AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. EDWARD LAWRENCE GRIFFIN

This interview was performed under a contract with the Oral History Program of the National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This document is a transcript of an interview with Edward Lawrence Griffin conducted by Adelynne Hiller Whitaker concerning enforcement of the Insecticide Act of 1910 and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1947. The interview was held in Dr. Griffin's home in [redacted] on January 31, 1973.

Dr. Griffin joined the Department of Agriculture in 1913 as a chemist in the Bureau of Chemistry. When the Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration formed in 1927, Dr. Griffin went with that unit as a chemist and assistant to the chief of the insecticide enforcement division. After 1938 Dr. Griffin's functions were primarily with administration in the Insecticide Division of the Department of Agriculture. He retired from government service in 1955, and now resides in Lawrence, Kansas.

Mrs. Whitaker is a doctoral candidate at Emory University, writing a dissertation on "Pesticides and Regulation."

Mrs. Whitaker:

Would you tell me something about your career and your early days? I understand you went with the Department in 1913.

Dr. Griffin:

I had an appointment as an assistant chemist in 1913, working in the Bureau of Chemistry on the enforcement of the Insecticide Act of 1910. I reported for work on June 16, I believe it was, 1913. I reported to Dr. Haywood. The appointment said to report to Dr. Alsberg. I suggested to Dr. Haywood that I go over and report to Dr. Alsberg and Dr. Haywood's reply was that the first thing is to get your name on the payroll.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Well, did you get to see Dr. Alsberg?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I never did see Dr. Alsberg. We were working then in a laboratory at the back end of the old Bureau of Chemistry building. The new laboratories which were being built for insecticide work were in the Olive Building which was next south of the Bureau of Chemistry Building and we didn't get into the new laboratories for about six or eight months, as I recall. The principal chemicals that we were working on at that time were the lead arsenate, Paris green and Bordeaux mixture. Those were the ones that were in large use as insecticides. I worked on Bordeaux mixture, and a couple of the other new chemists

who came in about the same time I did were working on Paris green and lead arsenates. After a short time, however, we began to get more disinfectants and I went over to the disinfectant field since my particular line had been organic chemistry. For several years I spent much of my time on coal-tar disinfectants, hypochlorites, and pine oil disinfectants. I made a considerable study of methods of analysis for coal-tar disinfectants. Also I made a considerable study of pine oils. At one time I made a trip through the pine oil production areas, from Virginia down the Atlantic coast and across the Gulf coast as far as Elizabeth, Louisiana, studying both the distructive distillation pine oil and the steam distillation pine oil. I don't know what . . . do you want to go any farther on that or not?

Mrs. Whitaker:
Yes. Did you feel, even though this was before you were involved with administrative work, that disinfectants belonged under the control of the Insecticide Act?

Dr. Griffin:
It was certainly accepted in the Department that they were under the Insecticide Act when I went to work at it. It was not fully accepted among the manufacturers and there were a number of cases where it was contested. However, there was one case that we lost on that but in general we won the cases.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you remember the details of the case that you lost?

Dr. Griffin:

I was not directly concerned in the one that we lost and at this time I can't go into detail.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Dr. Haywood's feelings were a little uncertain about disinfectants in the first two years of his chairmanship of the Board but then he championed the control of them quite adamently after that, with the same kind of dedication that he displayed toward the agricultural insecticides. Do you think that his interests were primarily with agricultural insecticides?

Dr. Griffin:

They definitely were. However, he certainly encouraged me to go ahead with the things that I was doing. Of course, I did not work directly under Dr. Haywood. I worked under Dr. McDonnell. He was the chief of the chemical laboratory.

Mrs. Whitaker:

That was Dr. C. C. McDonnell?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Tell me something about Dr. Haywood. There are so few pictures available of him.

Dr. Griffin:

Haywood was very tall, slim, he walked with a little bit of a gangling gait. He was inclined to be very enthusiastic about the things that he was working with. He was a man who certainly worked to help the men that were under him. He was the kind of chief that one liked to have. Of course, Dr. Haywood felt that if he wanted to cuss some of his people out that was all right but if somebody else did, that was something else yet again.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did he work directly with the inspectors, also?

Dr. Griffin:

He didn't work directly with the inspectors. Mr. Shibley was in charge of the inspectors. Mr. Shibley handled that part of the thing.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Mr. Shibley's initials were . . .?

Dr. Griffin:

James G.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And he had been with the Board almost from its inception?

Dr. Griffin:

As far as I know, from its inception.

Mrs. Whitaker:

As far as you know, was there any dispute between Marion Dorset and Dr. Haywood about the matter of disinfectants?

Dr. Griffin:

I can't tell you that. I know that he and Dr. Dorset didn't always agree but that's normal.

Mrs. Whitaker:

After Dr. Dorset resigned from the Board, saying that he wanted to devote most of his time to research and Haywood took his place as chairman of the Board, did Haywood work well with the other Board members?

Dr. Griffin:

As far as I could observe, they got along reasonably well. There were no serious squabbles. I don't think they always agreed but then . . .

Mrs. Whitaker:

He comes through very strong in the correspondence. I have

noticed that he might have been a little domineering in his relations with the other Board members and generally got his way.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, he was, of course, Chairman of the Board and he, I think, expected to do things his way.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And he was an able chemist as well as an administrator . . .

Dr. Griffin:
I think he was. He never did any chemical work during the time that I was there.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did your reports as a chemist in the early period go to Haywood? What was the procedure when a sample came in to the Board, was it assigned to one of the Bureaus?

Dr. Griffin:
It was assigned first to the chemical laboratory. Dr. McDonnell was in charge of the chemical laboratory and he would take it and assign it to one of the chemists and the chemist would analyze it and then the report of the analysis, together with the sample, would be submitted to the other bureau that might be interested. If it was an insecticide, it would go to Dr. Quaintance. If it was for use on animals, it would

go to Dr. Emery during the time that I was there or if it was plant disease it would go to Dr. Waite and they would look at it from their standpoint and then the reports would come back to the Board. There would be charges drawn if necessary. Those charges would go to the Board which held meetings, oh, I guess, about once a week, maybe oftener.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Where did they hold the meetings? The minutes do not indicate.

Dr. Griffin:
They were held in the Board Room on the first floor of the Olive Building. Then the Board would decide what action to take.

Mrs. Whitaker:
During the teens, before the 1920's, in that period, what were the relations with the manufacturers? Did you deal directly with the producers of any of these products?

Dr. Griffin:
Oh, yes. If charges were brought, they were never sent to the solicitor's office until after they had been discussed with the manufacturer. In the early days, I think that Dr. Haywood did most of the discussion with manufacturers. Later, it came to Dr. McDonnell's office. And Dr. Haywood's relations with manufacturers were very good. He attended their annual meetings pretty regularly and was, in general, quite friendly.

Mrs. Whitaker:

When the association of insecticide manufacturers formed in 1914, the published reports indicate that Dr. Haywood was charged with being arbitrary and perhaps more harsh with the leading manufacturers than he was with some of the smaller businessmen. Do you think there was any basis for the charges that were made against him?

Dr. Griffin:

No. At least as far as I know there was no basis for it. Of course, in an enforcement thing you always try to get the things that are going to affect the most people and the larger manufacturers made the products which affected more people so that normally you would hit the larger manufacturers more than you would the smaller ones. But I don't think there was any intention to pick on the larger manufacturers.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Under Wilson, President Wilson, and Secretary Houston, was there any change that you could observe on the working level in what your assignments were?

Dr. Griffin:

No, as far as the working level was concerned it made no difference who was secretary, functions went on. There were enough layers between us and the Secretary that we were shielded somewhat. I can't say that I knew anything in the enforcement of the Insecticide Act which was affected by political interests.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Your work was, before the 1930's, devoted mostly to the chemical aspect and analytical work?

Dr. Griffin:

Analytical and research. I got my Ph.D. in that period.

Mrs. Whitaker:

That was in 1923, I believe. The department evidently encouraged young chemists to go ahead with their work. I notice that even Dr. Haywood got his M.D. after he came with the department.

Dr. Griffin:

Oh, yes, they encouraged it. I was able to use my research for my thesis. That is the only thing that they did for me. The classwork was done out of hours.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Back again to disinfectants. Were you involved in the industry dispute over whether or not the phenol coefficient was to be placed on the labels?

Dr. Griffin:

I wasn't involved in the argument but I did do some bacteriological work. I had a bacteriology minor and I have run many phenol coefficients.

