

HISTORY OF THE
U. S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Interview between:

Arnold N. Morton, Retired

Director, Inspection Branch, New York

and

Robert G. Porter

Poulsbo, Washington

August 7, 1979

STATEMENT OF GIFT

I, Arnold N. Morton, hereby give to the United States of America for inclusion in the collections of the National Library of Medicine and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, the magnetic tape recording of the interview held on August 7, 1979, between Robert G. Porter and myself, together with the final edited transcript made from this recording. It is my understanding that a copy of the final edited transcript is to be deposited in the library of the Emory University as well as in the National Library of Medicine.

I hereby dedicate to the public my literary rights to this recording and its transcript, so that they may be freely examined, listened to, cited, quoted, or reproduced in whole or in part, subject to such restrictions as the Library may impose to insure their proper protection and preservation.

October 9, 1979
Date

Arnold N. Morton
Donor

Accepted:

Date

Chief, History of Medicine Division
National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland

INTRODUCTION

This is a transcription of a taped interview, one of a series conducted by Robert G. Porter, who retired from the U. S. Food and Drug Administration in 1977.

The interviews were held with retired F.D.A. employees whose recollections may serve to enrich the written record.

It is hoped that these narratives of things past will serve as source material for present and future researchers; that the stories of important accomplishments, interesting events, and distinguished leaders will find a place in training and orientation of new employees, and may be useful to enhance the morale of the organization; and finally, that they will be of value to Dr. James Harvey Young in the writing of the history of the Food and Drug Administration.

The tapes and transcriptions will become a part of the collection of the National Library of Medicine and copies of the transcriptions will be placed in the Library of Emory University.



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

TAPE INDEX SHEET

CASSETTE NUMBER(S) 1 & 2

GENERAL TOPIC OF INTERVIEW: History of the Food & Drug Administration

DATE: Aug. 7, 1978 PLACE: Poulsbo, Washington LENGTH: 127 Min.

INTERVIEWEE

INTERVIEWER

NAME: Arnold N. Morton

NAME: Robert G. Porter

ADDRESS: 00752 Chastant Road, N.W.

ADDRESS: U.S. Food & Drug Administration

Denver, Colorado

FDA SERVICE DATES: FROM 1939 TO 1970 RETIRED? Yes

TITLE: Director, Investigation Branch, New York District
(If retired, title of last FDA position)

CASSETT | SIDE | EST. TIME | PAGE
NO. | NO. | ON TAPE | NO.

SUBJECT

1	A	0 Min.	1	Introductory Remarks	
		1	1	Biographical Material	
		10	6	Quackery Investigations and Other Early Inspection Work	
		14	8	Nue Ovo Investigation	
		17	9	Additional Biographical Material	
		B	0	13	" " "
			4	15	Early FDA leaders
	6		16	Merlek Mineral Water Investigation, Dr. Ralph Weilerstein, Dr. Nelson, Dan Willis	
	2	A	13	20	Enforcement Philosophy - Andy Brown, Harry Moore
			16	21	John L. Harvey
			22	23	Walter G. Campbell
			23	23	Paul Dunbar
			27	24	Charles Crawford
			0	25	George P. Larrick
4			27	Wendell Vincent	
9			30	Dairy Industry and Other Types of Work in Denver District in the 1940's and 1950's	
19			35	More About Wendell Vincent	
28			39	Weems Clevenger	
B	29	40	Intensive Drug Inspection Program		
	39	43	More About Weems Clevenger		
	44	44	Dr. Goddard - Seattle District - Cnd. Salmon		
	0	44	" " "		
	13	52	Aminotriazol in Cranberries		
	18	54	Morton's FDA Award of Merit for Suggestion About Use of Computers for Management Information		
	22	56	End of Tape		

P. - This tape is being made on August 7, 1979. It is an interview with Arnold N. Morton. Arnold came into the Food and Drug Administration in 1939 as an Inspector at Seattle District. He retired in 1970 and at that time he was Director of the Inspection Branch at New York District. This interview is taking place at Arnold's home near Poulsbo, Washington. My name is Bob Porter.

Arnold, let's get this thing started by my asking you to give us a thumbnail sketch of your career so that anyone who listens to the record will have some idea of who you are.

M. - Okay, fine Bob. It's a real pleasure, of course, to sit down with a co-worker from the past, when I was a Resident Inspector at Salt Lake City, and subsequently when I was a Chief Inspector at Denver District. Let me go back, then, to the fall of 1939. I came out of the University of Washington as a chemistry graduate with a couple of years of graduate work in chemistry and additional work at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in chemical oceanography. So that was the general background; my educational background. Let's see, in the summer of 1938 I had taken the Civil Service Examination and had passed the biochemical and the analytical chemical options. I was interested particularly in the

Food and Drug Administration because, during my academic life at one of the meetings of the Chemistry Honorary, Mr. Roe, then the Chief of Seattle Station of the Food and Drug Administration, gave us a talk about the new law, the new 1938 law at that time, and he certainly sparked a great deal of interest among a number of the people who would be graduating or who were recent graduates at that time; also other members of the Chem Honorary. So that was my first introduction to the Food and Drug Administration, through the words of Robert Roe, Bob Roe. Of course Bob, all through my career then of approximately 30, 31 years, was a man whom I always looked up to and he always was one of those men that we feel attracted to professionally and personally. Bob Roe later of course had high positions in Washington, both in management and in scientific endeavors. At the time of my interviews for employment with the Food and Drug Administration I happened to be at Woods Hole, Massachusetts and was interviewed by Walter Heath, who was then Chief Chemist at Boston Station. Walter wanted me to go to work for Boston Station, but since I was a died-in-the-wool Seattlite, a "Puget Sounder", and was just a little bit shy about going East, I prevailed on Mr. Heath to make the recommendation for appointment at Seattle District. I didn't know whether the recommended appointment had gone through and was

registering in the biochemistry department at Northwestern University. When the appointment did come through I seized upon it because it was an excellent opportunity, I felt, even though it did interfere with my planned program of graduate work. I immediately got into the 1931 Essex and headed for Seattle with my little bride of only a few months. We got to Seattle and Bob Roe said, "Arnold, tomorrow I want you to go to San Francisco." So away we went after about two days as we did have to wash some clothes after getting in from Chicago. Anyway, Bob Roe had us go down to San Francisco and there I met Jack Harvey, John L. Harvey, for the first time. Jack was at that time the Chief of the Western District of the Food and Drug Administration. The Western District consisted of the Denver, Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles Stations; each of which had laboratories. So we had at that time, the fall of 1939, a training course for the new appointees; there were approximately 27 or 28 of us in the group some of whom had signed on as Inspectors, some as Chemists. Mr. Harvey gave the new group, with the assistance of people like Harry Moore, then the Chief of San Francisco Station, the job training the neophytes from all over the Western District. We formed many close friendships during the training that exist even to this day. Some of

the group are even still active in the Food and Drug Administration; such men as Irv Berch, from the University of Washington and Fred Lofsvold, from Gonzaga University; both in the state of Washington of course. In this group, all of us had a tremendous esprit de corps and we were instilled with what amounted to almost a religious zeal in the protection of consumers and in the enforcement and the expansion of the philosophy that was written into legislation in the 1938 Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

P. - This group were always known as 39ers and were certainly a pretty distinguished group as their careers went along. They had many important jobs.

