

The fact is that today the United States is one of the safest countries in the world in which to have a baby for the vast majority of women. Pill promoters are doing American women a disservice by not differentiating the small handful of women who are at high risk from the great majority of women who are at negligible risk.

If they did distinguish, and here I include the failure of the Chairman of the FDA Committee on Obstetrics and Gynecology to make such a distinction in his "Summary of the Second Report, 1969," they would of necessity conclude that for approximately 85 percent of the women on the pill at the time the hearings began, that is, $7\frac{1}{4}$ of $8\frac{1}{2}$ million women on the pill, the risk to health from pregnancy is negligible, whereas the risk from the pill is real.

It is for this reason that I agree with the position of Dr. Philip Corfman of the FDA Committee—a position which did not find its way into the Chairman's summary report either because it was suppressed or ignored—that the pill's "use should be monitored and restricted to women who cannot use other methods effectively."⁷

And I do hope the committee will see that Dr. Corfman's suppressed or ignored conclusions, because apparently he was not consulted in the Chairman's summary, gets publicity.

Mr. DUFFY. Did he sign the report, Dr. Ratner?

Dr. RATNER. No, the Chairman's summary was written by the Chairman; by nobody else. He signed his own section.

Mr. DUFFY. Dr. Hertz did not agree, by the way, he is the new chairman of the committee.

Dr. RATNER. You have a reference to support my statement in M.H. pages 3-48. Dr. Guttmacher was again in error in his testimony when he attributed the conclusion of the Chairman's summary to the 14 eminent unbiased physicians, public health experts, and highly qualified research scientists. The evidence is that not all the committee members concurred in Dr. Hellman's conclusion (Medical World News, Sept. 19, 1965, p. 5).

Now, Mr. Duffy, I would like to point out one thing, perhaps in answer to what you just said. In 1966, when the first report came out with Hellman as chairman, that summary was written by the whole committee. I think somebody should find out why in 1969 the position was switched so that he alone wrote the summary, because it does not seem coincidental that a drug firm immediately had the summary circularized all over the United States.

We do not yet live in Orwell's society, although some of our colleagues in both medicine and Government do not wish to admit this. For Dr. Guttmacher to say, in effect, that the hearings have produced nothing new in regard to risks, that those who are well-informed have known these things all along, that they—the well-informed—have balanced the hazards against the values and decided as groups of experts what is best for the less well-informed, the misinformed, and the uninformed is an affront to the principles of good medicine, as well as the foundations of the form of government under which we live and which you have been elected to uphold.

⁷ See reference 7 of Bibliography.