

drug as compared to other drugs.

In 1885 there were 5 prescriptions out of every 10,000, as fluid extract; in 1895, 11.6; in 1907, 8 out of every 10,000; in 1926, 2.3, and in 1933, the last figures we have 0.4 out of every 10,000.

That correlates your statement that its use as a drug for treatment of diseases, by the medical profession, has greatly fallen off and is on the decrease. The use of it seems to be negligible in the medical profession according to that statement.

On the other hand, it seems that there has been a great increase in the use of it as a narcotic where it has its most dangerous and deleterious effects.

If its use as a medicine has fallen off to a point where it is practically negligible, and its use as a dope has increased until it has become serious and a menace to the public, as has been testified here--- and the testimony here has been that it cause people to lose their mental balance, cause them to become criminals so that they do not seem to realize right from wrong after they become addicts of this drug--- taking into consideration the growth in its injurious effects and its diminution in its use so far as any beneficial effect is concerned, you realize, do you not, that some good may be accomplished by this proposed legislation?

Dr. Woodward: Some legislation; yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: If that is admitted, let us get down to a few concrete facts. With the experience in the Bureau of Narcotics and with the State governments trying to enforce laws that are now on the State statute books against the use of this deleterious drug, and the Federal Government has realized that the State laws are ineffective, don't you think some Federal legislation necessary?

Dr. Woodward: I do not.

The Chairman: You do not?

Dr. Woodward: No. I think it is the usual tendency to----

The Chairman: I believe you did say in response to Mr. Cooper that you believed that some legislation of some change in the present law would be helpful. If that be true, why have you not been here before this bill was introduced proposing some remedy for this evil?

Dr. Woodward: Mr. Chairman, I have visited the Commissioner of Narcotics on various occasions----

The Chairman: That is not an answer to my question at all.

Dr. Woodward: I have not been here because----

The Chairman: You are representing the medical association. If your association has realized the necessity, the importance of some legislation--- which you now admit--- why did you wait until this bill was introduced to come here and make mention of it? Why did you not come here voluntarily and suggest to this committee some legislation?

Dr. Woodward: I have talked these matters over many times with the----

The Chairman: That does not do us any good to talk matters over. I have talked over a lot of things. The States do not seem to be able to deal with it effectively, nor is the Federal Government dealing with it at all. Why do you wait until now and then come in here to oppose something that is presented to us. You propose nothing whatever to correct the evil that exists.

Now, I do not like to have a round-about answer, but I would like to have a definite, straight, clean-cut answer to that question.

Dr. Woodward: We do not propose legislation directly to Congress when the same end can be reached through one of the executive departments of the Government.

The Chairman: You admit that it has not been done. You said that you thought some legislation would be helpful. That is what I am trying to hold you down to. Now, why have you not proposed any legislation? That is what I want a clean-cut, definite, clear answer to.

Dr. Woodward: In the first place, it is not a medical addiction that is involved and the data do not come before the medical society. You may absolutely forbid the use of Cannabis by any physician, or the disposition of Cannabis by any pharmacist in the country, and you would not have touched your Cannabis addiction as it stands today, because there is no relation between it and the practice of medicine or pharmacy. It is entirely outside of those two branches.

The Chairman: If the statement that you have just made has any relation to the question that I asked, I just do not have the mind to understand it; I am sorry.

Dr. Woodward: I say that we do not ordinarily come directly to Congress if a department can take care of the matter. I have talked with the Commissioner, with Commissioner Anslinger.

The Chairman: If you want to advise us on legislation, you ought to come here with some constructive proposals, rather than criticism, rather than trying to throw obstacles in the way of something that the Federal Government is trying to do. It has not only an unselfish motive in this, but they have a serious responsibility.

Dr. Woodward: We cannot understand yet, Mr. Chairman, why this bill should have been prepared in secret for 2 years without any intimation, even, to the profession, that it was being prepared.

The Chairman: Is not the fact that you were not consulted your real objection to this bill?

Dr. Woodward: Not at all.

The Chairman: Just because you were not consulted?

Dr. Woodward: Not at all.

The Chairman: No matter how much good there is in the proposal?

Dr. Woodward: Not at all.

The Chairman: That is not it?

Dr. Woodward: Not at all. We always try to be helpful.

Mr. Vinson: the fact that they took that length of time in the preparation of the bill, what has that to do with the merits of the legislation?