Mrs. Whitaker:

During the 1920's, then, calcium arsenate became one of the target insecticides . . .

Dr. Griffin:

Well, calcium arsenates were used an awful lot during the 1920's.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you know Dr. B. R. Coad?

Dr. Griffin:

Dr. Coad? The name is familiar but I didn't know him personally.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Haywood held a rather tight rein on the Board, then, until 1927? Was he living at the time the Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration was formed and did he have a function within that administration?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes, he was living. We remained in the Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration and he carried out the same functions in that outfit. As a matter of fact, when they broke up, the research part of the group, which he had had charge of, went to . . . let's see, where did it go . . . it went to the Bureau of Chemistry, I believe, and there was a considerable fuss over who was to go where. I had a chance to go with

the research but I decided to stay with the regulatory. I remember Dr. Skinner had talked to me about going over there and Haywood got quite peeved because Dr. Skinner tried to get me to go.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Dr. Skinner had been with the department when Haywood came there as a young man, I believe, and Haywood had worked some with him on arsenic.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, Skinner and Haywood were, I think, good friends but they would get peeved with one another now and then.

Mrs. Whitaker:
There were a number of amendments proposed, one, in particular, in 1916 by Senator Wadsworth, I believe, to require the phenol coefficient to be placed on the labels and those amendments never really got off the ground.

Dr. Griffin:
No, I don't think that it was really a very good amendment because phenol coefficients would give the idea that the product had certain strength as compared with phenol against all sorts of bacteria. Actually as you know a phenol coefficient was only run against B. Typhosus and its effectiveness against other organisms might be, and frequently was, quite different from what it was against typhoid so that I think that phenol

coefficients were more misleading than informative.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Both Food and Drug and the Insecticide Board assumed responsibility toward disinfectants and I have not been able to find any formal arrangement between the two agencies.

Dr. Griffin:
The general arrangement was that anything which was used on or in living bodies was Food and Drug. If it was used on or in inanimate materials it was ours.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did that condition exist from the earliest days? I notice that there were some cases where both Food and Drug and Insecticide brought charges against a product.

Dr. Griffin:
So far as I know it was always a fact. We never tried to go into the use on the body. At one time I was picked to give a presentation before the Secretary of Agriculture, that was Henry Wallace, and the heads of the department, about what our group was doing, that is, the people who were enforcing the Insecticide Act. And I gave a dissertation on it and the only question that I recall coming up was that Henry Wallace asked which one of these things is good for athlete's foot?

Mrs. Whitaker:

In 1927, then, when the Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration was formed, you chose to stay with them. As far as you knew at the time, what was the philosophy in the reorganization?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, it was to get the regulatory and the research separated. It was felt that . . . actually the regulatory was sometimes at loggerheads with the research and of course there were many times that the regulatory is at loggerheads with the people in the Department of Agriculture that were going out and making recommendations to farmers. It wasn't infrequent that we found things being recommended to farmers which we felt were not suitable for such use, so that to prevent a conflict of interest it was better to have them separated.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Haywood, in his early years, was very much in favor of research, in fact, wanted to manufacture disinfectants. Were you involved in his project to set up machinery to produce insecticides under manufacturing conditions?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, to a certain extent, yes. Along about the time of the first world war, the gypsy moth was attacking trees in New England and it was killing off a lot of woodland. They had been getting a tarry substance from Germany for tree banding

... it was not available in this country. One of my jobs was to make a product which was similar to the German product that had been imported so that it would be available for tree banding to keep the gypsy moths from climbing the trees. The gypsy moth apparently was hatched out on the ground or below the trunk of the tree and climbed up the tree and took the leaves off. And I made some of the stuff, you'll see one of my articles on tree banding materials in there. We had a soap mixing machine in the building and I made up a couple of tons of that stuff at one time, tarry stuff, and another thing that we worked on at about that same time was cyanide fumigation of . . . well, it was particularly for long staple cotton from Egypt that they were bringing into the country. It's, I believe, the same as the Sea Island cotton in this country but it was not available here at that time.

Mrs. Whitaker:
This was during the war years?

Dr. Griffin:
This was shortly after the war years, I think. It was about that period. The cyanide fumes were . . . you might think of them as being very volatile, but actually they were adsorbed and they would stay for long periods of time. I think you've gotten a bulletin on hydrocyanic acid fumigation. They were fumigating the cotton bales under vacuum. A lot of it was being done up at Boston. I went up to Boston on that fumigation

business. They had tanks that would hold perhaps 15 or 20 bales of cotton, pull the vacuum on them and let the hydrocyanic acid gas in, and then force it into the bales by letting the vacuum down and the gas did get into the middle of the bales. We drove spikes into the bales and we analyzed the stuff that got into the bales and we also . . . I might say that the gas would come out of the cotton for a long time afterwards. They would pull the vacuum to try to get all the hydrocyanic acid out of the cotton and then the bales would be put in freight cars and several times persons who had crawled in on top of those bales of cotton got killed. They had also started using it for foodstuffs because they were fumigating buildings with it and it stuck in flour and various types of things for months.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Was Food and Drug involved in that as far as the administration of the Food and Drug Act or only from the standpoint of . . .

Dr. Griffin:
It was only from the standpoint of research and the idea of whether or not hydrocyanic acid was suitable for certain uses.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I read somewhere that chemical warfare service attempted to convert some of the war gases to domestic uses after the war.

Dr. Griffin:

They undoubtedly did but that was not a war gas, as far as I know. Chloropicrin was a war gas. They attempted to use that but as far as I know never got anywhere.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you do any work with that?

Dr. Griffin:

I never did any work in the government with chloropicrin but carbonyl chloride was a similar thing that was used and I did work in organic chemistry at the University here with carbonyl chloride but I never worked with war gases.

Mrs. Whitaker:

What is your opinion on the ingredient statement permitted under the old Act of 1910?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, that was a very meaningless ingredient statement. It was not good.

Mrs. Whitaker:

In the hearings and the correspondence on forming that act, Dr. Wiley apparently changed his views and recommended giving the manufacturers the alternate. Do you know if that was the result of manufacturers' pressure or what brought this about?

Dr. Griffin:

I can't say. It was before my time.

Mrs. Whitaker:

The question undoubtedly did come up again then as far as amendments. In the 1920's there were attempts made to strengthen that aspect of the law.

Dr. Griffin:

There were certain amendments made. I was not connected with administration at that time.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did the question then come up again later in the 1930's when you were with . . .

Dr. Griffin:

I don't remember anything about it. It's kind of a touchy thing. It was always felt that a man had a right to a certain amount of secrecy in his formulas and to try to get him to give too much was difficult.

Mrs. Whitaker:

It would probably have contributed to the opposition to the Act in the beginning?

Dr. Griffin:

Oh, yes, yes.

Mrs. Whitaker:
During the 1930's there were more attempts made to amend the act and one of the things that came up during the 1930's was the matter of rodenticides. Were you doing any work with rodenticides in the Bureau?

Dr. Griffin:
No, we did not work with rodenticides until after the '47 Act was passed.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you have any recollection of those amendments in the 1930's, from what sources they might have come?

Dr. Griffin:
No, I do not because they would not have filtered down to me. I was doing chemical work at that time.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And the weed-killers also would have been from a later period, or did that question plague you already in the '30's?

Dr. Griffin:
If you will notice, the first drafts of the '47 Act did not include weed-killers and we felt at that time that including rodenticides and the additional work required was about all the work we could handle. Weed-killers needed some control but we felt that at that time we just couldn't take it on.

At the hearings in this Act before the Agricultural Committee one of the congressmen from California, I don't remember his name now, asked why we hadn't put weed-killers in there and I told him, I suppose, something along this line. He said he thought they ought to be put in there and I told him that I thought they could be very easily put in, that all it needed was to insert the word "and weed-killers" and to give a definition of weed-killers. I said that there wouldn't be any trouble about that. He asked what the definition was. Well I told him they'd have to put in a definition of weeds, And he asked what the definition of weeds was and I told him just what's in the act there. He said that's the first time I've ever heard a government fellow come out with such a simple definition. Well, I said, it comes from your California law.

Mrs. Whitaker:
In California, the state law was . . .

Dr. Griffin:
It covered weed-killers at that time. So that was the way that weed-killers got put into the bill.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I noticed on one of the drafts that either you made the comment or someone made the comment that if you did not reword the law, it would apply to garden hoes. Do you recall the story connected with that?

Dr. Griffin:

I do not.

Mrs. Whitaker:

It was in connection with devices and the way the draft was written it would include garden hoes as one of the devices.