M. - Well, certainly when I think back on the group the Irv Berchs, the Fred Lofsvolds, and many of those that are now in retirement, I always feel a sense of humility because they were all very capable men. I feel as though Mr. Harvey and the others responsible for their selection did an outstanding job in their hiring. However, Bob, it seems to me as though we must recognize that there were other 39ers in other parts of the country being trained simultaneously and some of those later had interface relationships with our San Francisco group at that time--people like Winton Rankin, who later was Deputy Commissioner of Food and Drug and people like

Sam Fine, who was a colleague of mine, Sam was Chief Chemist, I was Chief Inspector at Denver at one time. So these also represented fine, distinguished Chemists and other scientists and we shouldn't forget those at all in our praise of the 1939 Western District group. However, of course we were always loyal to our own and I think of them first because of such close personal contact as a young Inspector.

Following our training at San Francisco, I understood we were going to be sent back to the Stations to which we had been appointed. Most of us were, however, there were some adjustments to be made and Mr. Harvey offered me the opportunity of going to Los Angeles as an Inspector. I had been appointed as an Inspector, but Mr. Harvey and his panel at that time also gave me the opportunity of joining Food and Drug Administration and having my rating changed to that of Chemist, for which I was qualified. I felt in looking at the work in 1939 that my opportunity for advancement and for a better contribution to the total work of the Food and Drug Administration might well lie in a career in inspection and, hopefully at some time in management. So I selected to stay as an Inspector. I can remember Jack Harvey laughing about it a little bit and asking me rather indepth why I wanted to be an Inspector. I laughed and I said, "Well, there a a number of men here

in our group who have their PhD's and who will make fine scientists for the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Harvey who didn't have a PhD, laughingly said, "Well we won't hold the PhD against them." And of course many of them did advance in scientific circles of the Food and Drug Administration. The Mortons did transfer. Then, rather than going back to Seattle Station, we did go on to Los Angeles Station and there I had my initial work as an Inspector. It soon became evident to me at Los Angeles that although a great deal of the work involved the detection and the analysis of samples for filth, I did contribute to some extent my educational knowledge in biochemistry by the inspection of quite a few of Los Angeles District's "nature fakers" as I sometimes refer to them. The "nature fakers" of course being those people who pretend that they are putting out some marvelous concoction, either in the nutritional field or in some type of drug field, or glandular field. At that time there were manufacturers of dried glandular materials. There was no scientific evidence whatsoever that the dried glandular materials, with one or two exceptions, had any therapeutic value in medicine whatsoever. So it became part of my job to look at the manufacturers of such products and I can remember some of them at that

time had literally hundreds of products which we were successful in proceeding against by seizure and to some extent against the manufacturers and promoters of them. Also, along the same line and sometimes in combination, there was the nutritional quackery element; the Ada Alberties, and the Adolphus Hohenses of the time. The Food and Drug Administration, using the provisions of the 1938 Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, was quite successful in court in establishing that many of these things were either harmful or useless and misbranded. I was rather actively interested in that field and did contribute to some extent at the time. It must be remembered, however, that a lot of the young Inspectors did a great deal of the leg work; things somewhat difficult for older Inspectors maybe to do, such as the sampling of bulk foods; flour, barrels of foods such as pickles or olives and that sort of thing. So during those years in late 1939, '40, '41 and early 1942 I did a lot of leg work in Arizona and Southern California. It was an excellent experience for independent work because the staff was relatively small and we had a new, and somewhat untried law, that had not been completely explored as to what its effect might be. I recall, in particular, one rather interesting misbranding. I had inspected a firm called Arnold Pickle and Olive Company in Phoenix

and found that they were blending domestic olive oil with other oils, all domestic, but they were labeled as genuine, imported olive oil. This was a relatively minor misbranding, but it was something that was interesting in that the new law certainly covered it very definitely and we were successful in bringing a case against the product and making it stick. The courts considered the case quite favorably and felt that it was an imposition on the consumer to be buying an imported olive oil and actually receiving domestic olive oil; even though nutritionally it might have been the same value. Anyway, at that time too, in exploring Arizona, we had ancillary work such as was going on in other Food and Drug Stations; other Food and Drug areas. I think particularly of one window display in Phoenix which helped considerably in the early prosecutions and seizures of the compound Nue Ovo, the patent medicine Nue Ovo manufactured in Portland, Oregon. The window display with proper photography helped to establish a very serious misbranding for many, many serious afflictions, and of course the product had no merit whatsoever. Interestingly enough, the Neu Ovo cases were tried primarily in Tacoma, Washington and before the rather famous, or some feel people feel infamous, Judge Boldt. Judge Boldt, of course, is the

one who most recently has been involved with much controversy over Indian fishing rights. Judge Boldt also was the price control administrator during I believe the Nixon Administration; at least a previous administration. Judge Boldt enunciated some important precedent law and he was upheld on appeal during the various appeals in the Neu Ovo cases.

P. - What precedent was established?

M. - The precedent, of course, for the misbranding of the product, both by virtue of the bringing together of the misbranding literature at destination; such as demonstrated in the window display at Phoenix, and other things that slip my mind at the present time. They are spread, of course, very completely in such volumes as Kleinfeld and Dunn and in various court reporting reports.

P. - Let me interrupt you just a minute just to see if we're getting a recording here. We're on again now.

M. - Well, Bob, those were just a couple of the highlights in Arizona and Southern California. Mr. Harvey, much to my surprise, offered me a job of Resident Inspector at Salt Lake City, Utah, with the transfer as of March of 1942. Remember this is just at the start of World War II and it involved some rather severe personal problems, as well as some of the problems with the war's impact on Food and Drug work.

We were in Salt Lake then for about, let's see,

until 1945 in December. So from March 1942 to December of '45 we were Resident at Salt Lake City. Then...

P. - Which is the time you and I got to know each other because I went to Salt Lake...

M. - That's true, Bob.

P. - ...worked as your junior partner.

M. - I was always glad that you were able to come to Salt Lake City and that we became such close friends at that time because certainly our friendship over the years has been profitable for both of us in so many, many ways. I consider you, Bob, as one of my best, if not really the best and closest friend in the Food and Drug Administration. Anyway, leaving Salt Lake and leaving you, Bob, behind to catch up with some of my deficiencies, I went on to Portland, Oregon, where at that time we had a sub-station of Seattle Station. The sub-station consisted of a small laboratory with three or four chemists, most of the time three chemists with a part of time four chemists working at the lab and about the same number of Inspectors. We had a little clerical help at that time. I was the Inspector in charge at the time. Richard Edge was the Chemist in charge. It was a sort of two-headed management team and we did a lot of valuable work, particularly in the canning and freezing industry of southwest Washington state and of Oregon, as well as general assignments.

Following the assignment at Portland, I finally went back home, so to speak, to Seattle. I've always considered Seattle as my ultimate home, or at least the Puget Sound area as my home. So fortunately I was able to come home and to work under a man who I have a great deal of respect for, both as a person and in his technical and Food and Drug qualifications. That was Kenneth E. Monfore, who was Station Chief at that time. Possibly by that time it was now a District. I've forgotten the exact date that Stations became Districts. But, in any event, I had the opportunity, then, to work closely with Ken Monfore as an Inspector and at the same time Fred Lofsvold from the class of '39 was working with Ken also. So with Fred and Ken and some of the others that formed a nucleus, we did a lot of cleaning up of the industries; the fishing and canning and freezing industries, as well as the traditional pesticide work which was always in the background in the orchards and the fields of the Pacific Northwest.

