

as a basis for developing means to discourage campus drug abuse. Start June 15, 1967; \$50,600.

Samuel Pearlman, Brooklyn College of City College of New York—Investigation of patterns of drug use and abuse in five New York City universities. Start May 1, 1967; \$4,200.

Christopher D. Stone, University of Southern California Law Center—A survey of laws concerning marijuana use, with special attention to problems of marijuana use in research. Start June 1, 1967; \$3,248.

Harris Isbell, University of Kentucky, Lexington—Studies of psychological, emotional and behavioral effects of marijuana in humans, Addiction Research Center. (Intramural).

Dr. GODDARD. You will notice that underway are several projects on the sociology of marihuana usage, the metabolism of marihuana in man and animals, and patterns of acquisition of the drug.

Gradually, we will be able to construct a clearer picture—based upon hard, scientific facts—of this drug, its short- and long-term effects, its fully identity, and the ways it can and cannot be used by man.

Clearly, while the answers to these questions are being formulated by the scientific community, by the work of many hundreds of physicians and researchers, our enforcement efforts in the Food and Drug Administration as well as in the Bureau of Narcotics must continue.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, of the experience the FDA went through when it first became involved in the control of abused drugs. The agency discovered, for example, that as many as 25,000 barbiturate dosages could be purchased at a truck stop.

The enforcement strategy for an agency with limited manpower seemed to be clear enough: concentrate on those who engage in the illicit manufacture, distribution, and sale of large quantities of those drugs which are abused by some members of our society. This was the position advocated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during the hearing before this committee on the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. This was the position adopted by the Congress.

After the amendments were passed by a unanimous vote of the Congress, this strategy of enforcement continued to be FDA's approach. In my opinion, it has worked well. In fact, last year, when we were questioned by three congressional committees as to the need for more stringent penalties—particularly penalties for personal possession and use of the amphetamines, barbiturates, and hallucinogens—I responded that we saw no need for a change in the law. We believed then and still believe today that no useful purpose would be served by making a felon of the individual who abuses these drugs.

I did state, however, that we would evaluate the effectiveness of the misdemeanor penalties for the illicit manufacture, sale, and distribution of the controlled drugs. If we find these penalties to be ineffective, I promised to come back to the Congress and seek a tougher set of penalties in that area. I repeat that promise now.

From this brief bit of history, you can see how the FDA, while administering the drug abuse control amendments and coming upon both LSD and marihuana in the course of our enforcement work, finds that there is a rather significant anomaly in the penalties with respect to these two hallucinogens.