Dr. Griffin:

I don't remember anything on that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

You mentioned the hearings. Do you recall . . . or were you involved in any of the appropriations hearings throughout the '30's or '40's?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I was not. I was . . . well, you said through the '40's. Of course I was in the '40's after the new act went into effect. I didn't usually attend congressional hearings on appropriations but I had the job of drawing up what the needed personnel was and describing the needed personnel.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Appropriations were difficult to secure, were they not, throughout most of the '20's and '30's?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes, oh yes.

Mrs. Whitaker:

How did the Congress generally view your work?

Dr. Griffin:

I think we weren't treated any worse than other people. I think agriculture was strong in those days. Of course agriculture now is dead, pretty nearly, as far as political power is concerned. Even in the state of Kansas the urban population has the power.

Mrs. Whitaker:

That certainly was not true in the days when you were with the department?

Dr. Griffin:

Oh, no. Things have changed.

Mrs. Whitaker:

When the spray residue question arose in the 1920's . . .

Dr. Griffin:

The spray residue question arose far before that. I think that Pope was working on arsenic residues in fruits and vegetables as far back as 1913 or 14.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Who was the gentleman?

Dr. Griffin:

Pope. Pope was his name.

Mrs. Whitaker:

I had not encountered his name. Was he a chemist?

Dr. Griffin:

He was a chemist. He spent a lot of his time taking down samples of fruits and organic materials with sulphuric and nitric acid and then determining arsenic.

Mrs. Whitaker:

So the department was aware of the problem . . .

Dr. Griffin:

It was aware of the problem and doing work on it.

Mrs. Whitaker:

How was the Bureau of Biological Surveys involved in the work that you were doing?

Dr. Griffin:

During the time that I was there it had no formal connection with it. However, Mr. Ward particularly had good contact with it and it was discussed with them in many cases.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Your arrangements with that Bureau then would have been similar

to the arrangment you had with the Federal Trade Commission?

Dr. Griffin:
That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:
. . . an informal exchange, through telephone, rather than . . .

Dr. Griffin:
Telephone, or personal contact, a personal thing and nothing formal about it as far as I know.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And do you recall any of the dealings that you might have had with the Federal Trade Commission, for instance, on label claims?

Dr. Griffin:
No, as far as I know, the Federal Trade Commission did not go into label claims. The Federal Trade Commission went into advertising and things that we couldn't touch but as far as I know they never got into labeling.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did they object to your getting into advertising or what role did advertising play in the cases that were brought under the Act?

Dr. Griffin:

Advertising which accompanied the product was considered labeling and the same thing that applied to labeling claims applied to the advertising that accompanied the product in interstate commerce.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And then radio commercials and things of that sort, you did not deal with them?

Dr. Griffin:

We had nothing to do with those.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Back to the question of rodenticides . . . when it was determined that they should be included in the 1947 Act, what kind of poison was used?

Dr. Griffin:

I would guess that about that time the thing that was causing the most trouble was 1080. You're probably familiar with what that stuff is.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Vaguely.

Dr. Griffin:

It is a very highly poisonous thing and it was tasteless.

It was being used as a water solution of 1080 being put out for rats to drink and it was very easy for a child to drink the stuff. It was quickly fatal so that was probably the thing that we had the most trouble with. Of course arsenicals had been used for a long time in baits, and phosphorus had been used for mice but neither of those, as far as I know, caused considerable trouble. I think the anti-coagulants that have been so successful in recent years came after that date. I wouldn't be sure just when they came.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Somewhere in my reading I noticed that McDonnell raised the question of whether or not a chemical that in one product would come under the insecticide act when used in a rodenticide would not come under the act. I did not find a formal ruling on that. Do you recall what the department did in relation to that?

Dr. Griffin:
I don't quite get the question.

Mrs. Whitaker:
When a rat poison, for instance, had as one of its components arsenic, you still could not bring charges against the product unless it was advertised as an insecticide also.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, that would be true before the rodenticide act . . . during

Dr. McDonnell's days that would be true. Of course if it was intended for use as both an insecticide and a rodenticide we could work on the rodenticide claims but if it was only intended for use as a rodenticide we couldn't touch it.

Mrs. Whitaker:
That answers the question that I had, yes.

Dr. Griffin:
If it came under our act, we required all claims to be accurate. If it did not come under our act, we couldn't touch it.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I have encountered in my reading a number of statements from Mr. W. S. Abbott, one in which he discussed the advantages and disadvantages of registration. This was during the 1920's. Could you tell me anything about Mr. Abbott?

Dr. Griffin:
Mr. Abbott was a very excellent entomologist. He had had infantile paralysis when he was a child and his legs had never developed. He did all of his field work in entomology on crutches. And his work was mostly field work and it was excellent work. I would trust his judgment a very long way. I feel that he was one of the top men.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Apparently Dr. Haywood did also because he consulted him

on a number of occasions.

Dr. Griffin:
He was a good man and well-balanced so that you could trust what he had to say.

Mrs. Whitaker:
The fact that he raised the question of registration as a possible amendment in the 1920's would indicate that his thinking was somewhat ahead of his time.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, as I say, he actually headed up the entomological work through a matter of, well, I don't know just how many years but I guess it was at least twenty years. His work was unquestionably good. But you would see this man with undeveloped twelve-year-old legs going along on a set of crutches . . .

Mrs. Whitaker:
It didn't hinder him at all in his field work?

Dr. Griffin:
It didn't hinder him in his field work. He was always a very independent sort of a guy. I remember at one time I think we were going down to Texas and we changed trains in St. Louis. The station agent from Washington had apparently seen Mr. Abbott, seen his condition, and they had a wheel chair waiting for him in St. Louis. I never saw anyone more disgusted than Mr. Abbott was. I think it was probably on that same

trip that we had been a little bit late in getting our reservations and they didn't have anything but upper berths and Mr. Abbott swung himself up into an upper berth like nobody's business.

Mrs. Whitaker:
He must have been an outstanding man. Do you recall any other time in this early period when registration on the national level became the subject of discussion?

Dr. Griffin:
Not a subject of serious discussion as far as I know. It wasn't until we began to get the '47 act in shape that it came up. Of course it had been done in states long before that.

Mrs. Whitaker: What was your feeling about registration when you began discussing it seriously before the 1947 Act?

Dr. Griffin:
Well, I felt that it was probably a good thing and one of the things that was becoming necessary. An act which was good in 1910 was not sufficient in 1947 and one which was sufficient in 1947 is not sufficient now. Things change and the law has to take account of it.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And it was a long time coming, this change, from 1910 to

1947. Do you think that registration in that act, as far as the act permitted, worked?

Dr. Griffin:
In the '47 act? I certainly do. I think that if you had seen the amount of work that went into some 50,000 registrations, I don't know how many there are now, but when I left there were some 50,000 . . . and each one of those labels was thoroughly gone over as carefully as could be done and the amount of correction that occurred was enormous.

Mrs. Whitaker:
What were the particular problems that you encountered in the registration?

Dr. Griffin:
Oh, there is always the question of over-rosy claims. If a thing will do one job, they think it will do everything so that we had to deflate claims. That was the principal thing. Of course the matter of composition, we quite frequently had hassles over what the statement of ingredients should be. Very often the manufacturer didn't want to give that information and it was a job to make him see the light.

Mrs. Whitaker:
During the months in which you were writing the 1947 act, what was the manufacturers' reaction in an informal

way to including registration?

Dr. Griffin:
I think that a good many of them would rather not have seen the registration thing in there. Of course, the manufacturer doesn't like to see any requirement put in, but they came around in the latter part of the discussion, and the ingredient statement, or the registration was not seriously questioned as far as I know. The question came . . . if you've got the copy of the hearing before Congress, the Congressional committee, you will note that the chairman took up in order each one of the criticisms that the manufacturers had made. As he took up the criticism he asked me what the answer to that criticism was. The criticisms, as far as I recall, did not go particularly to registration. They went to other points. I never saw a hearing done in that way. The copy of the Act was brought in and the manufacturers had had a chance to criticize it and they had raised certain objections to it. The chairman went down the line each one of the objections--this is their objection, what is your answer to it?

Mrs. Whitaker:
I wanted to ask you just another question or two about your role with the Food and Drug Administration before 1938. Were you involved with the regulatory functions at that time?

