

Goddard conceded, however, the basic accuracy of an October 19 front page story in the New York Times which quoted him as saying "whether or not marihuana is a more dangerous drug than alcohol is debatable—I don't happen to think it is."

With regard to his children, the Times said Goddard was asked if he would object to his son or daughter using marihuana. Reported the Times: "We've discussed this at home," he said, adding, "I would object in terms of the law today and any possible long-term effects."

The October 18 Minneapolis Tribune, in a story carrying Cohn's byline, attributed to Goddard the same quotes as the Times piece the following day on his children using marihuana and whether it is more dangerous than alcohol.

UPI STORY UNDERSTOOD TO HAVE COME FROM STUDENT PUBLICITY STAFFER

Goddard "stated two reservations," the Tribune story added. The first was that "We don't know what its (marihuana's) long-term effects are. For example, we don't know whether or not it may alter the chromosomes, as LSD may do. I wouldn't want young women who haven't been married and had children yet to be affected." Goddard's second reservation, the Tribune continued, was that marihuana "distorts your perception of reality so it's dangerous if you're driving a vehicle or operating heavy equipment."

The Tribune story added that Goddard is not in favor of "legalizing" marihuana completely. He was quoted as saying: "We need more research on chronic use, and I think this research will start now." The same quotes appeared in the Times story which was bylined as a "special" to the New York paper. It was based on Cohn's story, and written by his Minneapolis colleague, Lewis Cope. This is a customary journalistic practice when a newspaper wants a report on a distant story.

United Press International (UPI) launched the nationwide furor over Goddard's remarks when it carried a story from Minneapolis on the morning of October 17. It did not quote Goddard directly, but reported that Goddard said marihuana is no more dangerous than alcohol. The story also said: "He—Goddard—said he would not object any more to his college daughter smoking pot than he would to her drinking a cocktail." The UPI story was understood to have been based on a phone report from a University of Minnesota student publicity staffer.

The UPI story was obviously part of the basis for an October 18 story in the Washington Post, which the paper said was taken "from news dispatches." The Post story said: "The physician, who was appointed to the FDA in January 1966, said he would not object any more to his college-age daughter smoking marihuana than he would to her drinking a cocktail."

Goddard, in a three-paragraph statement issued October 19, said: "The statement that marihuana may not be more hazardous than alcohol can be misleading to those who are not familiar with the hazards of alcohol." The FDA Commissioner noted that there are an estimated 11,000 deaths annually from alcohol—"and most experts regard that as a conservative figure."

"No month goes by in which the FDA is not ruling adversely on drugs which are less hazardous than alcohol," the Goddard statement continued. "The research on marihuana and its effects is still extremely deficient and we must know a great deal more about its effect upon the individual." The Washington Post reported the Goddard statement the following day under the headline, "Goddard Defends 'Pot' Views."

In an October 20 followup dispatch, UPI said that "Goddard, under congressional fire for equating the dangers of marihuana with those of alcohol, says the statement was intended to point up the hazards of the drug, not minimize them." Reporting Goddard's October 19 statement, the news service repeated its earlier report that Goddard had said he would not object any more if his 18-year-old daughter smoked marihuana than if she drank a cocktail. Statements critical of Goddard quickly appeared in the Congressional Record, all inserted by Republicans.

Representative Kuykendall, of Tennessee, called the statement "one of the most shocking statements I have ever seen attributed to a high Government official." He added: "Such a statement by the head of an important Federal department is completely irresponsible and, in my opinion, makes Dr. Goddard