said Saturday." Is it likely that the UPI, which also originated this story, manufactured this spokesman?

Dr. GODDARD. Mr. Gray, I do not know who the spokesman was. I cannot speak for the Department on this. I can only tell you as the head of one agency, the information we have provided is on what research is being carried out, what IND studies are now being carried out, what we are finding in respect to marihuana in our BDAC activities. Beyond that, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the spokesman.

Mr. ROUSH. Who represents FDA in this study?

Dr. GODDARD. I do in providing information that the Department required.

Mr. ROUSH. You have not designated a particular individual or individuals to participate in the fiscal study itself, then? That is, in actively participating in the study?

Dr. GODDARD. No; I have not designated anyone. All that has occurred is we have been asked to provide certain information as a significant situation. We transmitted that information and to my knowledge, that is all that has happened.

(Subsequent to the hearings there was further correspondence with respect to this matter. The correspondence and other relevant documents follow:)

DECEMBER 1, 1967.

Dr. JAMES L. GODDARD,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER GODDARD: When you testified before the subcommittee on November 14 on the subject of marihuana controls, Mr. Roush, who was presiding in my absence, asked you about a UPI news story which appeared in the October 15 Minneapolis Tribune. This story, which appeared 3 days before the one in which you were allegedly misquoted, stated that for several months staff members from FDA, PHS, and the legal office of HEW had been conducting a study of marihuana aimed at determining whether the present stringent restrictions and criminal penalties for its use should be revised.

When Mr. Roush questioned you about this story, you said that you did not believe it was accurate. You acknowledged that a marihuana study had been carried out in the Department and that you personally represented FDA, but you maintained that the study was primarily oriented toward research on marihuana and that FDA's role was limited to providing information on research being carried out under IND's and on findings with respect to marihuana under BDAC activities.

A review of FDA files by the subcommittee staff subsequent to the hearings indicates that the HEW study was far broader and that FDA was far more deeply involved than your testimony indicated. The files show that at a meeting on June 28, 1967, representatives from NIMH, FDA, and OE were asked to submit views on marihuana to Mr. Joseph Murphy, special assistant to Secretary Gardner.

FDA's suggested departmental position on marihuana is contained in a July 21, 1967, memorandum from you to Dr. Milton Silverman, another special assistant to the Secretary. That memorandum outlines four alternative positions and lists the advantages and disadvantages of each. However, the alternative which you recommended be adopted called for control of marihuana as an hallucinogen under the Drug Abuse Control Act. Your specific recommendations for implementation of this policy were as follows:

1. Adequate resources for enforcement, education, training, and research be made available to Hew.
2. Repeal the current Marihuana Tax Act.
3. Place marihuana under DACA as an hallucinogen.