Dr. Griffin:

I was involved in the regulatory functions while I was in the Food and Drug Administration. One of the things that I had to do, however, was to have charge of the equipment for the whole Food and Drug Administration in the South Building, Department of Agriculture. Of course, the building was built by the Department and our contacts were with the Department engineer and with the Department administrator. We had the job of allotting space and of designing the equipment. Of course we did not design it ourselves but each group was expected to tell us what they wanted and it was our job to get them in and get the thing done.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you continue to work with insecticides during the time that insecticide control was part of Food and Drug Administration's functions?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes, insecticides and fungicides. I never worked particularly on any other product except those under the Acts.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you notice, during the time that insecticides were still under the Food and Drug Administration, a growing awareness on the part of consumers to the products they were using? In the very early period hardly anyone other

than you people and the manufacturers were even aware that there was an insecticide act. When did you first notice that the public might have become more conscious of it?

Dr. Griffin:
I think that they very definitely became more conscious, probably about the time that DDT and some of the organic chemicals that were used in World War II were introduced. That was the big change.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Other than reform and consumer groups who were actively in it, what was the public reaction to the arsenical residues?

Dr. Griffin:
Back in the late teens there was a very heavy public reaction to the arsenicals because at that time the lead arsenate particularly was used as a heavy coating for apples to protect them from insects and very frequently you'd find, even after the fruit was picked, you'd find residues of lead arsenate in the stems or in the blossom end. There was a lot of fear expressed.

Mrs. Whitaker:
How did you feel, working on this?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, actually, it never worried me too much. I didn't want it on the things that I ate but we used arsenicals around the laboratory and I did not have too much trouble at first, let me say. We never did have any trouble, as far as I know, from lead arsenate. I am sure that one of our men was severely affected with Paris green. His name was Elliott--and I used to see him around with Paris green on his face and he would mix up Paris green paste with his hands and he almost lost his eyesight. It had the effect of narrowing the field of vision and his eyesight got to be very bad. I think that it corrected later because they began to use a treatment to get the arsenic out of the system. We did have a bad case there, and I know that one of the other men, C. M. Smith, was afraid that he had gotten some arsenic. He found that a considerable amount of arsenic had gotten into his hair from internal sources, grown into his hair. It has the effect, I believe, of coming out in the hair. Arsenic isn't a thing that you can use with impunity.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you advise those people working with you to take precautionary measures?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't know that I was in a position particularly to

advise them. They were just as high rank as I was. They came to work at the same time I did. I guess none of us figured that arsenic could be quite as bad as it was. I did very little work on arsenicals.

Mrs. Whitaker:
We talked earlier about disinfectants. Having scanned these notices of judgment, household cleansers, disinfectants of all sorts played a very prominent role in seizures?

Dr. Griffin:
As a matter of fact, by that time the lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, Paris green had been pretty well gone over and the labeling was pretty well standardized. There wasn't too much trouble with them. Most of them were manufactured by large manufacturers who had good control of their products--good chemical control--and we didn't run into too much trouble with them. We did run into trouble with the more or less fly-by-nights, the ones that had no laboratory facilities for testing them and just put them out to sell a product.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I suppose that having gotten the major manufacturers accustomed to the act--Haywood had done some of that in his day--both funds and personnel were released to concentrate on disinfectants?

Dr. Griffin:

We did try to get some samples from the big manufacturers so that we could check them.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Put them on their toes?

Dr. Griffin:

Keep them honest.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did you have any dealings with the formation of the 1938 food and drugs act?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I had nothing to do with that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you know anything about the nature of the conflict between the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug when Congress took away the research funds for Food and Drug and gave them to Public Health Service?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I had nothing to do with that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you think that the public in general assumed that if a product was registered this gave the approval of the

department to the product to an extent beyond what the department intended?

Dr. Griffin:
I think there was a certain amount of that. Of course, there was considerable discussion at various times about allowing them to have a registration number and put the registration number on the package. We always objected on the basis that it would give an unacceptable view that the stuff had been guaranteed by the department.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Similar to the guarantee number that was issued under the old act?

Dr. Griffin:
That's right and that was cut out pretty quickly.

Mrs. Whitaker:
What were your feelings in the period before the 1947 Act about the seizure of goods instead of using the criminal information process?

Dr. Griffin:
That was a matter of the best way to enforce the act. When I first went with the government I felt that when we brought criminal proceedings against a person the

general public's reaction was that the government wouldn't bring action against this fellow unless he'd done something wrong. It was very much easier to win a case in court on criminal charges at that time than it was later. Later they came to the view that, heck, this is one of our home folks and what the heck is the government doing coming down here and trying to prosecute him. He's a good guy and he shouldn't be prosecuted. It was very much harder to do it. Now a seizure is a civil case and doesn't require the same amount of proof as a criminal case does. It's very much easier to handle a seizure case than it is a criminal case and very often a series of seizures would get the same results as a criminal case, so they went to seizures on that account.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you recall approximately what year this was?

Dr. Griffin:
I imagine in the 1930's. I recall a case that I went to down in Texas--it was El Paso-- and it was on a product that was intended to be fed to the chickens to prevent chicken lice and mites. There are products of that type now which work but at that time there were no products that worked and this was purely a fake. We went down to El Paso and came in to court on a Monday morning and wanted to go to trial. The case came up then and the defendent

put in a motion--I've forgotten what the motion was at the present time--and the judge said, we'll give you until Thursday to answer that motion. The U.S. attorney said that he'd like to go ahead with the case, these witnesses had been brought down from Washington and it had cost money to bring them down. The judge said, that doesn't make any difference. The government will keep them here. He didn't think much of the government. The only thing we could do was to take it. The United States attorney said, I don't know anything about this thing. This man's got this motion and I have got to write a reply to it. He said, you take it and write the reply. So I took it and wrote a reply, and I took advantage of the fact that I wasn't supposed to know any law and I put in whatever I wanted in the way of argument. Well, apparently the argument that I put in persuaded the judge because when we went in to court the next Thursday or Friday he had turned right around and he gave us all the leeway we wanted and we got a conviction. We didn't ask for any heavy penalty. All that we asked was that the product be taken off the market. When the case came up for sentencing the judge asked before he sentenced, will this stuff be taken off the market and the defendant said yes and the judge said, on that basis I'll fine you, I don't remember, ten dollars or something very minor, which was all we wanted. It accomplished our purpose which was to get it off the market. The people were poor people and they weren't people you wanted to have any vindictive thoughts of.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Just to protect the consumer from what they were selling?

Dr. Griffin:

That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Can you say at what point the Department became more concerned with the consumer's well-being, other than his economic well-being?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, that of course came in the early '40's during World War II. There were a lot of new products which came in. The organic chemicals were much more prominent at that time and there were a lot more products that the consumer didn't know what he was using. As far as an arsenical was concerned, the consumer always knew that arsenic was poison. If he got lead arsenic or calcium arsenic, he knew that he had to take care of it. But the things that came in, the organic chemicals, were not familiar and it seemed to be necessary when they came in to give the consumer more protection. That's about the story as far as I know it.

Mrs. Whitaker:

The original intent of the old law was primarily to protect the consumer's economic interests?

Dr. Griffin:

To protect the consumer as far as effectiveness was concerned, economic protection. But there was nothing in the old law to protect his health or to protect him from personal injury.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Would the Department's interest in disinfecting materials--antiseptics, germicides--have indicated a concern also with and a recognition of the responsibility toward public health?

Dr. Griffin:

A certain amount of that but not whether the product caused direct injury to the person. Of course, it caused indirect injury if it was ineffective and allowed him to get infected with some disease. The economic concern was still the major concern.

Mrs. Whitaker:

When your work became more administrative than chemical during the 1940's and the discussion arose about the amended or adjusted bill, was the setting of standards a question of major significance?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't recall anything that was said at that time about setting of standards so I guess it wasn't significant.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Would you tell me something about your role after 1938 when Food and Drug went to the Federal Security Administration and you stayed with the Department of Agriculture?

Dr. Griffin:

By 1938 I had practically ceased to do any chemical work and my work was virtually all administrative, largely handling correspondence with manufacturers and others that asked questions concerning the application of the law to their products and possible violations. There was practically no chemical work after that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Was there any abatement in enforcement of the Act during the war period for any reason--production and scarcity of materials and things of that sort?

Dr. Griffin:

So far as I know, there was no abatement of the enforcement of the Act. Of course we were interested in food then and insecticides are necessary for the production of food and so I think our work probably was increased if anything.

Mrs. Whitaker:

What would have been factors in that, was there more adulteration of products, for instance?