- P. - Monfore considers the pesticide work as probably the one subject, if he could pick one most important subject throughout his career, it was that. So that he probably influenced you to do a fair amount of that too.
- M. - Both at Portland and then on my return to Seattle, I did do a moderate amount of field work in the investigation

of the misuse of pesticides. There was, of course, the educational opportunities also for helping people in agriculture to understand the effects of various new chemical entities that were being used, both at the conclusion of World War II, and then in the years subsequent to World War II. The years then in the late '40's at Seattle Station were a period of growth, both personally and of course within the District. The opportunity then came at the beginning of the '50's where two of us, there at Seattle Station, Doug Hansen, Douglas C. Hansen, who had come back from service in World War II, and I were appointed Chief Inspectors; Doug at Seattle and I at Denver District. So in June 1951, I went on to Denver as Chief Inspector. I enjoyed the assignment there; part of the time under Wendell Vincent, with whom I had had very pleasant and close relations when I was Resident at Salt Lake City, and part of the time under Ralph Horst, who succeeded Wendell Vincent as Chief of the District at that time. In 1956, primarily because of personal reasons, I requested a transfer back to Seattle District. There were a number of things of a personal nature that I felt were quite important to my family and the administration did arrange a transfer to Seattle District again as a Food and Drug Officer. Subsequently, I was promoted from Food and Drug Officer to Deputy District

Director. I guess in that time I was also an Associate Director. I think there was such a position at one time, I've forgotten.

P. - Your job was what today would be called a Compliance Officer.

M. - The Food and Drug Officer was really the District Director's right-hand man in the preparation, review, and the hearing procedure preliminary to the filing of cases. He also assisted the United States Attorney with the evidence and the testimony of Food and Drug cases in court. That work, then, continued until 1967. In other words I'm saying 1956 to 1967, a period of approximately 11 years in which I was Ken Monfore's Food and Drug Officer and Deputy Director.

In 1967 Ken retired and I was transferred then to, well, before the transfer actually I had temporary duty in Washington in a special investigation assigned by the Administration. Then after the temporary investigation and assignment, I went on to New York District as the Director of Inspection Branch for New York until my retirement in 1970. Actually I retired May 1, 1970, however, I did leave New York a little sooner than that on annual leave. I rather disliked going out on retirement because the assignment at New York was so challenging and interesting. However, because of the

tours of duty at Seattle, I had established many roots, both family roots and in outside interests and obligations of various types. I felt that it was better to take retirement in 1970 than to continue to try to handle things on both coasts at the same time. So that's briefly, Bob, the thumbnail sketch of the career in Food and Drug Administration. I feel, and I've always felt that it was a worthwhile career. I've never wanted another career actually as I did have some offers after retirement which I had to refuse. I really am the type of person who feels that after retirement from a government, particularly a regulatory position, that the employee should not sell his expertise in that area to the highest bidder. I feel as though that's somewhat being, well it's too self serving for my feelings. So I didn't go to work for another agency or the industry. That doesn't mean that I am anti-industry in any sense, however, because I do have a great deal of respect for many people and many contacts I made over the years in industrial positions.

P. - I think this morning there's several different lines that I would like you to follow and you can kind of call it the way you want it. I would like you to talk about some of the people who were important in the Administration; to enough detail so we can get a feeling of what kind of people they are. You talked about Harvey and

you mentioned people like Vincent and so on. If you would like to elaborate a little bit on people, your relationships with people at the Commissioners level, or District Directors level, fine. If there's some cases that you were involved in like you discussed the Nue Ovo case, let's bring those in. And then maybe later I would like to ask you some questions about the effects of reorganization and policy changes and so on over the years on the organization, and anything else you want to talk about. It's your tape.

M. - I think that's good, Bob. I'll be glad to talk about a few personalities that we enjoyed, maybe some of them that we didn't enjoy in the Food and Drug Administration.

P. - I want you to say some things that aren't on the written record if you will.

M. - I don't want to castigate at this late date some poor souls that saw some things somewhat differently than we may have. Going back though to my feelings as a young chemist coming out of the academic world, I did have a little bit of teaching experience at the University, but my first impression of all of the people in authority, the people both in Washington and in the field, people like Harvey and the various Station Directors at that time, Station Chiefs, I felt that they were such broad-minded people compared with some of

the narrow minds that we see in the colleges and of course in industry itself. My experience at that time had been primarily with people at the university level and I was rather amazed at how very broad-minded, how objective and how interested the people in the Food and Drug Administration were in the advancement of the young Inspectors and Chemists and other scientists, bacteriologists at that time. One of the very early trials, even before I had a year in Food and Drug Administration, I collected some samples of Merlek Mineral Water in Phoenix and that resulted in a seizure trial. Merlek Mineral Water was an interesting product in that it was Pacific Ocean water taken at a certain spot, somewhat westerly and somewhat northerly of the Golden Gate, and that was supposed to be the magic spot, and it was so promoted and the Pacific Ocean water was selling at that time in 1940 for about \$20 a gallon. It was sold as a mineral water and a cure-all. To give some idea of the volume of it there were purportedly at least 5,000 users of Merlek Mineral Water in Maricopa County, Arizona. So it was, even though the misbrandings may have been considered rather nonsensical by a scientifically trained person, nevertheless it had a tremendous impact on old people and others who believed this type of fakery. In the preparation for that trial and in

the trial itself, I had an exposure to some people who, all through my career had a great deal of influence both on Food and Drug cases, case law, case medical law, and so on. One of them was Dr. Ralph Wellerstein. Dr. Ralph had come out from the Bureau of Medicine in Washington at that time, or whatever the name of the predecessor of the Bureau of Medicine was, and Ralph was our medical officer. I was astonished at his tremendous vigor and his knowledge of various aspects of quackery and his ability to put all of these various facets together to form a case. A part of the quackery involved with Merlek also involved nutritional quackery. Dr. Elmer Nelson came out to the trial. Dr. Nelson, it may be recalled, was one of those, who as a graduate student, worked on the original Steenbock patents at the University of Wisconsin on the activation of ergosterol to form vitamin D. Elmer was a world authority at that time on nutrition and on vitamins, mineral content of foods and other preparations. He offered just marvelous expert testimony at the Merlek trial, likening the amount of mineral gained from the prescribed dosage of the medicine, the nostrum, to the amount of mineral you might get out of drinking a glass of Phoenix city water each day. So here were two very forceful, very knowledgeable personalities that, as a young Inspector I learned so much from that I'll always, of course, be in their debt

for that type of knowledge. An additional person who was a crusty gentleman that I enjoyed working with at that time was the man who, for the Department, was an Assistant General Counsel in charge of Food and Drug matters, Daniel Willis, "Dan" Willis. Dan worked on the Merlek case. Well, this in a sort of a microcosm gave me access to a very-broad range of expertise and it taught me so much with respect to Food and Drug law through Dan Willis' eyes, to medicine, through the eyes of Dr. Wellerstein and to nutritional factors through the eyes of Elmer Nelson. So that was a very interesting case to me. Of course I offered my testimony too as to the inspection part of the case and it gave me my first testimony experience in a Food and Drug case.

