

I don't say that it was a physical correlation but more terrible to me and more callous to me was the fact that those individuals who use marihuana had been picked out by the pushers that sold the heavy drugs; they were prospect No. 1 to try to get them to use something more.

Dr. GODDARD. Mr. Brotzman, this is an interesting point. Most addicts, I am told, are introduced to the drug by the people they associate with. Now, the people who handle heroin as pushers, I am told, never handle marihuana or almost never. So, you see the people who handle the hallucinogens, the amphetamines, the barbiturates, on the other hand nine out of 10 arrests we make we find them in possession of marihuana, too.

This whole question is very complex, as you well know. We have a drug subculture that exists. People get drawn into that subculture and the most frequent thing they start with is marihuana; you are quite correct on that. Now, if they stay in that drug subculture, they always tend to get arrested and they always tend then to go on and become involved with heroin. But that does not mean that everyone who has used marihuana goes on to heroin, nor does it mean that, and it is a fact indeed that of those who use heroin 90 percent of them have had marihuana to start with.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Now, I don't say that every one of them do but I think that the record will show that a majority or maybe a large majority started out just this way.

I want to make this particular point. The prosecution usually is aimed at the person that is selling. However, in order to convict that person, many times you can't get the evidence of a clearly defined sale, so the reason for the "possession" in the law, according to my experience, is to get the pusher, and there you do have some means of checking what I think is a very dangerous crime against our whole society.

I have not heard the Narcotics Bureau state that they think that they should lessen the penalties on sale or possession of marihuana, or any other type of drug, have you?

Mr. GODDARD. No; to my knowledge, they have not. I cannot speak for them.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I must express this thought as I see the chairman about to bang the gavel. I think to take a step backward in this area right now would be bad for our country. I hope no younger person misunderstood the remarks attributed to you, as putting the stamp of approval on this because it is my sincere belief, and I would say this to my daughter, too, and I have, that this is at least an invitation to a life of degredation, hardship, and unhappiness.

I have seen young females turn to prostitution; I have seen young males turn to armed robbery because they had taken the first step. This is what I want to prohibit.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Dr. Goddard, when I asked you for the medical evidence on which you based your conclusions that the penalties for possession should be reduced, you sent me a bibliography of 137 different scientific studies, most of which have been done since 1960, and then went on to say that we need more research to come to some conclusion.

Now, can you tell me how much more research we ought to do?

Dr. GODDARD. To answer what question?