Dr. Griffin:

There wasn't more adulteration, no, but along about that time the organic insecticides began to come in. That would be the production of DDT, the production of a number of things intended to prevent insects from biting, mosquito repellants. There were quite a number of new materials that came in just about that period.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Were there new products that preceded DDT during the period between 1938 and approximately 1942 which might have been substitutes for the old arsenicals?

Dr. Griffin:

I would think that there were. I don't have any close enough recollection of what happened at what date so that I could say. I think that perhaps some of the published material that you have will show that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Yes, I did see some reference to it and I wondered if that in any way influenced or affected the kind of enforcement problem you might have had. I noticed in the printed material the tremendous amount of agitation for an amendment to require coloring the white products that were mistaken for food from time to time.

Dr. Griffin:

That applied particularly to sodium fluoride. Sodium fluoride did start to be colored at that time, colored blue.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And then when you began writing the new act, in about 1945, that was incorporated?

Dr. Griffin:

That was incorporated in the act.

Mrs. Whitaker:

In the matter of factory inspection, I noticed in the printed material that Dr. Haywood did not favor factory inspection; he felt it was not legal. But Food and Drug, when they took over the enforcement of the Insecticide Act, did use factory inspection. What was your feeling on that when you became an administrator?

Dr. Griffin:

Factory inspection is mostly a question of helping the inspector. The things that you accomplish by factory inspection are finding out what is being shipped, where it is being shipped, and get a general idea of the chemical composition to help the analyst. You can't by factory inspections make sure that the product is not adulterated or that it is what it claims to be. Of course, we had to prove interstate shipment in all cases. I notice

that that is not required in the latest law. It helped prove interstate shipment. That's largely what it would do.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Was it the practice of the Insecticide Division after 1938 to utilize factory inspection to any great extent or did you concentrate primarily on the collection of samples?

Dr. Griffin:
Well, let me say that after 1938 the inspectors were in the Food and Drug Administration and I believe we ceased to have any inspectors directly connected with the insecticide work. All of that would not come under our control at all.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Were you hampered by the limited number of inspectors that you had during the war period when personnel were harder to secure?

Dr. Griffin:
We always wanted more inspectors.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Well, you had very few . . . I think the most was seven.

Dr. Griffin:

We had very few. We had to keep a balance between inspection work and the number of samples collected, and the number of samples that could be handled in the laboratories. I was never directly connected with the inspection work. My connections were with the laboratories and we had about as many samples as we could handle.

Mrs. Whitaker:

So an increase in the inspection force would not have helped you without further appropriations?

Dr. Griffin:

That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:

You were involved then, after 1938, with the matter of appropriations. What were your dealings with the Congress?

Dr. Griffin:

I did not have dealings with the Congress on appropriations after the 1947 Act except in the one case in 1947. The 1947 Act was passed just before Congress was to adjourn. We asked for an emergency appropriation of $50,000 to start its administration and were told to appear before a congressional committee to support the request the next day. When we arrived the Navy was asking for a large amount,

I think about $500,000,000. The hearing went on until noon or later. Then came our turn. The Chairman said "Do you need this money?" I said "yes." That finished the hearing. In deciding what money is appropriated estimates had to be made and we had to put in a request to the department. I usually had something to do with requesting new people, new equipment, or whatever.

Mrs. Whitaker:
What was the attitude of the department itself towards appropriations for insecticide enforcement work?

Dr. Griffin:
They never give you enough money but Ithink they're reasonably fair.

Mrs. Whitaker:
On the matter of seizures, I notice in the printed material that Dr. Haywood attempted almost annually to get appropriations increased (and he did deal directly with the Congress) to expand the use of seizures. What are your feelings on seizures as compared to the criminal proceedings?

Dr. Griffin:
The difference between the two is that seizures are handled as civil cases and the requirements for proof are much less rigid than those in criminal cases. The criminal cases

require proof beyond reasonable doubt and they are much harder to carry. Also, a jury will consider a civil case which can only lead to a fine as much less serious and they are much more likely to give you a verdict than they are in a criminal case. If the seizures will accomplish the same purpose, and I think they did in most cases, the seizure is probably the preferable situation. Of course, there are some places where there are small amounts and where a seizure can't be made. Over the long run the seizures are a better procedure.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And you used seizures whenever you could when you reached the administrative level?

Dr. Griffin:
That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:
You may already have answered this to the extent that you would be able to without the records here, but what determined whether or not you decided to seize a product instead of bringing a criminal procedure?

Dr. Griffin:
You just considered the whole case and if you thought that the seizure would accomplish your purpose--getting it off

the market or getting corrections--the seizure was entirely adequate. The purpose in general of enforcement is to see that the people get the product that they should have. It isn't to punish anybody or anything of that sort; it is to accomplish results in the way of protection.

Mrs. Whitaker:
How did manufacturers feel about having their products seized? Did you generally get more reaction from the manufacturers through seizure?

Dr. Griffin:
I don't know that there was any difference. I think perhaps the manufacturer accepted the seizure more readily than he accepted a criminal case. After a seizure was made, we had the goods there and he thought they were gone, but what of it. But I think it accomplished the results we were after.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I have noticed in the printed material that appropriations were cut somewhat in the 1950's for a year or so. Do you recall what the particular circumstances were?

Dr. Griffin:
I do not.

Mrs. Whitaker:

In the preparation for presenting the new act--I think you wrote the first draft in about 1945, did you consider the question once again of bacteria?

Dr. Griffin:

Frankly, I don't remember just what we put in there. I think the bacteria were covered by the act. It has been a long time since I read the act.

Mrs. Whitaker:

They were covered and I wondered whether you intended to expand the limits of the products covered?

Dr. Griffin:

No, there was no intention to expand. That first draft was written without discussions with other people, that was on my own. It was put up for somebody to kick at.

Mrs. Whitaker:

It didn't get much kicking at. It came through pretty much the way you had written it the first time.

Dr. Griffin:

It came through a good deal that way.

Mrs. Whitaker:

There was a good deal of discussion, however. I think you

invited all of the different bureaus to submit comments?

Dr. Griffin:
We invited discussion. After the first draft we went over to the Solicitor's office and the solicitors went through it. Just as a matter of advice, if you want legal advice, go to one lawyer; don't get four in on it.

Mrs. Whitaker:
You found that that complicated matters? Was Mr. Bucy the general counsel at that time?

Dr. Griffin:
No, that name doesn't ring a bell. I can't tell you who was.

Mrs. Whitaker:
What were your feelings about cattle dips and disinfectants? Did you feel that they belonged under the Insecticide Act?

Dr. Griffin:
Both cattle dips and disinfectants, yes, very definitely.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And household cleansers and bleaches--did you feel that these products belonged under the Act?

Dr. Griffin:

Not a cleanser but a cleanser that claimed disinfecting power.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And you feel that they rightfully should have been controlled by the Act?

Dr. Griffin:

There wasn't anything else to control them. I think that a good deal of the advertising, even at the present time, goes hog wild on the disinfectant claims.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Who were the other people that did assist you later with the bill that eventually culminated in the 1947 Act? Do you recall any of the discussions or conferences that you may have had during those years?

Dr. Griffin:

I do remember, of course, that we discussed them with the state officials, the state economic poison officials. There were very considerable discussions with the man who ran the manufacturing chemists association--I don't remember his name. There was Hamilton who was with the Chemical Specialties Association. We had close contact with him. He, by the way, is still alive and I get a card from him at Christmas.

Mrs. Whitaker:
What were their feelings toward the bill?

Dr. Griffin:
Well, they had a string of criticisms. We ironed out everything that we could iron out between us and then, if you will remember the Congressional hearing, they came up with a list of criticisms which they had and which we tried to answer and in most cases our answers were accepted.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did industry accept the need for a change in the law?

Dr. Griffin:
Yes, they accepted the need for it. They knew that it was the coming thing. They didn't fight the act as an act, they only fought certain things which they didn't agree with. They didn't like the registration provision.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Were they fearful that this would unduly curtail their activities?

Dr. Griffin:
It meant that they would have to submit their labeling before they put the product on the market and that, of course, delayed and made additional difficulty. With the new law I don't see how a product is ever going to be put on the market.

At that time we figured that to put a product on the market for use anywhere near foods would cost from a half million to a million dollars in research work. At the present time I would guess that five to ten million would be a low estimate.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And so it will increase the cost to the consumer eventually?

Dr. Griffin:
Of course it will. After all you can't stay in business if the business doesn't pay for itself.

Mrs. Whitaker:
On the matter of penalties, was there much feeling in the department or what was your feeling about increasing the penalties for violation of the Act, compared to the penalties imposed earlier?