P. - Did we win that case?

M. - We won the case, however, it was quite interesting in the final stages of the case that one of the defense counsel had a heart attack and died near the end of the case. We were very much afraid that this might have an emotional impact on the jury. However, the jury held with the evidence and took very little time in making the decision in favor of the government in the case. However, there was an additional case in the prosecution of the promoters of Merlek. All through the years, the 30 years of experience in Food and Drug, you know Bob, we don't get rid of these

nostrums, these quack medicines. They continue and they spring up in various forms. Even in the '70's I have read of ocean water being promoted under different names of course, they didn't use the old Merlek, the "milk of the sea" in French, type of lable, but nevertheless it shows that we have to have continued vigilance and continued attention both to rigid enforcement and through proper financing, proper appropriations by the legislative branch in order to at least partially control this type of imposition on the consuming public. These things have a tremendous impact, too, on people that can ill afford that type of expensive and ineffective treatment.

P. - You know I collected a sample of one of the subsequent similar waters. I recall during our time in Salt Lake, the thing that impressed me when I became a young Inspector and started investigating quackery was that how loyal these customers, who were really being gypped, how loyal they were to the product; to the extent that they sometimes wouldn't even allow an Inspector in the house or talk to them. You see this over and over and over in regard to these products. That they somehow almost mesmerized the people who use it to the point where they protect the very person who...

M. - ...who's actually injuring them. And sometimes to the point of death.

P. - Certainly ripping them off; at least that.

M. - Of course as the tape plainly shows, Bob and I here are expressing the philosophy which to the young Inspectors that entered Food and Drug right after the 1938 law was passed became a type of religion and morality, and we felt a zeal, which I think really originated back in the days of Dr. Wiley, in 1906 when Dr. Wiley was engaging in his crusades for pure foods and drugs.

Returning, then, for a minute to personalities, the personalities of people such as Andy Brown, who was Station Chief at Los Angeles. Andy was an old, old line Inspector. So was Harry Moore and these men added a dimension of verve and interest and history at that time. They were Inspectors who had to travel by railroad trains to take samples and to transport samples back to the Food and Drug labs at the time. I can remember still, Andy and Harry both saying in effect, "Well if I could have just received more information out of the laboratory, I could have done much more good and have corraled many more of the adulterated products that I encountered at the time."

P. - During a period when they were young Inspectors, the laboratory and the inspection people had no local connection at all. The relationship existed I suppose in Washington, but it wasn't like it's been in all our

years where there was a laboratory more or less teamed with the Inspectors.

M. - Mr. Harvey, of course, was the dominant personality in the Western District at that time. I always felt that he influenced many of the Inspectors and Chemists to do not only just their job, but to devote their, probably their entire waking hours, to thinking about how to develop and how to educate and how to protect the consumer against the various adulterated products that we found in the course of our inspections and analyses.

Mr. Harvey was a man who could almost, I believe, talk about any subject in great depth and do it very effectively, either in a small group or in a large group. I'm convinced that he was one of those fortunate persons who had a photographic memory. As a manager, he had the ability to delegate effectively. Also, he had the faculty with this photographic memory of focusing on small details in order to make a more effective organization. Jack Harvey, for example, would know if a particular automobile was out of line in the fleet of Los Angeles District -- (remembering that he was stationed at San Francisco), he would remember the mileage figures and the gasoline figures on a given fleet car.

P. - Is that right?

M. - I've seen him also remember that a car, which had suffered an accident, had this accident at the very same

intersection as a previous accident that had occurred in a previous year. With a memory of that type, he had a rather personal and deep involvement with each of his men throughout the 11 western states. I really feel as though many of the personnel at that time had a warm and personal feeling for Mr. Harvey. Like anyone else Jack had his detractors, but they were few and far between. I felt often that it involved rather unjust things and of course there are always in any organization some petty jealousies. My feeling on it was that he was a very broad-minded man. Later in contacts after he was in the administration in Washington and was Deputy Commissioner of Food and Drug and testified for many congressional committees, I felt that Harvey bore a far greater share of the burden of consumer protection than any one man should. Of course industry was always his antagonist because he was an effective enforcer. I always, of course, felt that it was incumbent on some of the younger men to train themselves to take his place when he no longer could function after his retirement and so on. Actually I was somewhat dismayed when Jack Harvey finally did retire because Jack was so effective it was hard to conceive of any man being as effective in the testimony and hearing procedures and in protecting consumer interests as Jack Harvey was through many years. His

training, of course, as an Inspector was under the days of Walter Campbell and I had no opportunity really to know Mr. Campbell. Campbell was the Food and Drug Commissioner, I believe, in 1940 and I did meet him on one occasion. I really had no impression except that he was a very austere, rather dignified and certainly a fine physical specimen of a man. The meeting was in a group so that my chance of really exploring his personality was non-existent. Mr. Campbell was followed, as I remember, by Dr. Dunbar. Dr. Dunbar was a scientist, a very low-key gentleman, a man that you could depend on who would always be gentle with his people. I never heard him during my contacts with him ever criticize another individual for obvious mistakes or deficiencies. After all, he didn't as far as I know, ever criticize me for some of my deficiencies. On the other hand, Paul Dunbar did take every occasion that he could, in my experience, to offer a letter of appreciation or to give the people in the field a certain amount of satisfaction in knowing that he knew that they had done a job satisfactorily or even an excellent job on occasion. So I had a very warm feeling at the time that Dr. Dunbar was heading the Food and Drug Administration and when coupled with the leadership of Jack Harvey I felt that the two men personified for me the best of consumer protection and

the best of government, the best of civil service that you could find in a career organization. I certainly did feel that many of our people tried to pattern their philosophy, tried to pattern their actions and their personality after these--should I call them midterm Food and Drug leaders? They may have been early leaders, but from our present aspect, actually they were men who formed the, probably the basis for, shall we say, the universe of Food and Drug protection for the nation.

Let's see, Paul Dunbar was succeeded, then, by Mr. Crawford, Charlie Crawford. I had a few very brief and pleasant contacts with Crawford, who occasionally visited the field. His career, although he was a long term Food and Drug scientist, nevertheless Mr. Crawford was not, because of health reasons I believe, a long term Food and Drug Commissioner. During those few years that he was Commissioner, he certainly tried to bring the field into the decision-making process in Washington and he was out in the field on a number of occasions more often than you would expect from a new Commissioner and making personal contacts. I showed you, Bob, yesterday a picture of a picnic at Denver District taken at the time Mr. Crawford was Commissioner. He actually took the picture and was in it. He set the camera and got back into the

picture. The retirement of Mr. Crawford of course was the most severe blow to many of us in the Food and Drug Administration, but we certainly had a most competent Commissioner in George Larrick, who continued and expanded the consumer protection that we had learned to expect with his predecessors; and particularly as an Assistant or a Deputy to Dr. Dunbar. George Larrick was always very accessible to those of us in the field and he was always sympathetic with the problems that we would discuss with him in person when he visited the field Districts. We, of course, with the dual leadership of George Larrick and Jack Harvey in Washington, felt that those of us in the West had personal representation for all of the problems that we encountered. We felt that the nation's interests were certainly being served most adequately and within the framework of the appropriations. At that time the appropriations always seemed somewhat inadequate to the immense job that we perceived should be done. This is probably true with many agencies, but particularly in this line of work it always seemed as though those of us in the field needed additional funds for expanding the work that really had a large impact on the health and the pocketbook of the consumer. I'm thinking of things,

as I say, the quackery did spring up continuously even after we thought we had laid it to rest. Even today with the resurgence of such things as Krebiozin and with the resurgence of Laetrile and all, those of us that worked so intensely on trying to corral the quackery, and particularly the quackery in serious diseases such as cancer, feel as though if a little more generosity had been shown by Congress in those years, that with the leadership available, with old line Food and Drug people such as Harvey and Larrick and Paul Dunbar, that we could have once and for all disposed of them. This may be a little unrealistic, but nevertheless I do feel as though some of them could have been laid to rest a little more firmly.

