

equipped to answer honestly and authoritatively the facts that have been presented about the pill—not conjectures but facts, and I think that he should be made to recognize the necessity for him to take the time from the busy life of a doctor to answer these questions, and if he feels that he cannot do this, then I think he should not dispense the pill.

We must recognize that for many situations, the pill may not be the ideal contraceptive. I have often said, and I would say it again, that I think that nothing can be substituted for the pill when it comes to premarital sexual relations. I think nothing can be substituted for the pill in early marriage, where couples are making a good physical adjustment. But I think after marriage has matured and a good sexual adjustment has been made, then I think the intelligent patient should go to an intelligent physician and discuss methods of contraception. She may find that other methods may be quite satisfactory to her.

Some couples have become so dependent upon the pill, because to them its great virtues would not permit them to substitute other methods. Since sexual response and satisfaction is so largely psychic and so little organic, it is what one's attitude is that counts. If couples wish to reject other methods of contraception, I think they have the right to. On the other hand, if they can make a trial of other methods and find them entirely satisfactory, I think perhaps other methods should be substituted.

Now, of course, I get back to what I told Senator Nelson. The primary responsibility, I think, is to educate the medical public, not the lay public. And this is a tough assignment.

Senator JAVITS. I think the Government can play a very significant role in this. I think, therefore, any additional help you can give us on that score would certainly be welcome, very constructive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Chair particularly for its indulgence in allowing me to break in with this rather lengthy questioning.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Senator.

I have just one minor observation on the question that was raised on the balance of the hearings. For example, we called Marvin Legator, Chief, Biology Branch, and Director of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Bureau of Science, Food and Drug Administration, on the first day, because of the distinguished work he has done.

On the second day, we called Dr. Roy Hertz, Assistant Medical Director, Biomedical Division, Population Council, Rockefeller University, and a member of the Food and Drug Administration panel and a member who signed the so-called Hellman Report. Dr. Hertz made an important contribution to the FDA report. Dr. Hertz' testimony got widespread publicity because he was critical of many aspects of the pill. But of course, that was his testimony.

Then we called Dr. Kistner on the second day because he is a very distinguished gynecologist, wrote a book on it—a very good book—which I read and in which he, for all practical purposes, unqualifiedly endorses the pill. He is a strong proponent, so he was on the second day.

On the third day, we had Dr. Hellman, who is the chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration. He had very critical things to say about the pill. He was chairman and