Dr. Griffin:
I don't think there was much feeling about it. The penalties are not too heavy. As far as the financial penalties are concerned--I don't recall just what they were--they are probably no more than the decrease in the value of the dollar. I went to work at $120 a month. That's changed quite markedly now.

Mrs. Whitaker:
It's surprising though that the amount of the fines imposed

by the court in the very early years generally ran between one dollar and fifty dollars and then in later years the penalty imposed did not actually increase a great deal over that.

Dr. Griffin:
In most cases the penalties were to make the manufacturers be more careful of what he was doing. The notice of judgment was actually the greatest punishment because tho were used by the competition.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And the practice of issuing notices of judgment began with inception of the act and continued through the time that . . .

Dr. Griffin:
Through the time that I was there.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And you feel that that was a greater deterrent to the manufacturers than the penalties?

Dr. Griffin:
I feel that it was.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you remember any particular comments or complaints that any manufacturer might have made to you directly?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I don't recall anything of the sort.

Mrs. Whitaker:

What were the circumstances that led directly to your sitting down, taking pen in hand, and writing that first draft? Do you recall the circumstances?

Dr. Griffin:

The first Food and Drug Act came out in 1906 and about five years after that, or four years after that, in 1910 it became desirable to write an insecticide act. As I recall, the Food and Drug Act was revised about 1937 and after that was revised it seemed that a similar revision was desirable--I was talking to Harry Reed about it one day and he agreed that it would probably be a good thing for us to look into revision of the insecticide act. It was at that time that I sat down and wrote a rough draft. From then on it got in the works and went through the regular procedure.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Certainly you did not encounter the opposition that the Food and Drug revision did?

Dr. Griffin:

Actually, the fact that the food and drug revision in 1937 had been made gave us a little bit of help because a lot of the companies were also in the food and drug field. After

they had been worked over by the Food and Drug Administration, they were more amenable. They had been softened up a little.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I think that Haywood probably had the same advantage so there would be a parallel situation.

Dr. Griffin:
Yes, I think so.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I think we've already discussed to some extent the problems that registration did present for you after the act was actually passed. This required, of course, more appropriations and more personnel?

Dr. Griffin:
That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you recall any of the particular details of how you set about carrying out the administration of the act?

Dr. Griffin:
Before it was passed we had to make some plans as to what sort of organization we would set up. Before the organization there was no registration unit in our office. We had the chemical group and the bacteriological group in Washington.

By the time the act was set up the chemical group, I believe, had all been moved out to Beltsville and the bacteriological work had gone out to Beltsville. We had a very small Washington office. We had to set up a Washington office to include people to pass on the chemical labeling. We brought the people who passed on labeling into Washington and we had to set up a registration unit to handle the registration. It meant setting up a completely new Washington office. I went over and got a list of people that I thought would be needed for it. We got along fairly well but it was a rough time the first year.

Mrs. Whitaker:
That would have been the year in which you had the heaviest load. About how many years did it take you to get those products already on the market registered?

Dr. Griffin:
They were all pretty well registered, as I recall, in the first year.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I noticed in the cases brought under the act initially that most of them had not been registered.

Dr. Griffin:
That's probably true.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you recall any particular problems that you did encounter with trying to bring products to trial which were registered by the department?

Dr. Griffin:

We did not handle that part of it. Our office would make recommendations for prosecution and then it would go to the solicitor's office and then from there on it was up to the solicitor's office.

Mrs. Whitaker:

What were the circumstances that would convince you that a product should be prosecuted--a product, that is, that was registered with you?

Dr. Griffin:

If it was significantly adulterated, if it was significantly different from the composition that it was supposed to have, that was almost surely a prosecution case. If it was a question of very definitely fraudulent claims, that would be a prosecution case. If it was a case where the claims were marginal, that they were just blown up to some extent and could be corrected by correspondence, we got them corrected and did not recommend prosecution. It was a matter of judgment and we used the best we could.

Mrs. Whitaker:

The method of correspondence was used quite freely?

Dr. Griffin:

I would say that there were at least fifteen to twenty correspondence cases to prosecution cases . . . it could be more than that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And this solved the problem in some cases more efficiently than prosecution would have?

Dr. Griffin:

It solved them very efficiently but prosecution would probably also have solved them. It may have been that they solved some of them quicker because in a case of prosecution the solicitor's office doesn't want you to go on dealing with the company about the product. They want to handle it with prosecution, whereas if we were handling it by correspondence we could get it done promptly and be finished with it.

Mrs. Whitaker:

What was the department's feeling on the matter of handling it through correspondence? Was there any expression from the Secretary, for instance, about how you handled the cases?

Dr. Griffin:

I never heard any expression that we hadn't handled them correctly.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Unless a complaint was lodged with the Secretary, you had fairly free rein, then?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes. There were very few cases that the Secretary entered. We had very little trouble from political sources. We frequently had a Congressman come to us about one of his people's products but in all except one or two cases the Congressmen were gentlemen and we understood that the Congressmen had to do something for his people and we would usually go over it with the Congressman and we would tell the Congressman what we thought the person could reasonably claim for his product and what we thought he couldn't. The Congressman was usually happy with the results he got from us and he would write something back to the person. In one or two cases I had Congressmen that were very difficult to deal with.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you remember the particulars of these cases?

Dr. Griffin:

I remember one Congressman, he was from a southern state--

I wouldn't mention who he was--he had been in Congress for a long time and apparently there was a very influential drug outfit in the district that he was representing and we had recommended prosecution on the case. He kept urging me for . . . I guess closing time at that time was five o'clock . . . and I think that I was still talking to him on the phone at 5:30 or 5:45. He was attempting to get us to throw out the prosecution. It was a justifiable prosecution and I didn't throw it out. I think that the case was not prosecuted but it was not dropped in my office.

Mrs. Whitaker:
If it was dropped, it would have been after it reached the solicitor's office?

Dr. Griffin:
It would have been after it reached the solicitor's office. And then I had another one. He took Dr. Reed and myself out to eat at the capitol and he had a case . . . well, he had a product which I didn't think much of and he wanted us to drop our prosecution. He mentioned that he was on the appropriations committee, the committee that handled our appropriation, and you know what that means.

Mrs. Whitaker:
That would have been a pressure difficult to resist. What did you do in this case?

Dr. Griffin:

As far as I was concerned, we didn't drop the case. I think we finally went ahead with that case and I think the case was lost in court.

Mrs. Whitaker:

You don't remember the particulars?

Dr. Griffin:

I wouldn't go into what the product was.

Mrs. Whitaker:

But this is indicative to me of how you handled pressures. Some of the later criticism against the department and some of the criticism, as you well know, was along the lines that you did respond to critical pressures, manufacturers' pressures, but this would indicate that you had not.

Dr. Griffin:

As far as I know, in our office we never were intimidated by political pressures. Now I won't say what happened farther out the line. We didn't have the final sayso.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And so the pressure might have been transferred from you to . . .

Dr. Griffin:

Actually, these are the only two cases over a long line that

I can think of undue political pressure being applied at our level. In general I have a very high opinion of congressmen. Of course, a congressman's chief job is to get re-elected. He must satisfy his constituents. I always recognized that and I went out of my way to try to help him satisfy his constituents without compromising our job.

Mrs. Whitaker:
On the matter of pressure, what kind of pressures did you get from the manufacturers themselves?

Dr. Griffin:
Nothing but reasonable pressure. I have seen a man come down to Washington who had pressures put on him. I am very firmly convinced in one case that the man was told unless he could get what he was sent down for he didn't need to come back. In that case, we didn't give him any more than he was justified in having. So I don't know what happened when he went back. The people who came to us were very frequently under heavy pressure. There wasn't too much pressure that they could put on us, as far as I could see.

Mrs. Whitaker:
And the same kind of situation would have existed in the period before 1947?

Dr. Griffin:
The same situation both before and after.

Mrs. Whitaker:

I have heard you later referred to as a gentleman who was almost Mr. Insecticide . . . could you tell me about how that name came to be applied to you?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't know that that name was particularly applied to me outside, but when I came to retire one of the boys handed me a little poem in which he referred to me as Dr. FIFRA, for the Federal Insecticide Fungicide & Rodenticide Act. Whether I was called that behind my back or not, I don't know.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Well, I think it certainly was a complimentary term or meant to be.

Dr. Griffin:

I'm sure it was.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And you did, certainly, with your long years of experience with both the analytical and later the administrative work serve as a stabilizing factor in the division.

