

What is disturbing to me is to see all of these attacks on the hearings upon the grounds that the public is being told what the facts are. The argument seems to be that the public should not have the facts, therefore, we should not have hearings.

There are serious problems with the pill and they do not want it publicized because it will frighten people. Some of the facts about the pill are of great concern to individuals, and they ought to be told, and that is one of the things these hearings are about.

And if anybody thinks that this pill, which is in about the model T stage in this field, is the solution to the world's population problems, it is nonsense.

If we do not get this out in the open and if, unfortunately, some very substantial and serious side effects develop that are not now specifically known, leaving out carcinoma—just say metabolic imbalances that create a serious problem for women for the last 20 years in their life—if that occurred—and nobody knows that it will not, and the FDA report is very concerned about it—if it does occur, it will wipe out all birth control pills all over the world all at once. It is a whole lot better to have 6 percent of them fussing and worrying now and get at the business of having the public understand the issue and get the money for the research and do something about expanding studies for planned parenthood and research in this field, than to run around concerned only about the fright which occurred when you start telling the American women the truth—facts they should have been told 10 years ago.

That is my view.

Senator DOLE. Mrs. Piotrow, did you say 100,000 even at 6 percent? I do not want to take any credit from the Chairman. You referred to them as "Nelson babies" and that is all right with me. Do you consider that a conservative estimate?

Mrs. PIOTROW. I arrive at the figure 100,000 babies on the estimate that two-thirds of the women who had discontinued pills manage to find some other effective method and do not become pregnant. That is a fairly conservative estimate, that two-thirds of the women who stopped taking orals managed to avoid pregnancy some other way. I was only considering on the basis of one-third of those who discontinued, which is 600,000 women. One-third of those were then being exposed to pregnancy for a period of 3 months.

And again, figuring conservatively, the 600,000 women are exposed to pregnancy for a period of 3 months when the likelihood is about 80 percent for married women at risk to become pregnant over a 12-month period. Over 3 months, there would be a 20-percent chance of becoming pregnant, so that would be about 120,000 pregnancies. I would assume a considerable number of those would not lead to births, either because of spontaneous miscarriages or, in a great many cases, abortion, even though it is not legal.

So when I get the figure down to 100,000 unwanted births in 1970, that is conservative. One could say it was going to be 1.6 million. But I think the figure 100,000 is probably a conservative figure for this particular group that may be the result of these hearings, Nelson subcommittee babies.