

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that statements attributed to me, but which I did not make, have caused additional concern. Let me clarify the record in this regard at the very outset.

I did not say that I would not object to my daughter smoking marihuana.

I did not, and I do not, condone the use of marihuana.

I did not, and I do not, advocate the abolition of controls over marihuana.

I did not, and I do not propose "legalizing" the drug.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to one point which arose as the result of an erroneous news dispatch from Minneapolis on October 17. I was reported to have stated that I would not object any more to my daughter smoking marihuana than if she drank a cocktail.

The news dispatch was not correct, and Mr. Julius Frandsen, vice president and Washington manager of United Press International, has written me a letter on the subject. With your permission, I would like to insert a copy for the record and quote just this brief portion:

So it has become clear to me that UPI erred in attributing to you unqualified statements which in fact were considerably qualified.

I am sorry if UPI has compounded your problems. We are prepared to carry a dispatch acknowledging our error.

(The letter referred to above follows:)

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1967.

DR. JAMES L. GODDARD,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. GODDARD: Following my return from a trip, I have been belatedly looking into the circumstances of our dispatches from Minneapolis on October 17 and 18. I find we owe you an apology.

I refer to the UPI dispatch which began, without qualification:

"Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Dr. James Goddard says he would not object to his daughter smoking marijuana any more than if she drank a cocktail."

Unfortunately, no complete tape exists of your exchanges with reporters. The questioning began in an informal session in the front of the auditorium after your speech and no recording equipment was there. Equipment was set up in another room and only the ensuing proceedings at that place were taped.

UPI was represented by Miss Judy Vick of the University of Minnesota News Service. She says her notes show that in the Q. & A. with reporters in the auditorium Victor Cohn of the Minneapolis Tribune asked whether marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol. And that you replied "Whether or not marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol is debatable. I don't happen to think it is."

Miss Vick says that Mr. Cohn then asked whether you would mind if your daughter smoked marijuana any more than if she drank a cocktail, and that you replied "No, except in the context of the present law." I take that to be a reference to the fact that marijuana is illegal and alcohol is legal.

Mr. Cohn's recollection is that his question was to the effect "Would you mind if your daughter took marijuana?" His notes have you responding: "We have talked about it at home. I would (that is, would object) in terms of the law today" and "we really don't know what the long-term effects (of marijuana) are." Followed by some comments about distortion of perception following use of marijuana.

So it has become clear to me that UPI erred in attributing to you unqualified statements which in fact were considerably qualified.

I am sorry if UPI has compounded your problems. We are prepared to carry a dispatch acknowledging our error.

In view of the public uncertainty that now exists as to what you do and do not believe. I hope you will sit down with our Louis Cassels so that he can prepare