Dr. Griffin:

I was probably in '55 . . . I was definitely in '55 the one who had the most experience on the law and law enforcement

in that period.

Mrs. Whitaker:

You had a remarkably stable unit throughout the years?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes, it was a good unit.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Dr. McDonnell had been chief for . . .

Dr. Griffin:

Dr. McDonnell was chief of the laboratory when I went there in 1913 and he stayed chief until 1945.

Mrs. Whitaker:

So there was a continuity?

Dr. Griffin:

Very definitely.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Can you tell me what you can remember about Dr. McDonnell. He's no longer living now?

Dr. Griffin:

No, he's no longer living. Dr.McDonnell loved bridge. He played duplicate bridge very frequently. He was a Scotsman

and he was one that you could very definitely depend on. He was a good boss. He was sometimes a little bit inclined to be terse. I remember one time during the noon hour while the rest of us were out of our laboratories he apparently came in to read the paper in there and when we came back we found the chair at the desk . . . the office chair . . . was busted to pieces. On the table was a note, "I think you need a new chair" and signed "C. C. McD."

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did he explain . . .

Dr. Griffin:
He didn't explain at all. One time when I . . . oh, maybe I'd been there three or four years . . . I got a bad lot of hydrogen peroxide and I opened one bottle and the hydrogen peroxide was all gone. And I opened another and it didn't work and I sent over to the supply room for a dozen more bottles and I continued to open them and they weren't any good and finally I got disgusted and threw one of them over in a corner against the concrete wall. The next morning I got a note from Dr. McDonnell--Please don't break any more glass around because the janitor might get cut cleaning it up. That was characteristic of him. He didn't say much but what he said was pretty clear.

Mrs. Whitaker:
He came into the position of chief of the Insecticide Division

after long years of working with Dr. Haywood first, and then in Food and Drug Administration? In the early years of Dr. McDonnell's career, he was doing analytical work also?

Dr. Griffin:
He never did any after I came there but I think he probably did in his first years.

Mrs. Whitaker:
In some of the printed material, and this carries us back again to the earlier period and something we touched on briefly yesterday, Dr. Haywood's concern was with the welfare of those people he was responsible for. I mentioned to you, I think, something about his attempts to secure pay raises for Dr. McDonnell and then I think you commented he did this for you also later?

Dr. Griffin:
Yes, he did it for me. I think I have already put on the tape his going over to the Secretary.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I'm not sure you did. Let's have that again. I think we did not put that on the tape.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, there's the story, of course, that Secretary Wilson

was in the habit of considering pay raises once a year or perhaps twice a year and the list was submitted to him. According to the story, he would sign them until he got tired and then he would say, well, I'll let these go until next year. At one time Dr. Haywood went over and was quite insistent that his people be given pay raises. The Secretary indicated that the conference was over and Haywood continued to argue and Wilson turned to the man he had there and said, "Show the gentlemen out." That ended that. And then at a later time I had an offer to go to the General Chemical Company at a considerable raise over what I had been getting. I didn't accept at the moment but I came back to Washington after a trip to New York. Dr. Haywood said, "Have you accepted." I said, no. He said, "Wait a couple of days and I'll see what I can do." I think within two or three days he had a raise through for me which, while it wasn't as high as the General Chemical offer, I decided to accept.

Mrs. Whitaker:
This concern for your welfare seemed to have inspired a great deal of loyalty for Dr. Haywood from the people who worked for him?

Dr. Griffin:
I think his people were quite loyal to him. They felt he was one who was looking out for them. They liked him.

Mrs. Whitaker:

I notice that Dr. McDonnell served as an adviser to Haywood as his health declined a few years before his death. He was in ill health for a number of years?

Dr. Griffin:

Dr. Haywood was, yes. He continued in his office but he wasn't the man he'd been earlier.

Mrs. Whitaker:

He certainly comes through from the printed material as a very dynamic person.

Dr. Griffin:

He was. If he was anywhere in the building, you could hear him.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And he, of course, was the subject of abuse on a number of occasions from disgruntled manufacturers?

Dr. Griffin:

Yes. I don't know too much about that because it didn't come back to us at that time.

Mrs. Whitaker:

One manufacturer who was quite incensed at having his product surveyed or examined, I believe carried his feud over

to your days?

Dr. Griffin:

You're referring to Mr. Harris?

Mrs. Whitaker:

Yes.

Dr. Griffin:

Yes, he carried it on over. He came into the office at various times and we felt that he couldn't be relied upon to be unbiased in his statements. At one conference in my office I called in a stenographer to take down what was said because I was afraid of what might be said. I think the culmination of it was when he asked for and was given a hearing in the Secretary's office. The hearing was headed by the solicitor and witnesses were heard. Harris's statements were taken and the statements of several witnesses, including myself, were taken. We were completely exonerated. I think that nobody could have heard Harris's statements at the hearing without being convinced that they weren't entirely reliable.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Though you were exonerated from this, the attendant publicity was damaging to your Division?

Dr. Griffin:

I didn't feel that it was damaging. I felt that Harris's statements taken on their own standing were not good.

Mrs. Whitaker:

He was not typical of the kind of persons you dealt with?

Dr. Griffin:

Oh no, he was not typical. He was very unusual.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Back to the question of pressures. After about 1940 when you became extremely active in administration, we di$cussed congressional pressures and manufacturers' pressures. Were you pressured in any way by consumer groups?

Dr. Griffin:

Not that I recall. Consumer groups in that day were not very important.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And the environmentalists?

Dr. Griffin:

I never heard the word environmentalist. It did begin to come on in the very last period with DDT particularly but it was not an important aspect.

Mrs. Whitaker:

In retrospect then, considering all of the emphasis that has since that time been put on the environmental aspects of pesticides, this was not one of the considerations?

Dr. Griffin:

It wasn't a major consideration. Of course, in the larger sense we always considered the environment. The Act requires that the product must be safe when used according to the directions that are given. That is an environmental situation, if taken in the larger sense. If you take it in the way it has been used recently, we didn't have that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Were you involved with the Inter-departmental Committee on Pesticides?

Dr. Griffin:

No, I was not involved in that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

We were discussing the matter of arsenicals and the criticism directed toward arsenicals and you mentioned that the criticism went back to the early twentieth century?

Dr. Griffin:

It went back to . . . I would say, 1914 or 15. I was brought up on a farm in New York state, the west bank of the Hudson

River and our principal cash crop was apples. On a good year we'd have a thousand barrels of apples or more. We had up to the time I left the farm in 1903 or 1904 never used any insecticide on the apples. The apples were not perfect but still they demanded a good price on the New York market. We shipped to New York. The general use of arsenicals--the hefty use--started in the Northwest and had perhaps started before that time. Since then it has been impossible to raise marketable apples in the Hudson River Valley without insecticides. The arsenicals were used very heavily on apples. The fruit was covered with them and very frequently you would find a white residue in the stem end or blossom end of the fruit when they came to market, that would have been from 1915 to 1925. There was real reason for worry about arsenical residues on apples. When I first came to the department or shortly thereafter a lot of work was done on arsenical residues in our laboratories. A chemist by the name of Pope was assigned to that work. He was continually taking down things of that sort--fruit--with sulphuric and nitric acid to make arsenic determinations. He had a publication, I believe, on the subject.

Mrs. Whitaker:
There was very little under the Insecticide Act that could have been done about this. You really had no control over the residue except what Food and Drug had?

Dr. Griffin:

No, the residue wasn't our problem. But since we were in Food and Drug we were doing the work.

Mrs. Whitaker:

The analytical work?

Dr. Griffin:

That's right.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Did this present any conflict of interest--and I'm reluctant to use that since it is now so overused--but was there a conflict of interest in your insecticide section in trying to maintain a standard?

Dr. Griffin:

I wouldn't say there was a conflict of interest. I would say the interests were the same. We wanted to have food that was good to use and so did they. There was sometimes difficulty between the entomologists who were working out in the field, the field man, and the food and drug. The field man's job was to get marketable apples and he was working to make money for the orchardist. He sometimes made recommendations which he knew orchardists had been getting away with which we would not agree with.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Would he have been a state official in most instances?

Dr. Griffin:

He could be state or federal. There have been cases where there had been a conflict of interest between the two but I think that in all cases where we were able to show that residues were there, we straightened it out.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Might the attempt to find a substitute for arsenicals in the days before DDT and the introduction of other materials have been the result of trying to find some way to relieve the orchardist of his problems?

Dr. Griffin:

That was one of the things that would govern them in trying to get substitutes for arsenicals.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Were you involved in any way in attempting to find a product or was this strictly the manufacturers' endeavor?