Going on to the personality of George Larrick, he was always a fast, active man and I remember him particularly for his wanting to expand the scientific facilities of the field laboratories. During his time as Commissioner, this type of program was instituted, and we did have an upgrading in the scientific equipment of the laboratories, and in some cases, the opening of, well we had the opening of Detroit District; one of the first new laboratories, new districts, in many many years all through our career, Bob. This type of expansion should have been possible before, but it wasn't

because of restrictive financing. It was certainly not because of the lack of enthusiasm at, either the grass-roots level or at the top management level of the Administration in those years in the late '40's and the '50's, early '60's.

P. - Well, Arnold, we both worked for Wendell Vincent for quite a long time and you worked for him in Denver during his last few years before he retired and I think it would be nice if you kind of gave your impressions or told narratives or instances or whatever you want to about him.

M. - Wendell Vincent was a very dynamic, hard working Chief. I had no personal contact with Wendell when he was Chief of the Western District before Mr. Harvey. However, when I went to Salt Lake City in 1942, Wendell was at that time the Chief of the Denver Station. We became very close colleagues of course, and helped each other frequently on the telephone; and occasionally Vincent would get to Salt Lake and I would get to Denver. So in that way we did have a rather close professional relationship. I did have an opportunity to see Vincent in the early '40's when he had his full faculties. I was able to judge his character and judge him professionally. Vincent was a man who was completely dedicated to consumer protection and certainly he was a man who was willing to put his own neck on the block, so to speak, in order to get a job done. In that

sense Vincent was an independent thinker, and often times I'm sure was at variance in his thinking with the Administration's policy as it was enunciated in Washington. In other words, Vincent ran his District in the way he felt it should be run and in order to get the maximum amount of consumer protection out of his budget. There were those of course that felt that he had many personal problems and that those personal problems did affect his efficiency. However, at no time during the three years, almost four years I was at Salt Lake, did I observe that this was in fact true. So I never could really understand, and I had no experience of his having problems that affected the work. On the contrary, I felt that Vincent at the time had the very definite fine characteristics of being able to develop enthusiasm and to develop initiative and independence among his Inspectors. This had its good and bad points. From an institutional standpoint it may have been bad, but certainly it developed a group of independent thinkers. I believe, Bob, that you would agree, being an independent thinker yourself, and knowing some of the people that worked for Vincent and developed their early careers under Wendell Vincent, that this would be a fair statement.

P. - He not only was really able to engender enthusiasm among

us to protect the public, but he also had that invaluable ability to make each of us feel that we were important in the picture and that our contributions were worthwhile. This, for young men learning the trade so to speak, was a very important morale factor.

M. - I have the feeling, Bob, that Wendell Vincent drove his men very hard, yet at the same time you always felt that he was completely in back of you if your own positions were valid. You had the feeling, in other words, that, I used to express it at the time, that Wendell Vincent was an Inspector's Inspector, so to speak. That you looked up to the man because he was a hard-driving Inspector himself. I'm sure, Bob, that if you look back you could probably say that we didn't work only 44 hours a week. At that time, during the war particularly, we worked 44 hours a week officially, but we probably put in, on the average probably at least that many more hours in unpaid overtime and lost leave-time that added to consumer protection. We did it willingly because we knew that there was a tremendous job to be done and we had the Chief's backing. I feel as though probably some of this devotion and some of this drive and enthusiasm for the protection of foods and drugs in the United States, as well as in other nations, that we have seen a certain amount of loss of

this zeal, the old crusading spirit of Harvey W. Wiley. Vincent had it and there was no question that he had a tremendous influence on cleaning up industries that were prominent in the mountain and the intermountain area at that time. For example, Bob, you'll remember that I went to Salt Lake City in the very early period of the United States participation in World War II. You joined me very soon thereafter. One of the things that we did under Vincent's aegis was although we couldn't get very far in talking to the cheese industry on the basis of sanitation and living up to the law, we really accomplished a great deal by selling the cheese industry sanitation and pasteurization on an economic basis. We showed them in dollars and cents that they would get better grades of cheese and a higher proportion of their output would be Grade A under the agricultural grading system at the time, if they would pay attention to increased milk sanitation and increased factory sanitation, as well as pasteurization. Bob, at the time when we went to Salt Lake, I think that there was only one out of about 28 cheese factories in the intermountain area that pasteurized. A lot of the cheese offered to the Armed Forces during the war was really stinkin' stuff. While we were there, we had campaigns, intensive campaigns with the

help of other Inspectors from Denver Headquarters to clean up, both the milk supply in these cheese plants and other dairy products as well. Vincent backed us even to the point of our staying with a particularly dirty area where there were several dirty milk processing plants using filthy milk and we stayed there until we cleaned up the situation. This later really became the technique that I favored in, for example, in our intensive drug investigations in the late '60's. I know that not everyone was in favor of that type of technique, but I felt that for the amount of money expended in protection that it really did a lot bigger job than was generally recognized.

P. - I remember when we were there we had a creamery in Pocatello, maybe it was Mutual, I don't remember the name. I think it was Nelson-Ricks. The history had been that every time we inspected them and ran sediment tests on them on the milk and so on, they just held that which was made while we there in the state. We were having trouble sampling what had been made from what we had evidence on and so I went up there and I inspected and ran the milk, said good-bye at the end of the day. The next day the same thing. I arrived in the morning, make another inspection, run the milk, say good-bye to them at the end of the day. Their

policy holding it within the state wasn't beginning to work because they didn't have that much trade in the state, and their warehouse was getting full, and finally because they practically had no choice, they loaded out a truck, shipped it to Salt Lake. Of course I called you on the phone and you were there when the truck got there. We got samples. It was the only way you could--they knew enough to get around us unless we used pretty extreme methods. This was all for us doing that kind of thing if it worked.

M. - Well, we combined under Vincent in those days a program of education. Both of us gave many talks to industry groups and the state groups. We helped to coordinate both the federal-state effort on cleaning up the dairy industry. We had the larger operators, such as the large Kraft processing plant at Pocatello, to work with and we actually improved their raw material supply; that is the cheese coming into the processing plant during our days there. Certainly Vincent had a guiding effect. I know that we did a lot of the leg work, but nevertheless we did have the backing and sometimes I felt that this backing was somewhat over the directions that Mr. Vincent had from Headquarters; that people felt that he was overdoing enforcement in the dairy industry. How true

that was, I can't say at this time. Certainly I had that feeling from talking to some people out of Headquarters during those years.

P. - But this didn't mean we weren't just as aggressive in the bakery industry, in the candy industry, in the canneries.

M. - Vincent really wanted us to clean up all of the industries obviously. During our career in Salt Lake City at that time, Denver District had a large share of Montana, New Mexico. Even the Resident Inspector of Salt Lake City had large amounts of time devoted to some of the problems in other parts of Denver's territory. In that respect Vincent certainly employed his very, very limited staff. How many Inspectors did we have, Bob, not more than about 6 or 7 Inspectors for all of those states. I think that probably if you could quantify the consumer protection in any way, it's pretty hard to do, that the Denver Inspectors were producing more by almost any standards than in any other area of the country at the time. This may be blowing our own horns, but nevertheless judging by the number of legal actions, which might be one criteria, judging by the number of factories that were cleaned up and put aright, judging by the number of pasteurizers installed in milk processing plants during a period of

real scarcity during the war, judging by the type of materials delivered, both to the Armed Forces and to the general consuming public, we really, with very short resources, very limited resources, offered a lot in those years.

