

and medical. You also have to carry out enforcement. This is necessary. It is important that the enforcement officials of our country have good programs and reduce the availability.

But all of these things have to go on concomitantly. It is not one thing only that will solve the problem. In fact, in the long run, education may be the only meaningful answer to the problem.

Mr. DOLE. With specific reference to California, you cited the figures on the increase in arrests. Do you know for a fact whether this shows increase in the use of drugs or better law enforcement?

Dr. GODDARD. I have pointed out that better law enforcement or more arrests may certainly be a factor, just a tighter approach to enforcement may be involved. But I do not think there is any disagreement that there is a marked increase in usage all over the country. This is reflected in the stories that come in on the press every day. In this morning's New York Times, 63 were arrested in a Connecticut town, teenagers.

Mr. DOLE. With reference to California again, a total increase of 28,000 adult arrests in California. Do you know how many were for use and possession as opposed to manufacture or possession with intent to sell?

Dr. GODDARD. I would have to obtain that for you. In marihuana, most of those are for possession.

Mr. DOLE. The same with reference to juveniles in the State of California.

Dr. GODDARD. Those were possession arrests, the vast majority of them.

(The material referred to follows:)

1966 DRUG ARRESTS IN CALIFORNIA

A PRELIMINARY SURVEY

Data shown in this report are subject to modification by additional arrest information received prior to formal publication in the annual report Drug Arrests and Dispositions in California.

ADULT ARRESTS

The 1966 total of 28,319 adult drug arrests is the highest annual arrest figure recorded by the Bureau of Criminal Statistics to date; this figure exceeds the year earlier total by 32.1 percent. Marihuana offenses accounted for approximately one-half of the 1966 arrests and showed a 71-percent increase over those reported during 1965. Arrests for "heroin and other narcotics" increased by about 11 percent while arrests for "narcotic addict or user" increased by 6 percent. Dangerous drug arrests showed a 4-percent gain.

Neither Los Angeles County nor the remainder of the State conformed too closely to the statewide averages. Arrests for "narcotic addict or user" increased by 18 percent in Los Angeles County but decreased by 23 percent in the rest of the State. The converse was true for dangerous drug offenses which increased by 14 percent in Los Angeles County while exhibiting an increase of 33 percent in the other counties.

In 1966 about 59 percent of the adult arrests occurred in Los Angeles County, as compared with 62 percent recorded in 1965, and 68 percent in 1960.

There were 16,820 adult arrests reported by Los Angeles County in 1966; San Diego County reported 2,708; San Francisco County 2,187; and Alameda County 1,469. These four counties alone accounted for 82 percent of the total arrests.

The total of 28,319 adult arrests involved 24,244 individuals. Of the arrests, 16,051 (57 percent) represented persons who were new to the drug file. Relatively few of the new offenders were involved with heroin—about 10 percent. This was in sharp contrast to marihuana, which accounted for over 60 percent of the new subjects. Of the 14,293 adult marihuana arrests during the year, 9,819 involved persons new to the study.