

I can give you a reference if you wish, a more precise pharmacological description of these drugs that are misused in our society. But those are the general comparisons I would draw.

Mr. GROSSMAN. As far as you are concerned, is there any social or medical value for marihuana?

Dr. GODDARD. I certainly know of no medical value at the present time. As I have mentioned before, the recent synthesis of the most active ingredient of marihuana, the tetraphydrocannabinols—THC—is rather interesting. The pharmacologists familiar with this have indicated that it may be helpful to have some of these data available with the mechanism of sleep, possibly the study of euphoria, as a mild euphoriant, the active ingredient may have some merit. So I would not preclude or close the door to the possibility of some useful pharmaceutical agent being developed from one of the synthetic things. But there is no medical purpose in our society for marihuana today and for practical purposes, there has not been since 1937. Now, social, it is hard to comment on, because it apparently does have some social use. People are using it quite widely.

Mr. GROSSMAN. In your testimony you discuss the inconsistencies between the laws relating to LSD and to marihuana. Have you specifically recommended to Congress any changes in the laws relating to marihuana?

Dr. GODDARD. No, sir; I am suggesting that they examine them. I have not, for example, recommended the removal of penalties for personal possession. I am not talking now about possession for sale, but personal possession. I am saying let's look at them. It may be executive seizure is indicated here. There is a whole spectrum of penalties one could consider. I am saying, look, the usage seems to be increasing. The major complaint we hear is about the inconsistency of the penalties and the question keeps coming up, time and time again. I am simply saying, is it not desirable to reexamine it?

Mr. GROSSMAN. Do you feel at all inhibited, perhaps, by law enforcement problems? For example, in this task force report, there is another statement which says:

In any event, it must be recognized that if the law does outlaw sale, but does not allow arrest for possession, whether this be for LSD, marihuana or any other drug, the work of the police will be long and hard and the public must not expect large numbers of arrests. As a corollary it is quite possible that such a policy would, as many law enforcement persons might fear, result in less suppression of illicit drug traffic and subsequent greater use.

Now, my question is, basically, do you feel that you have one point of view and that the law enforcement people are pushing against your making any changes in these laws?

Dr. GODDARD. Well, reading under the drug abuse control amendments, where we do not have a Federal penalty for personal possession but we do have the privilege of executive seizure, we have not found this to be a handicap. Our position has been that we want to concentrate our efforts on the sellers, the manufacturers, the distributors. Now, we do not condone the possession of LSD and these drugs, nor would I condone the possession of marihuana. It should be seized and taken away. I want to make that clear. Certainly there is room for discussion on this point as to how effective and how needed is the personal possession thing.