P. - I must say that more or less in looking back, in perspective, that we were very enthusiastic about what we were doing, but in dealing and talking with other people throughout the years, I have a feeling this was not exactly untypical of the entire Food and Drug Administration.

M. - I'm sure that that's true, we just didn't have knowledge because we didn't have communications with some of the people that we later learned to have a great deal of respect for; people like for example, Winton Rankin, who when I first knew him, first got acquainted with him was at a Chief Inspector's Conference in Chicago. I immediately recognized him as a man who had a great depth of knowledge and a complete devotion to the Food and Drug Administration and consumer protection. Of course later Winton did assume very responsible positions and ultimately a Deputy Commissioners position in Washington. So we weren't alone, I know, but at the time we certainly had a great competition among Inspectors too. I can remember one summer, I think

it was the summer of 1943, where one of the other Inspectors, Herbert Ayres, who was a member of the group of '39, was working in New Mexico and I happened to be working in Montana. We had an informal contest between the two of us to see who could come up with the greatest number of legal actions at the time, the greatest number of lots of contaminated food stuffs. We came out awfully close together at that time. I've forgotten who won. It was the spirit. It was a friendly rivalry, but nevertheless it resulted in a great deal of spirit and a great rapport among the Inspectors. We had certain Chemists at that time that we considered Inspectors/Chemists. If you really wanted to make sure that your sample had first rate consideration, you would make sure that it got in the hands of the right Chemist. This was unfair to some of the others, I know, but nevertheless we recognized it and it was a fact of life.

P. - Some were more competent than others and more enthusiastic.

M. - The later years with Vincent, this then would take us back to the period 1951 to 1956, during my years as Chief Inspector, the first year that I was back in Denver. I again worked under Vincent and had a lot of respect for him, but like all of us we age and I felt that Vincent did have some very serious personal problems and health and family problems that probably

did impact on what he wanted to do as Chief of the District. I tried to support him as a loyal employee, but there were times when Sam Fine, who was Chief Chemist, and I as Chief Inspector, had to take the interest of the Administration in our personal hands to make sure that the job got done. This is not to say that we didn't have respect for Vincent and what he represented and all, but he did then take retirement when the opportunity came. I don't know too much about the type of pressures that were on the Chief at that time. I do know that the Administration representatives came out to look into the District operations and I understand that there were some deficiencies. I have heard rumors that Vincent had some problems that were, should we say accusations of dishonesty. If such problems were in existence at the time, I as Chief Inspector think I would know that they were very minor if they existed at all in the way of dishonesty. I don't think that Vincent ever was in any sense a dishonest person. He may have had deficiencies in other ways, but certainly I didn't feel as though there was any reason to believe that he was anything but a very firm and staunch government employee.

P. - I certainly in my years with him never saw any evidence of anything of that kind. In fact, I have a

feeling that at least some of those accusations came about because he was a man who was capable of developing quite close personal relationships with people prominent in the industry. Yet, I know the fact and experience that with these same people that he was on a first name basis with and so on, he had no hesitation in recommending legal action on the evidence indicated. Maybe that's a little unique, but I don't believe those close friendships or these personal relationships he had had any effect on his regulatory judgment or decisions. I think obviously there might be things I don't know.

M. - I don't feel as though there was any evidence; at least none that has ever been brought to my attention, that Vincent was "double-dealing" in any sense, particularly in his relationships with the trade. As you say, Bob, the man had a unique ability to push the sanitation, to push the proper use of pesticides, to push the good practices, the good trade practices in the industries in the mountain and intermountain areas, in spite of the opposition of industry and through many of his personal contacts with the trade. These could have been misinterpreted, I believe. I'm not trying to make any apologies for Wendell Vincent. I do feel as though during the last few months that he was on board as District Director, that he may have

become paranoiac. I think any of us might be paranoiac if we feel as though we're being investigated or if there were things that he was being accused of without any foundation in fact. Certainly either of us would have felt that way at the time.

P. - He didn't live much longer after that.

M. - He didn't really. He was having health problems and I think that that was more the problem than if Washington felt that he had become less efficient in his job.

I think Winton Rankin, who did come to Denver at the time that Vincent retired, probably has a greater knowledge of some of the things that were occurring from the standpoint of the Food and Drug Administration's Headquarters.

P. - I haven't talked to Rankin, but if I do it might be...

M. - I think it would be interesting to get the...see Rankin had been involved in several in-house investigations of personnel. I believe that Rankin, who I feel is a very objective man, could give you a real good picture of the types of things that had been rumored, or that he found either existed or didn't exist at the time.

Sam Fine and I of course had problems because of the investigation and because of this tendency toward a feeling of, maybe a paranoiac feeling on the part of Vincent.

P. - Well I remember you telling me that they wanted to bring

me over from Salt Lake too. Winton wanted to talk with me and you told him that I was just one of several Inspectors that he had available to him there to talk to him, and you felt sure I couldn't add anything to what they said. I think that's true, but at least it saved me from being personally involved in any way.

M. - I always, during my career, maybe to my own detriment, tried to be loyal to the men that were my immediate superiors. Certainly I feel that in general this is the policy that makes the strongest organization, and certainly if you're going to do otherwise you should at least give the man a chance to know that you feel dissatisfied with his performance. I think that this is also good management policy. Fortunately not very many of those things occurred, but occasionally they did.

A man who had some of Vincent's characteristics, but was an entirely different type of personality, was the New York District Director during the time I was the Director of Inspection Branch at New York; Weems Clevenger. Weems was somewhat younger than I and a man of great enthusiasm, great drive. I felt that Weems had two very outstanding characteristics; one, Weems was an innovator. He innovated somewhat like Vincent did. When he perceived a problem, he didn't

let anything really stand in his way toward trying to bring about a solution to the problem. Sometimes this stepped on toes in Washington; sometimes stepped on toes in the trade. He was a very controversial figure for that reason. The second characteristic that I appreciated a great deal in Weems was that when one of his people came up with an idea that was innovative, or an idea that might be adapted to further the Administration's interest, Weems was one of the first to recognize and to push and encourage the man into performing and acting on his idea. He was the first District Director that I had been privileged to work with who whole-heartedly pushed the furthering of advanced education among his personnel. I believe the record of New York District will show that he was continuously recommending his men and pushing his men to take advanced courses in scientific fields, and management fields. He probably was unpopular with some of the other District Directors because he was successful in pushing his men into management training, into further scientific and analytical training, and in helping his people to push into new areas of endeavor.

Going back clear to my days in Salt Lake City, remembering the intensive inspection of dairy plants, I pushed at New York District, with the help of Weems

Clevenger, the idea of intensive drug inspections and intensive pharmaceutical inspections in order to cut down on the entirely too many drug recalls; sometimes recalls that should have been caught at the plant, if the controls had been proper. So, what we were actually preaching at that time, and trying to develop, was education within the pharmaceutical industry to bring about early detection and catching the problem drug before it ever left the plant, recognizing that you have problems of personnel that will always lead; the human problems that will always lead to some foul up, but, nevertheless, having adequate controls so that those never left the plant to the detriment of the consuming public, or to the medical profession. So I know again, that this was not the most popular program, but, nevertheless, I was dedicated to it and Weems likewise helped me in the promotion of that plan. I do feel as though the statistics up until the time I left New York, will show that we did cut down considerably on the number of drug recalls necessary for those plants distributing pharmaceutical drugs out of the territory, from northern Jersey, and New York State and Puerto Rico.

