

Farris covering changes in the uterine lining under the influence of oral contraceptives and I again recommended the publication of this report.

In 1965, there was a critical article submitted to the J.A.M.A. entitled "Is Fertility Altered by Oral Contraception?" Here again, this article was accepted for publication but as a "Letter to the Editor" since it did not contain a great deal of original data.

In addition, in August 1964, there was an article by Robert Burtket of Cincinnati General Hospital, which was reviewed and accepted for publication relating to "The Incidence of Idiopathic Thromboembolism in Women."

In November 1966, an article was submitted from Scott Air Force Base by Doctor S. S. Resnick describing "Melasma Induced by Oral Contraceptive Drugs." This presented a possible new side effect and I recommended its publication.

In addition, more recently, February 1968, there was an article entitled "Ovulation Suppression, Psychological Functioning and Marital Adjustment" and this article was also accepted for publication.

These are just a few illustrations of some of the types of articles that were considered acceptable and that primarily dealt with problems of side effects related to use of the pills.

On other occasions where there were articles submitted relating to new modifications of present pills which did not seem to present any major scientific advances, and I went on record as suggesting that these not be published and in almost all instances the Editors went along with these recommendations. This, despite the fact, that their publication would have undoubtedly been desired by advertisers.

It is, therefore, I am sure most unfair for any statement to remain in the record implying that the J.A.M.A. had acted in any prejudicial fashion regarding publication of reports relating to oral contraceptives.

There are other major concerns that I have regarding the government's relationship to oral contraceptives and the lack of a keen interest in them, dating back to the start of these programs. It appears to me that during the several years since the introduction of oral contraceptives, government research funds have been extremely limited in the direction of exploring possible side effects. As a matter of fact, I am certain that the amount of money available from NIH for research into these fields was extremely limited and it was apparently felt that the pharmaceutical industry should take care of any other necessary studies on these medications even after they were approved for marketing. This might be to some extent reasonable if one were to assume that there was only limited numbers of women using a very specialized medication. On the other hand, when the numbers became so great that it appeared that only extensive studies on large population groups could provide meaningful information, this would have been a time for the government to step in and exert its influence as well as provide cooperation to investigators. My impression is that only in the last few years has there been any real government policy toward encouraging contraceptive research.

In addition, The Population Council and Ford Foundation which originally supported limited oral contraceptive research then decided that this was not in their field of interest and also indicated it was the drug industry's concern.

I will send you correspondence to verify each of these statements, should you indicate you would like copies.

At the time I started this report it appeared indefinite as to whether my testimony would be desired in Washington to present a more objective viewpoint than had appeared to date. Since I find that some of the recent presentations have made more sense it is unlikely that it will be necessary for me to come personally. Therefore, not knowing what use will be made of these written remarks, I will discontinue them at this point and simply indicate that if you should care to have more data for the records I would be glad to discuss in writing what I know about the FDA's attitude toward oral contraceptives over the past decade, as well as the WHO, where industry has stood, how the present coverage has to some extent been manipulated, how TV has very obviously taken sides and how, in general, this subject has become more of a political football than a matter for objective scientific evaluation.

Yours respectfully,

EDWARD T. TYLER, M.D.

*Medical Director, Family Planning Centers of Greater Los Angeles.*

(Enclosure omitted.)