

the course of our enforcement work, finds that there is a rather significant anomaly in the penalties with respect to these two hallucinogens. During the past year and a half I have become personally aware of the problem, as the Agency's Commissioner. For example, our agents may find two individuals in the same room, one possessing LSD—an extremely dangerous drug—and the other possessing marihuana. Our BDAC agents would seize the LSD under the executive seizure provisions of the drug abuse control amendments, but the person possessing the drug would not be subject to prosecution under the Federal statute. His companion, however, would be taken into custody and be liable to a felony conviction under the laws governing the possession of marihuana, a drug which is less potent than LSD. This is why I consider the penalties to be inconsistent and why I believe that this inconsistency prevents full and effective protection of the public interest in the matter of abused drugs of any kind.

I would like to summarize for you some of the tasks we are performing and the goals toward which we are striving in dealing with the problem of drug abuse in a comprehensive manner. Among these, I would include:

- (1) A continuing concentration of enforcement activities against the illicit manufacturers and distributors of dangerous drugs.
- (2) An increased exchange of information with State and local police and health agencies, as well as with similar international agencies, to strengthen enforcement programs and to broaden the total understanding of the scientific and social data upon which these programs must be based.
- (3) The continuation and expansion of the research effort to fill the gaps in our knowledge that I noted a moment ago.
- (4) Effective assistance to educators and journalists to support their effort to bring factual drug knowledge to the public, who ultimately must determine the nature and direction of our control programs.

The cooperation of many agencies, at all levels of government, is required in carrying out these broad assignments. The Food and Drug Administration will give its best efforts in this cause, I assure you.

In closing, I again emphasize that I have never advocated the legalization of marihuana. Rather, I have raised the question of the severity of the penalties attached to possession of marihuana and I suggest that the Congress might also wish to review these penalties in the light of enforcement experience throughout local, State, and Federal government and as the results of drug research may dictate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to appear before you today to clarify our position with respect to marihuana. I will be happy to answer any questions you or your colleagues may have.

Mr. ROUSH. Thank you, Dr. Goddard.

I have a few questions to ask and then I will call upon other members of the subcommittee to ask those questions they might wish to ask.

Concerning the reported statement which you made in Minneapolis, it is my understanding that for various reasons, there is no complete transcript of your remarks at that press conference. Is that correct?

Dr. GODDARD. Correct.

However, I do have a letter from the dean at the university, which indicates as well that I did not make the comments that are attributed to me, in addition to—the dean was present with me throughout the so-called press conference. There was confusion, as I indicated in the hearing the other day, because a fuse blew about 3 minutes after the press conference started. I was told at the time that the tape recording would be complete, but unfortunately, it was not.

Mr. ROUSH. Do you have a copy of the letter from the dean?

Dr. GODDARD. Yes, we are looking for it now.

Mr. ROUSH. If there is no objection, I think this letter should be included in the record.

(The material referred to follows:)