Dr. Woodward: The legislation is impracticable so far as enforcement is concerned, and the same study devoted to State legislation, with 44 State legislatures in session this year would have produced much better results.

Mr. Vinson: If the legislation had been prepared in one day you could have answered what your objection was. But it crops out here just at the end of your testimony that this legislation has been studied for 2 years and prepared in secret.

Dr. Woodward: Yes.

Mr. Vinson: What has that fact, if it be a fact, to do with the merits of the legislation, unless you are piqued?

Dr. Woodward: It explains why I am here voicing opposition to the bill that might have been adjusted to meet the needs of the medical profession if we had been consulted at an earlier date. I should have been glad to have cooperated with the Bureau of Narcotics in the preparation of a bill, if an opportunity had been afforded.

Mr. Dingell: The impression I gain from your last remark is that it is only the medical profession that is interested in this bill; but what about the 125,000,000 people in this country? This is not only a bill that the medical profession is interested in, or that the American Medical Association is interested in, but all of the people are interested in it. Incidentally, I would like to ask how many doctors are members of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Woodward: Approximately 100,000.

Mr. Dingell: That many are members of the American Medical Association?

Dr. Woodward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dingell: How many doctors are there in the United States?

Dr. Woodward: Probably 140,000 or 150,000, or there may be 160,000.

Mr. Dingell: Are we to understand that the medical men of the State of Michigan, or the medical profession in Wayne County, or the medical association of Detroit, are opposed to this legislation?

Dr. Woodward: I do not know. No medical man would identify this bill with medicine until he read it through, because marihuana is not a drug.

Mr. Dingell: Please tell me this: What effort has been made in my State through the medical association to protect the school children and the unfortunate people who are falling victims to this habit? I ask that question since we are talking about controlling it through the States. I want to know what has been done by the State of Michigan and members of the medical profession to give protection intended by this bill.

Dr. Woodward: It is, of course, impossible for me to say just what has been done in any particular State; but in the Michigan laws of 1931, chapter 173, they do regulate the production and distribution of *Cannabis indica*.

Mr. Dingell: What kind of regulation is that?

Dr. Woodward: I do not have the law here.

Mr. Dingell: Can you tell me whether that legislation was at that time sponsored by the medical association of my State?

Dr. Woodward: I do not know. I cannot carry all of those details in my mind. You understand that marihuana is simply a name given *Cannabis*. It is a mongrel word brought in from Mexico. It is a popular term to indicate *Cannabis*, like "coke" is used to indicate cocaine, and as "dope" is used to indicate opium.

Mr. Dingell: We know that it is a habit that is spreading, particularly among youngsters. We learn that from the pages of the newspapers. You say that Michigan has a law regulating it. We have a State law, but we do not seem to be able to get anywhere with it, because, as I have said, the habit is growing. The number of victims is increasing each year.

Dr. Woodward: There is no evidence of that.

Mr. Dingell: I have not been impressed by your testimony here as reflecting the sentiment of the highclass members of the medical profession in my State. I am confident that the medical profession in the State of Michigan, and in Wayne County particularly, or in my district, will subscribe wholeheartedly to any law that will suppress this thing, despite the fact that there is a \$1 tax imposed.

Dr. Woodward: If there was any law that would absolutely suppress the thing, perhaps that is true, but when the law simply contains provisions that impose a useless expense, and does not accomplish the result---

Mr. Dingell (interposing): That is simply your personal opinion. This is kindred to the opinion you entertained with reference to the Harrison Narcotics Act.

Dr. Woodward: If we had been asked to cooperate in drafting it---

Mr. Dingell: You are not cooperating in this at all.

Dr. Woodward: As a matter of fact, it does not serve to suppress the use of opium and cocaine.

Mr. Dingell: The medical profession should be doing its utmost to aid in the suppression of this curse that is eating the very vitals of the nation.

Dr. Woodward: They are.

Mr. Dingell: Are you not simply piqued because you were not consulted in the drafting of this bill?

Dr. Woodward: That is not the case at all. I said in explaining why I was here that the measure should have been discussed and an expression of opinion obtained before the Treasury Department brought this bill before the Congress of the United States, so that it would be in a form that would be acceptable, with as few differences of opinion as possible.

Mr. Cooper: With all due respect to you and for your appearance here, is it not a fact that you are peeved because you were not called in and consulted in the drafting of the bill?