel Uclaf does not want to manufacture the drug for sale in this country.

It was then left for the Population Council and Roussel Uclaf to revise the terms of their contract, while Roussel Uclaf began sending scientific information to FDA and the Population Council. A tentative goal of September 15 was established for concluding the contract negotiations. As of late July 1993, the Population Council thought that the negotiations were proceeding smoothly, though slowly.
MEMORANDUM FOR CAROL RASCO

The purposes of this memorandum are: (1) to inform you of the Department's progress in implementing the President's directive of January 22, 1993, to "assess initiatives by which the Department of Health and Human Services can promote the testing, licensing, and manufacturing in the United States of RU-486 or other antiprogestins;" and (2) to outline the necessary next steps to accomplish the President's directive.

Background: You may recall that RU-486 is manufactured by the French firm Roussel Uclaf and is approved to induce abortions in France, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. Roussel Uclaf has stated that it can act in the United States only with the approval of its parent company, Hoechst AG, a German firm. Hoechst has historically refused to permit Roussel Uclaf to seek marketing approval for RU-486 as an abortifacient in the United States.

Both Dr. Kessler and I have taken steps to persuade Roussel Uclaf and Hoechst to change their position. In February Dr. Kessler met with Dr. Edouard Sakiz, the President of Roussel Uclaf, to discuss the availability of RU-486 in the United States for research and marketing. In March I wrote to Professor Wolfgang Hilger, President of the Board of Hoechst, to ask him to permit Roussel Uclaf to begin any necessary testing of RU-486 in the United States in preparation for filing a new drug application with the FDA. Later in March there were press reports that Roussel Uclaf would respond to the requests of the Clinton Administration to make RU-486 available in this country and that testing of the drug would begin approximately two months later (i.e., in May).

In April 1993, FDA arranged a meeting between Roussel Uclaf and the Population Council, a non-profit corporation that conducts research on reproductive health issues. The meeting's purpose was to facilitate an agreement between those parties to work together to test RU-486 and file a new drug application for the drug. The Population Council was identified as the most likely group to work with Roussel Uclaf because of an existing contract between these two parties that required Roussel Uclaf to give the Population Council sufficient amounts of the drug for the Population Council to conduct clinical trials. The contract also appeared to require Roussel Uclaf to license the drug to the Population Council if Roussel Uclaf were unwilling to sell the drug in the United States.

At the April meeting, Dr. Edouard Sakiz, President of Roussel Uclaf, raised the issue of federal legislation to indemnify
January 29, 1993

Professor Wolfgang Hilgar  
President of the Board  
Hoehst AG  
D-6230 Frankfurt-am-Main 80  
GERMANY

Dear Professor Hilgar:

The Food and Drug Administration contacted Dr. Edouard Sakis of Roussel-Uclaf in December 1992 to discuss the availability of mifepristone in the United States for research and marketing.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you directly of our interest in this important matter. The Food and Drug Administration wants the opportunity to review a New Drug Application for RU-486 for termination of early pregnancy. To that end, we think that Roussel-Uclaf should submit an application as soon as possible. If Roussel-Uclaf thinks that additional research on RU-486 is required, Dr. Sakis should advise us as to what research he thinks is necessary and provide us with a time frame for conducting such research. We would appreciate it if you would expedite progress in this regard.

At our February 24, 1993 meeting with Dr. Sakis we plan to discuss the status of knowledge concerning the safety and efficacy of the drug, the readiness for a New Drug Application for this indication, the suitability of a treatment IND as an interim undertaking, and the identity of the applicant.

We would appreciate hearing your views on this matter. I can be reached at (301) 443-2410 and my mailing address is 5800 Fishers Lane, Room 14-71, Rockville, Maryland--20852.

Sincerely yours,

David A. Kessler, M.D.  
Commissioner of Food and Drugs

cc: Dr. Edouard Sakis
MEMORANDUM

TO: Carol Rascoe
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

FROM: Kevin Thurm
Chief of Staff to the Secretary

SUBJECT: RU-496 Letter

Per our conversation yesterday, I am sending you this draft letter regarding RU-496. I would appreciate your expediting approval through legal counsel and communications offices. If the letter can be received by Hilger before the meeting between FDA and Roussel-Uclaf for Tuesday, progress toward the Company's application for U.S. approval may be accelerated.

Thanks for your help.

January 29, 1993
FAX COVER SHEET

TO: (NAME, ORGANIZATION, CITY/STATE AND PHONE NUMBER):

Carol Pascoe

FROM: (NAME, ORGANIZATION, CITY/STATE AND PHONE NUMBER):

Kevin Thurn  (690-6133)

RECIPIENTS FAX NUMBER: ( ) 456-2878

NUMBER OF PAGES TO SEND (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 3

129
Pending answer from Legal

Walter Dellinger starts Tues. 2/12 & needs to review w/have answer 1st thing

2/2 - approved by Walter Dellinger, Legal
- Left message for Kevin Huynh to proceed.
THIS FORM MARKS THE FILE LOCATION OF ITEM NUMBER 1.
LISTED IN THE WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER.

THE FOLLOWING PAGE HAS HAD MATERIAL REDACTED. CONSULT THE
WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.
May 11, 1994

NOTE TO CAROL RASCO

The following are the HHS attendees at the meeting with Carol Rasco on RU-486, at 10:00 a.m., May 11, 1994, in Carol's Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>SOCIAL SECURITY NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Thurm</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Rabb</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kessler</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avis LaVelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Klepner</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pendergast</td>
<td></td>
<td>REDACTED REDACTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>