

trary division is not only totally unrealistic but also most regrettable. I believe that I speak for the overwhelming majority of physicians when I state most emphatically that I do not belong to either group.

Senator NELSON. May I interrupt you for a moment?

Dr. CONNELL. Surely.

Senator NELSON. I would think that perhaps all but two witnesses would put themselves in your category. There may have been reports and stories written which characterized witnesses as pro-pill or anti-pill. I read one national magazine that said that this week, the hearings were loaded seven to one against the pill. I could find about four of them who did not address themselves one way or another, pro or con the pill. But the hearings have not been aimed at either camp, and I do not think that more than one or two of the witnesses who have already appeared would put themselves in the category of anti-pill.

Some of them have been pro and others have simply expressed their concern about certain aspects of it. But today, Doctor Ball was the only doctor who has testified that he was opposed to using the pill at all.

Dr. CONNELL. I was not speaking here only of physicians testifying before you. I was speaking of physicians at large who are now being classified by their patients and their confreres as being either pro- or anti-pill. This is what is happening outside of these hearings.

I firmly believe that no thinking objective doctor can be totally pro-pill or totally anti-pill. We all recognize the tremendous contribution made by these agents to medicine and society, and we use them with the same judgment and the same respect we pay to any powerful drug. In this respect, we are pro-pill.

We also recognize that there is an element of risk in all potent medications, and so for particular patients, we are anti-pill. However, to be forced daily by current pressures to declare ourselves as belonging to either the far left or the far right on this question is not only increasingly annoying but is actually incredibly destructive. Segregation of doctors into opposing camps is of value to no one, least of all the women we are all dedicated to serving.

I would like to look first at what has come out of the preceding days of testimony, as viewed by a self-styled moderate. First of all, virtually nothing has been presented in these hearings that those of us working in this field have not heard many times over. When I examined the vintage of the testimony to date, I discovered that some is relatively new, much is several years old, and a few pearls of information were in print long before I started in medical school.

It has been frequently asserted that the hearings, thus far, have been slanted, one-sided, and unfair. Objective consideration suggests that in one sense, this criticism may indeed be valid. The bias which I feel has been noticeable on previous days has been the bias of positive results. No scientist of experience would question the capability and integrity of almost all the previous witnesses. Their work has been meticulous and their results are not in question. What is disturbing is the fact that such a great percentage of time has been