

Dr. KISTNER. I am quoting the tobacco statistics from the textbook of Peel and Potts. I am not a tobacco expert. I don't smoke.

May I continue?

In regard to cancer preliminary studies by Pincus and Garcia in Puerto Rico, studies indicated a lessened incidence of cancer in users of breast, cervical and endometrial malignancy. But, as Dr. Hertz has pointed out, the age group was much below the average and the length of pill-usage was too short. Critics stated it would take 10 or possibly 20 years before the "cancer epidemic" would appear. However, apprehension that the pill causes cancer is not shared by the majority of physicians. Reporting on 7 years of experience with the pill, 99 percent of specialists surveyed by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists stated that they did not correlate breast or endometrial cancer with the use of the pill. The specialists' virtually unanimous statement agrees with the reports of several research studies where women have taken the pill for 12 years.

There is one aspect of the problem, however, that remains unanswered. This concerns the timelag or latent period between exposure to agents that cause cancer and the actual development of the disease. The advisory (Hellman) committee on obstetrics and gynecology, in its report to the Food and Drug Administration, said, "It is known that all human carcinogens require a latent period of approximately one decade before exerting their result. Hence any valid conclusion must await accurate data on a much larger group of women studied for at least 10 years." Observations on the first group of patients treated 10 years ago are now being collected and analyzed. But the sample is small. The next 5 years should provide sufficient patients from which conclusive data may be derived. Meanwhile, in my opinion, there is no statistically valid basis for linking the pill to the various forms of cancer that occur in the human female.

I would like to interject one other statement at this point.

Dr. Hertz and others have stated that cancer has been produced in five strains of laboratory animals. What is not generally known is that the mice used in the early experiments were a special strain which had been inbred for hundreds of generations. These mice had such a high incidence of spontaneous cancer that if they were allowed to live their natural lifetime under the best of conditions (no chemicals at all administered) more than 50 percent would develop mammary cancer.

What about the dosage in the animal investigation. These mice were given as much as 1 gm. of the estrogenic chemical weekly for 6 months. However, a mouse weighs about 50 gm. and lives only 2 years. Actually the susceptible mouse was given half its body weight for one-fourth of its lifespan; it would be impossible to administer a proportionate amount to a woman even over a 20-year span. What about the experiments with the primates, since the human is in that particular field. Attempts to obtain similar results with other animals have failed utterly. That estrogens are not carcinogenic in other animals was shown by investigators who assaulted monkeys, I don't know whether that is a good choice of a word, who assaulted monkeys, for as long as 10 years with estrogens augmented by local trauma and other carcinogens. No malignant growths were produced. Still