P. - You know from my standpoint in Washington at that time I don't remember how long that intensified drug program lasted, but three years...

M. - I think it was about three years, Bob.

P. - I don't think that the program was abandoned because it failed, so much as that we had by that time covered all of the firms that had been named as candidates for this kind of thing by the Districts. I'm sure it greatly improved the overall conditions in the industry and it probably reached a point where maybe no longer were we getting sufficient accomplishment for the expense, and it was an expensive program. I think another thing we got out of it, of that program, was a tremendous increase in our own ability, our knowledge of the industry, that the number of people we had who were fairly versed in the problems of the drug industry so that though the program might have been abandoned, it was not a failure in my thinking at all. I think that the people in charge at that time would agree with that.

M. - Well, I'm glad to hear that because I, of course, had a real good feeling about the program in New York District. Of course, New York District at the time was a major drug district in the country. One of the things that we did at New York at the time was that we tried to train the younger chemists, bacteriologists, or microbiologists and the people knowledgeable in antibiotics, with the help of those who had worked in the industry, but who were very few; such people as Charlie Wayne, for example, an old time Inspector at

New York District, and some of the people in the laboratories in New York, who could contribute that training.

Going back to Weems Clevenger again, Weems recognized during his years at New York, how necessary it was to train the young people and to get a greater depth with the expansion of Food and Drug personnel, and with expansion of budget. Certainly it was incumbent on all of us to get the people that were going to succeed us properly trained technically, and properly trained also in the traditions of the organization. I hope some of that "took". Anyway, we certainly tried.

Weems Clevenger was a man who also, like Vincent, was quite close to the regulated industries and had good relations and respect of the regulated industries. Again, unfortunately, Weems was a man who had personal problems while I was under his direction. I could sympathize with many of those problems. Ultimately I'm sure they did have an impact because it wasn't too long after I retired, and I did retire of course from New York, Weems took a position with another agency. Weems had been very instrumental in the programs of enforcement in the Bureau of Drug Control, whatever the name of it was at that time; during the time when Food and Drug enforced the drug programs, I should say the controlled or restricted drug programs. He came back to FDA as a very strict drug enforcer. He

developed the personnel, many of the personnel who later went to Washington as leaders and also in the field.

P. - Well, Arnold, I'm sure what you've said about Weems is of interest because I haven't in any of my interviews had anybody talk very much about him and if there aren't any specific people that you would like to go ahead and talk about, I have one question. It seems to me at the time Dr. Goddard was Commissioner, there was a situation between him and Seattle District regarding the salmon plan. I don't know quite how to say it, but you would know better than I do, which eventually resulted in Ken Monfore's retirement and your transferring from Seattle to Washington. I wondered if there's anything about that that you might say.

M. - Well, this is an interesting question, Bob. Seattle District at the time was most interested in the problem of can seams in the canned salmon pack, primarily canned salmon out of Alaska, but also some production in the State of Washington. The interest that I showed in those years was generated because of the deaths of several people due to the defective seams and defective procedures in the canned tuna industry. By projection I felt that we might have some of the same problems in the industries of the Pacific Northwest. I therefore...

P. - Excuse me. Was it botulism?

M. - Yes. The deaths were due to commercially packed tuna produced in California and resulted in widespread recalls throughout the country. It was a sad situation on a commercially canned product. I pressured the inspection staff at Seattle District in my capacity as Deputy Director. I also was interested in whatever information the Inspectors and the microbiology section of Seattle District, any information that they might have, or might develop, maybe through NCA or through specific canners, as to what constitutes adequate can seams in canned foods; and particularly non-acid canned foods that might be subject to botulism intoxication. This was the project that we were engaged in at the time of Dr. Goddard's assuming his position as Commissioner of Food and Drug. We had sufficient evidence that we had found more than just an isolated can here and there, and were starting to get a pattern of defective can seams; seams which our microbiologists felt could possibly lead to contamination, even though the cans themselves did not show swells or other types of abnormalities. We felt that after conference with the Chief Chemist, Dr. Arthur Stears, Microbiologist Charlie Thayer, who was in charge of the microbiological lab at Seattle District at the time, the Chief Inspector, Bill Kupp and the

Inspectors interested in the project, that we had, even though we recognized a rather deficient amount of information, nevertheless, a problem that should command the immediate attention of the Administration. Mr. Monfore at the time was on annual leave, actually in California because of a health problem involving his family. I was in charge at Seattle District at the time and did recommend, (on the basis of the defective seams, even though no demonstrable contamination of the salmon meat had occurred, nevertheless that it was a potential danger to health situation), that it be studied in depth and broadly. This recommendation seemed to create a situation between the Office of the Commissioner and Seattle District, that Seattle allegedly had not done an adequate job of inspection of canneries, number one, and number two, in controlling the sanitation of canneries, and number three, that we had inadequate evidence of a bad practice that we should be on top of, rather than recognizing it as I viewed it at the time as advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the technique of canning, and seeking areas which might potentially involve public health. So I was dismayed at the reaction that we received from Dr. Goddard. I didn't seem to be able to put across to the representatives of the Administration, either in Washington or

later to people that came out from Washington (who seemed to be rather critical of Mr. Monfore, and of course, by inference, critical of my recommendations). In any event, the deficiencies in the inspection work, if they were in fact deficiencies, seemed to lead to a great deal of criticism of the management of Seattle District at the time. I felt personally responsible, of course, for the recommendation. I felt personally responsible for the fact that possibly not enough pressure had been brought to insure that more inspections of sanitation had been made and of coordinating the thing better. Possibly I felt a little bit guilty because I may have made premature recommendations for legal action on the basis of the limited evidence at hand, instead of waiting for further evidence. However, remember that we were dealing with what I considered a real potential danger to health based on type E botulinus poisonings incurred in fishery products. So I felt that we couldn't waste any time in making recommendations and instituting a broader study. I've always regretted that we could not seem to advance the ideas of Seattle District to correct this problem, rather than to simply come in with a broad brush and sweep away dedicated people in our organization; people that had dedicated their lives to consumer protection. In fact, over the years I have several times asked

microbiologists, and particularly Charlie Thayer, who was involved deeply in the analysis of the samples gathered, whether this problem has ever been corrected. Quite recently in the '70's, my last contact with Charlie, he reaffirmed to me that the problem really has never been adequately answered, never really been covered properly and that it's an imminent danger, even though remote, and that possibly we could go a long time, but at any time we could also expect on the finite basis to get one or more cases of botulism types of poisonings from, not only seafood products, but other products which display defective can seams. This is the type of thing that Mr. Monfore was quite concerned about on his return from annual leave. I felt a little bit at the time that Mr. Monfore had been let down by the staff, but on the other hand I felt that the Administration itself had not, and I'm speaking primarily of Dr. Goddard, that Dr. Goddard had not been able, because of his rather limited experience in Food and Drug matters, had not been able to really perceive what the District was in fact trying to do, and the protection that the District was trying to offer to the Administration and to the public. These comments bring me somewhat to the personality of Dr. Goddard.

