

a definitive dispatch. I believe you know Mr. Cassels and his outstanding record for accuracy and fairness. Please let me know.

Several members of Congress have inquired about our original story, and I am taking the liberty of sending them copies of this letter.

Sincerely,

JULIUS FRANDSEN,
Vice President and Washington Manager.

Dr. GODDARD. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Frandsen—and other members of the press—recognize the complexities of the issue of marihuana and wish to serve the public in the best possible manner. I think the press does sense the importance of the problem and makes every effort to provide the Nation with the best information available.

My remarks at Minneapolis and elsewhere concerning marihuana have always been in response to questions from the press. In every instance, I have made it abundantly clear that marihuana has been and still remains under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Narcotics of the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

It is often erroneously assumed that the Food and Drug Administration, which administers the drug abuse control amendments, has jurisdiction over not only the controlled drugs—the amphetamines, barbiturates, and hallucinogens—but marihuana, as well. Our agency has made every effort to clarify the differences wherever possible.

Now let me make several points about marihuana. First, the shocking growth and use of marihuana has been so rapid that none of us in Government, in medicine, or the legal profession has been able to counter it effectively.

For example, the Department of Justice of the State of California has reported a total of 28,319 adult drug arrests for 1966, the highest figure to date, fully 32.1 percent above the 1965 figure. Some of this increase comes from the enforcement last year, for the first time, of the drug abuse control amendments, which became effective on February 1, 1966.

However, to quote from the California report, “Marihuana offenses accounted for approximately one-half of the 1966 arrests and showed a 71-percent increase over those reported during 1965.” Arrests for “heroin and other narcotics” rose by about 11 percent. “Dangerous drug arrests showed a 4-percent gain,” the report also adds.

California’s adult marihuana arrests in 1966 were triple that for 1960. Among juveniles, the rise was even more dramatic: Drug arrests in general increased 87 percent between 1965 and 1966, but juvenile marihuana arrests increased 140 percent, from 1,623 to 3,869.

The marihuana arrests, plus the 898 dangerous drug arrests, accounted for 95 percent of the juvenile drug arrests in California during 1966.

We could pursue this further, Mr. Chairman, but I hope that this illustration will show that, as we have talked about the problem in professional circles and have done our studies and exchanged our memorandums, the agencies of law enforcement have encountered a grim situation that is developing with great momentum—with a momentum that seems to exceed our own ability, thus far, to explore the problem and come up with sound solutions that are in the public interest and that can be put into effect.

This is only part of the broad picture of drug abuse. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the drug abuse control amendments, which we carry