

record and, if we could, to inform the public and repair the damage which may or may not have been done.

I certainly recognize what happens at news conferences, particularly the one you were involved in—it must have been on the run, apparently.

Dr. GODDARD. It was.

Mr. DOLE. I can understand that statement might have been misinterpreted.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include my statement in the record at this point.

Mr. ROUSH. Without objection, it will be included.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT DOLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. Chairman, I joined with Congresswoman Dwyer and Congressman Brown of Ohio in calling for the present hearings because of my great distress over the statements made by Dr. Goddard concerning the use of marihuana. I believe that these hearings will serve a useful purpose if we can find out what Dr. Goddard said, why he said it, and whether his statements are supportable in fact. The extent to which we can get the word out to the public, preferably through the words of Dr. Goddard himself, that marihuana is a dangerous drug and should be left alone, the better off our country will be. Unfortunately this has not yet been accomplished although Dr. Goddard has twice appeared before other committees of Congress after our hearings were announced.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the qualifications and technical competence of Dr. Goddard.

Dr. Goddard admits that marihuana is a dangerous drug. Dr. Goddard states that he does not advocate its use or legalization. Dr. Goddard acknowledges, I believe, that users of marihuana may develop a psychological dependency for the drug which, at least in some persons and under some conditions, could well lead to a serious psychotic state and, perhaps, physical damage. Dr. Goddard may also concede that the use of marihuana could lead to the use of heroin or other dangerous drugs such as LSD, amphetamines, and barbiturates. Dr. Goddard's statements about marihuana and his equating this drug with alcohol undoubtedly have the effect of sanctioning its use.

It is certainly admirable and, undoubtedly, essential to advocate change when one has concluded, based upon facts and reasoned judgment, that old ways and old beliefs are no longer tenable. It is neither wise nor sound, however, to advocate change when such is based only on conjecture, guess, and assumption. This is particularly so when one is dealing with so dangerous a substance as addicting or habituating drugs and with so impressionable an audience as young people.

The drug problem in the Nation is on the rise—undoubtedly associated with the increase in social instability and unrest in the country. Each of us should do all we can to arrest this rise. Education should, of course, help. So should enforcement of criminal penalties against illegal manufacture, distribution and sale. But, it seems to me that penalties against use and possession should also be continued as a deterrent to experimentation.

Admittedly, existing penalties against use and possession of marihuana have not totally prevented illicit use. Neither have they in the case of heroin. But, can it be reasonably argued that such penalties have not had some beneficial effect? Have they not aided many parents in discouraging their children from taking these drugs? And, perhaps of equal importance, can Dr. Goddard establish that removal of the penalties would not increase the use of marihuana and, thereby, graduation to even more dangerous drugs? The duty is clearly on Dr. Goddard to sustain this burden since he is the one advocating the change and, if he should prove to be wrong, it would not be he who would primarily suffer.

Admittedly, there is no clear scientific proof that a causal relationship exists between the use of marihuana and that of heroin or other dangerous drugs. But, many eminent medical authorities attest to such a relationship. Again, Dr. Goddard would seem to have the burden of proving that the causal factor does not exist. Because, if he should prove to be wrong, the effect of his statements could result in increased use—to the detriment of many more persons than he alone.