Dr. Griffin:

The only one that I worked on was oil emulsions. I did a considerable amount of work on oil emulsions. They were used to a large extent.

Mrs. Whitaker:
As a replacement for arsenicals?

Dr. Griffin:
As a replacement for arsenicals in some of the spray schedules. In fact my Ph.D. thesis was connected with that work.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did you select the topic as a result of your work in the department or was it the other way?

Dr. Griffin:
After I had done the work, I did the Ph.D. thesis.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you recall, Dr. Griffin, when the word "pesticide" first became part of the language of your division?

Dr. Griffin:
I think that it was after the passage of the '47 Act. Personally, I wasn't very fond of the word pesticide, I don't know why. I was rather desirous of calling the act the Insecticide Act the same as the Insecticide Act of 1910 but after discussion we thought it would be more informative if we put Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. The weed killer was put in after the original drafts of the act had been made and we never did get the weed killer into its name. Probably that would have been a little bit too cumbersome. Pesticide, I guess, was a good term and I have

used it in recent years when I have talked about them but at that time I wasn't very fond of it.

Mrs. Whitaker:
There was some concern that the manufacturers might not like the term pesticide because of the connotation of pests?

Dr. Griffin:
I think that's probably true.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Did you hear any comments yourself?

Dr. Griffin:
I don't recall any comments from industry on that but I can see why it would probably be true.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I want to go back also just another moment to the transition of administrators and the fact that there was a great deal of stability in the Insecticide Division. Dr. McDonnell had been with the service even longer than you had and I'm sure then that you managed very well to acquaint Dr. Reed when he came in with the work that had been done. Could you tell me something about Dr. Reed and that period of transition?

Dr. Griffin:

Dr. Reed came from, I believe, the meat inspection service. He was a veterinarian and was not familiar with pesticide regulation. He accepted advice very readily. In fact, he asked for it. My relations with him were always very pleasant and I think that we worked together very well. I think that he did a better job of going out to manufacturers' associations and getting around with those people than I would. On the other hand, he gave me a very free hand and full cooperation in carrying out the application of the Act and carrying out the technical work that was necessary in its application.

Mrs. Whitaker:

He left the formation of policy fairly well in your hands?

Dr. Griffin:

Fairly well. He never changed any policy that I started that I can remember. We had no difficulty in that line at all. I think he gave me a pretty free hand.

Mrs. Whitaker:

And his relationship with Food and Drug and the other bureaus that you had contact with?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't know that he had very much to do with Food and Drug. I think that all the relations with Food and Drug were carried

out by people under him and I doubt if he had any very direct relationship with them.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Other than the requirements later on the registration and establishment of the tolerance or no tolerance, what were your relations with Food and Drug during this period?

Dr. Griffin:
They were quite informal. I think that the people in our organization would informally ask the Food and Drug if they had any objections to this use or that use of a product and where use seemed to conflict with their views, we wouldn't permit it. Some products would be subject to both the Food and Drug Act and the Insecticide Act and in those cases we didn't accept them until it seemed acceptable to Food and Drug. Again, our relations were good. Sometimes as you've noticed from the verse about Wales we thought that they were a little bit sticklers but not bad.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you have reference there to the tolerances perhaps or the . . .

Dr. Griffin:
Well, the tolerances, also, we discussed with them. I had reference to both claims and tolerances. We tried not to accept any claims or tolerances that would be embarrassing

to Food and Drug.

Mrs. Whitaker:
There were some persons in Food and Drug and also in the American Medical Association who felt that the aerosol sprays were abused. What were the views of the Insecticide Division on that?

Dr. Griffin:
I'm not familiar with just what aerosols they were criticizing or just what it was. We tried to keep claims for aerosols within reasonable bounds. Whether there were any of the aerosols . . . I presume that you have in mind the possibility of danger from breathing aerosol materials. In a good many cases, as I recall, we required them to be used and then the room evacuated until the aerosol had had a chance to disperse. I don't recall that we had any conflicts that were not resolved by discussion.

Mrs. Whitaker:
I would invite you now to add any recollections . . . anything that you might remember of your personal relationships with any of these people that we've discussed--McDonnell and Haywood.

Dr. Griffin:
Well, I think that I've pretty well, while we were discussing

them, given you most of my reminiscenses of them. I would say that throughout the time that I was there my relations with my bosses, including the three that you have mentioned, were very satisfactory. I wouldn't say that we didn't disagree at times but I can't conceive of having a better bunch.

Mrs. Whitaker:
That would be Haywood, McDonnell, and Reed?

Dr. Griffin:
Haywood, McDonnell and Reed. They were very satisfactory people to work with. In other words, they usually let me have my own way and do as I darned pleased.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Well, I think that would be a good note to close on for this session and if we think of anything to be added we might do that later on. Thank you.

Dr. Griffin:
I will say this, that in the time that I was there I never had any of them come back to me after a thing was done and criticize me for having done it. No second guessing.

Mrs. Whitaker:
You retired in 1954.

Dr. Griffin:
1955.

Mrs. Whitaker:

So you were still in charge of much of the administrative work in the initial period of the relationship between Food and Drug and the Insecticide Division as far as the Miller Amendment to Food and Drug?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't think that came into effect until after I left.

Mrs. Whitaker:

The criticism that the Department of Agriculture and specifically the insecticide people were subjected to came at a period later than your service?

Dr. Griffin:

I can't remember any serious criticism. We weren't perfect but we think that we didn't get any more criticism than we probably deserved.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Do you have a recollection of the Albert Deutsch articles in 1949 and the joint statement that the Department of Agriculture and Food and Drug made concerning DDT on dairy products?

Dr. Griffin:

I don't have any recollection of that.

Mrs. Whitaker:

I did have one more question that I wanted to ask and that concerns registration under protest. I notice that this was not in your original draft and I could not find where it was introduced or under what circumstances. Do you recall anything on that?

Dr. Griffin:

The provision for registration under protest was inserted after there was objection by manufacturers that the law as originally proposed would give a government official authority to refuse registration without a hearing or without any other legal restrictions. The manufacturers felt that such authority would be too much, that they should have some method of keeping a product on the market. As a result, the provision under protest was inserted and as a matter of actual practice, it was not used to any great extent. I do not recall a single product which was registered under protest during the time that I was there. There may have been one or two but that would be the limit. I think that the registration under protest was not a thing to be worried about because if a product was registered under protest and a user brought suit for injury of any sort certainly the manufacturer would be behind the eight ball in defending a suit.

Mrs. Whitaker:

There was a provision also, I believe, for even heavier

penalties if the department brought suit?

Dr. Griffin:
I believe there was but that was never used during the time that I was there.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you recall, was this Mr. Hitchener's request?

Dr. Griffin:
Mr. Hitchener, that was the executive secretary of the manufacturers' association, I can give you the name if you want it. He was quite prominent during the time that I was there.

Mrs. Whitaker:
Do you think that the proposal came from his organization?

Dr. Griffin:
I think it probably did but I . . . it might have come from Mr. Hamilton's organization or it might have come from his. Both of the organizations were active.

Mrs. Whitaker:
In discussing this, was there no serious objection raised to it by government?

Dr. Griffin:
No. As I say, it was actually of very little importance.

Mrs. Whitaker:

We have not talked much about DDT because it has been the subject of so much discussion elsewhere but I wonder if you feel that DDT was the catalyst, perhaps, that brought about the 1947 Act?

Dr. Griffin:

It was one of several products which came in about that time. DDT was the most important of them but there were several others also.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Early in 1950, after the series of articles by Albert Deutsch, I noticed in the Secretary's correspondence that a good many consumers began writing to the Department expressing concern and alarm. Was there any of this alarm felt within the Department that you can recall? Food and Drug, I think, was concerned but I wonder how the Department of Agriculture felt about DDT at that time?

Dr. Griffin:

Well, the Department of Agriculture was undoubtedly concerned with it. However, a large part of the evidence on which the concern was based came after I left the Department. It was a thing that was building up at the time that I left.

Mrs. Whitaker:

So, between 1950 and 1955 there wasn't as much concern felt in your division. For instance, there was no reluctance to continue registering products that contained DDT?

Dr. Griffin:

I would suspect, without recalling definitely, that we were probably more careful about some of the uses where it might get into foods. I don't think that we were concerned at that time with the widespread occurrence of DDT which has been reported since then.

Mrs. Whitaker:

Have you thought of anything since our last conversation that you might wish to add to this?

Dr. Griffin:

No.

INDEX