

development of high blood pressure in a certain small proportion of patients. We know the fact that certain patients get depressed on the pill.

These are facts we are all privy to.

But when it comes to cancer, for example, you are dealing then with a wholly conjectural structure, because we have no evidence to date that the pill causes cancer in the human. When we talk about chromosomal damage to the ovary and perhaps to the offspring, we are talking about conjecture and not fact.

This is the thing that I think has a tendency to confuse the public, because the public does not separate fact from conjecture. When you are talking about cancer in such a meeting, in such a forum as this, they do not take Dr. Roy Hertz's statement that no cancer that he knows of in either a monkey or in a human being can be attributed to the pill. Dr. Hertz is concerned that the hormone estrogen may cause cancer in two target organs in women on the pill, the breast and the uterus.

This is highly inflammatory to the public.

Senator JAVITS. The doctor's first responsibility as to whether he will allow the patient to use the pill and as to what information he will give the patient about the pill is to the patient? That is the first responsibility?

Dr. GUTTMACHER. Absolutely.

Senator JAVITS. And the first responsibility?

Dr. GUTTMACHER. Yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. So a patient has a right to assume that the doctor is going to be fair and honest with that patient.

Dr. GUTTMACHER. I hope so. I expect so.

Senator JAVITS. That is true of many other medicines?

Dr. GUTTMACHER. That is true. If the doctor is going to recommend surgery, he has to do it from the patient's point of view, because it is necessary.

Senator JAVITS. Dr. Connell's implied criticism—and I think she was rather soft in this—of the hearings was that the presentation should have been very carefully balanced at every stage so that the public does not get hit on the head with a sandbag. This has caused many serious problems, which I understand has resulted in a number of unwanted pregnancies, some of which have been terminated by abortions. What is your comment on that? That was my understanding of the implication of her testimony.

Dr. GUTTMACHER. It would have been certainly preferable, if feasible. I am not sure you know how a witness is going to testify before he comes on the stand, and perhaps many of the witnesses were uncertain even when they were called. But I think a balanced picture is very valuable, and unfortunately thus far this has not been a balanced presentation. I do not think it is by design of the chairman; I think it is a matter, perhaps, of happenstance that this has been an overwhelmingly negative type of hearing in regard to the safety of the pill. I do not think that people have emphasized the vast and tremendous importance that the pill has to certain segments of our population.

When one says more or less carelessly that other methods of contraception can be easily substituted, he is really not talking out of