port. It reflects the increase in information. We had a good many consultants, and we had the benefit of some experimental work that was done by the Committee itself, namely, the Sartwell Report on Thromboembolism.

It differed from the previous report on pills in several respects that I will take up in just a minute. I would like to say at this point that it seems to me that the Food and Drug Administration and the Committee have been more than diligent in an effort to keep abreast of the information available to them. I can find really no fault with this organization. My resignation as Chairman of the Advisory Committee took place in December and was based entirely on my own preference. I told Dr. Ley at the time that I thought it was time for some fresh blood in the Committee, that I had given and said about all I could say in any report, and I hoped he would agree with me and accept my resignation. He did, with reluctance. Actually, it happens that with my new job as Deputy Assistant Secretary, I could not be Chairman of that Committee anymore anyway.

Now, I think also that one can say the same thing for the Committee on Safety of Drugs in Great Britain. They have been hardworking, they have endeavored to keep the public and the press and the scientific community informed.

I think that these three documents, Senator Nelson—and I am not alone in this opinion—constitute the best single body of knowledge on modern contraception that is available today. The distribution of these documents throughout the world, bespeaks this matter.

Now, let us get down to the second report.

Our Committee worked by dividing into task forces. The assignments of the various task forces were discussed at a preliminary meeting. Then the Chairman assigned the various members to the task force. They were allowed to meet at any intervals that the chairmen of the task forces wanted to. The resources of the Food and Drug Administration were available to them, as well as the resources of the pharmaceutical industry. I would like to emphasize here that the industry has always been cooperative with this Committee in any day they could.

When a task force had a rough draft of its report, and this was often very rough, there was a meeting of the Committee and the rough draft was read to the members of the Committee. Suggestions for change were made. When the final drafts or what they thought were the final drafts were ready, there was another meeting of the Committee. The final drafts were read in detail, the data presented, and corrections made by the Committee and approval or disapproval of the report made.

You will notice in the first report that the Committee on Carcinogenesis has two reports. This has often been interpreted as meaning there was a minority and a majority report. I do not like minority reports. I do not think they mean very much. It was not a minority report. There was a real divergence of opinion, and it seemed to the Committee, and they voted so, that both reports should be published. And I think it was very salutary that they were.

Then, after the task forces were in, the Chairman had the task of trying to summarize what was said. This fell to me and it fell three times in succession, during my vacation. I had a little difficulty with my wife on this problem. Nevertheless, when the Chairman submitted