His first visit to Seattle District was, I felt

a disaster right from the start. He did not seem to have any empathy with the problems of the District and we recognized, of course, that he had very little experience in Food and Drug matters. I can recall specifically that Dr. Goddard came in and demanded to know what the pecking order of this place was; which seemed like a rather odd way for a new Food and Drug Commissioner to respond to people that were anxiously awaiting to greet him and to help his Commissionership. Of course the subsequent contacts with Dr. Goddard reaffirmed some of our suspicions with respect to his lack of objectivity in Food and Drug matters. I realize that this is a very harsh, an extremely harsh judgement and it possibly represents an unobjective analysis on my part, but it has been confirmed by other people at other places as to Dr. Goddard's personality. Some of the Food and Drug people feel as though Dr. Goddard brought politics into an agency which always had prided itself on a scientific objectivity and resulted in a great deal of damage to people that had devoted their lives to the pursuit of a crusade for pure foods and drugs. Bob, I don't know whether that is appropriate on the tape, but these are some of the deeper feelings that I think perhaps might at some time be valuable to anyone reviewing the history of Dr. Goddard's Commissionership.

P. - Yes, I think it's very appropriate, Arnold. I don't want to leave the tape without saying that probably you have rather put your position modestly, and if, in fact, Dr. Goddard misunderstood you at the time; as I recall you later came to Washington and did some special investigation and Dr. Goddard personally recommended and appointed you to be the Chief of the Inspection Branch in New York.

M. - Well, that's certainly correct. I know that my feelings were based on an incident early in Dr. Goddard's Food and Drug career. Also, they were based on the fact that Dr. Goddard was a political appointee and didn't completely understand the field position. Dr. Goddard, in the opinion of many Food and Drug people, did an excellent job of developing certain aspects of the Food and Drug Administration that had never been developed before. I felt that at New York that Dr. Goddard had the complete confidence of Weems Clevenger, and of course both Dr. Goddard and Clevenger seemed to be very pleased with the conduct of the Inspection Branch at New York District during those years. Also, Bob, there was a special investigation at Washington before I went to New York which seemed to uncover certain things that were suspect, and which gave Dr. Goddard a basis for taking personnel actions that he felt were necessary.

P. - I remember that you came to Washington and did that, and that it was considered quite confidential at the time to the degree that, even though we were friends, you didn't tell me much about it. At this late date is there anything really that you could say about that?

M. - I don't know whether it's appropriate to go into the investigation because, actually no one has ever reported to me what the actions were taken on the basis of the, and I would hate to involve people that might be hurt because of something that I might say inadvertently. I think that it would be no secret to say that the investigation did involve possible illegal activities on the part of the Bureau of Antibiotics, and this was a subsequent action to the Dr. Welsh problems earlier. Of course I had nothing whatsoever to do with the Dr. Welsh problems in the earlier part of the '60's.

P. - Well, I wanted to ask that question about the matter in Seattle and more or less get your side of the story, get some of the facts on the record. I, looking back at what we've said this afternoon, can't think of any further questions I have. We're here, and if there's anything more you'd like to say, why this is the time for it.

M. - Well, Bob, going back somewhat in the history and the involvement of the organization, perhaps the organization was somewhat isolated; maybe a little bit

scientifically arrogant because we weren't involved with national politics. Possibly we weren't large enough to really warrant the attention of politicians to a great extent. Possibly one of the things we did at Seattle District that brought the Food and Drug Administration out of the scientific closet and into the limelight of national press coverage, and the attention of the politicians, was the famous cranberry incident, where Seattle District for a number of months had known that the industry, against the recommendations of both the Department of Agriculture, and of Food and Drug, had used 3-aminotriazol as a weedicide, as a herbicide on cranberry bogs. We suspected, but we didn't have the analytical evidence to establish that 3-amino-triazol was a systemic that went into the cranberry fruit, cranberry berries. However, we continued to work on the problem chemically and all during the summer, from the time that the bogs were treated in the spring, at that particular time we didn't have the sophisticated analytical measures that we later had for detecting such pesticides. So it was a real hard problem with paper chromatography. Phil Greer, the lead analyst on the problem, who was very persistent and worked hard and many over-time hours to solve the problem and eventually came up with irrefutable evidence that the cranberries were contaminated with

3-aminotriazol. 3-aminotriazol already had been established as a strong carcinogen and of course the only recommendations that I or Mr. Monfore could make at the time was to tie up the crop long enough to get sufficient analyses to know whether or not we could sustain seizures. This is what we did. Of course this hit the papers a very few weeks, two or three weeks before Thanksgiving. So it was a sort of the Food and Drug Administration going against motherhood; cranberries at Thanksgiving which resulted in the national publicity. From that time to this, I feel as though the activities of the Food and Drug Administration has been more in the limelight than they were ever prior to that incident.

P. - I would agree.

M. - A rather sad, but interesting sidelight, and I'm not inferring anything because I really don't know, but Phil, who worked with 3-aminotriazol standards and with the cranberries that year, very shortly thereafter passed away from leukemia. We don't know what the cause of the leukemia was.

P. - I didn't know that either. Well that's an interesting thing. I've had people talk about the cranberry episode, but not quite say the things you've said and that will fill in on a story.

M. - The Department of Agriculture rescued the industry

to some extent by giving them subsidies for the lost crop. However, in my philosophy of government, it seemed rather ironic that they disobeyed the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture and then were rewarded for having contaminated their own crop.

P. - They didn't do it through ignorance or through inadvertence, but with the knowledge...

M. - ...with the knowledge that

P. - ...they had been warned.

M. - They had been warned, but again, they were taking the chance that we wouldn't develop methods in time to catch that particular crop.

P. - Well, Arnold, if you don't have anything more to say right now, I think we might just close off this interview, but before we do, you have neglected to mention as I recall in 1964, you were awarded the FDA award of merit by George Larrick, the Food and Drug Commissioner. Again, if I recall right, it was largely for your recommendation, suggestions in regard to the use of the computer for recording field accomplishment data; that is the factory inspection information and sample information. Of course, since my job later involved that very thing, I have to either thank you or damn you for making that suggestion, but it did give you the FDA award of merit.

M. - Well, I'm surprised that you remembered it, Bob, but

I always felt that the suggestion did have, no pun intended, some merit to it, however, later on I really had to have second thoughts because of rather inadequate IBM or other type of recording equipment. Actually, the recording of inspection data, sampling data, and analytical data in a recording system could be done much better with modern electronic equipment; and particularly since solid state technology in computers has become standard. I don't know, but you probably do, Bob, how much improved the data gathering system could be with the modern computer.

P. - You'll be interested to know that currently FDA is installing mini-computers in each District that will not only record the data and transmit it on to a master computer in Washington so that we will have statistical tabulations and so, but which will make the data available for manipulation in management's use at the local level. I think we're beginning to get where many had hoped we'd be a long time ago.

M. - The punchcard system in the old computers was very time consuming and expensive, of course. It didn't always record accurately because of time lags. If the system can be made quite, almost instantaneous with the gathering of the data, it will help both the planners, and the projections of the Administration. It will

be of inestimable help in budgeting, both by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Congressional Committees in evaluating different programs that Food and Drug Administration is responsible for. So I really feel as though this recognition, although at the time I know the suggestion had many deficiencies, nevertheless, was a kernel of an idea that still hasn't realized its full potential.

P. - I think that's right and certainly I spent ten years of my life trying to realize that potential, and its still got a long way to go.

Well, Arnold, if you haven't any more to add then, I think we will close this interview and I want to thank you very much.

M. - Well, Bob, it's been a pleasure to talk about old times and reminiscence a little. If there's any other subject matter that comes up in which I have had some hand in doing, let me know and I'll be glad to augment anything that you have on the tape.

P. - Thank you very much.