

Mr. ROUSH. Do I understand that you do not believe that a criminal penalty for the personal possession of an illicit drug is a deterrent to the trade in such drugs. Is this your position?

Dr. GODDARD. Yes, sir; it is basically my position, because the usage of marihuana has increased greatly. If such a deterrent were a penalty, then one would wonder why the increase is occurring.

Mr. ROUSH. Would not the very face of the penalties reduce the demand and thus affect the market? It seems to me that if I knew that I was going to be subjected to a penalty for the possession of a drug, I would not be as likely to buy it and I would not be as likely to promote a market for it.

Dr. GODDARD. A market for it, we think that is where the emphasis should go and that is where we are using our resources, on those who promote the usage of these drugs or offer for sale or manufacture or distribute them. We think that with the limited resources at our level, this is where our major effort should be concentrated and that is what we have done. But when we have hundreds of thousands of people, and the estimates range—for example, on marihuana alone, between 400,000 and 3 million persons using the drug in our society. We have to raise the question, Would making criminals or felons out of these people accomplish the purpose? Could you even accomplish that objective if that were your desire? Rather, should we not make every effort to control these drugs that are being abused by trying to decrease the amount available for usage and cut off the sources of supply? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. ROUSH. I think you should be commended for trying to get at the source of supply. But it does seem to me, and I am just expressing a personal opinion, that making possession an offence also makes its contribution in setting up a deterrent for the use of these drugs. This is, of course, just a personal opinion.

Just a couple more questions and then I will call upon Mrs. Dwyer.

An article published in the Minneapolis Tribune of October 15, which I believe was three days before you made your "famous" statement—

Dr. GODDARD. Is that infamous?

Mr. ROUSH. Infamous would be better, perhaps.

It stated that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had been conducting a broad-scale investigation of marihuana for several months but had not reached any consensus for recommending a change in the Federal policy toward the drug. According to the article, the investigation was being conducted by staff from the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and the legal office, and was aimed at determining whether the present restrictions on use of marihuana and the accompanying criminal penalties should be revised.

Is that an accurate story?

Dr. GODDARD. I do not believe it is; no, sir.

Mr. ROUSH. Well, what is the story?

Dr. GODDARD. There has been a staff study carried out. I cannot speak for the Department as to all the objectives, but mainly the interest has been on the research program. I tried to outline the broad interest of