

Senator SULLIVAN: There has been very recent information which has come out on this, if we have to give it a little different terminology, that LSD is acting in the same way as alcohol, which does produce permanent brain damage. I think this is a most important point. I would not like this to go from the Senate saying that this is a non-habit forming drug.

Dr. HARDMAN: Sir, I disagree with you; it is not a physically addicting drug.

Senator SULLIVAN: All right.

Dr. HARDMAN: It is not physically addicting. There is evidence of two types that long-term usage of LSD may lead to permanent damage.

Senator SULLIVAN: That is right.

Dr. HARDMAN: The one is an actual alteration in the chromosomic picture, which is the hereditary factor in cells. This is fragmentary evidence and has not been documented, and has not been reproduced elsewhere, so I mention it in passing.

Along with that, there is some evidence that continuous uses, people using 300 or 400 "trips," tend to have the ability to perform the psychological tests at the level they performed them prior to starting on the drug.

Senator SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Senator THORVALDSON: May I pursue another phase of the subject. I would like to ask Mr. McCarthy a question, in regard to the reason why this legislation was not put under the Narcotics Control Act. Instead of that, you are presumably taking a new type of procedure, which you will apply first, as I understand it, to LSD, but which it is expected may have added to it various other drugs, namely, in Schedule J. Would it not have been a better procedure to make control of this drug part of the Narcotics Control Act?

Mr. J. D. McCarthy, Legal Adviser, Department of National Health and Welfare:

Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, this was a matter which was considered very carefully when the legislation was being devised, namely, the advantages and disadvantages of adding this to the schedule of narcotics in the Narcotics Control Act.

Actually, lysergic acid, as I understand it—I am neither a technician nor a doctor—has never been recognized as being in the same family at all as narcotics, either internationally or in Canada. That is the first point.

In the second place, the acid itself, as I understand it, is not a drug within the definitions contained in the Narcotics Control Act. It is a substance, but it is that substance, and the base for the production of LSD, that we are trying to get at. Primarily I think it is a fact that LSD does not fall into the family of narcotics and has not been recognized internationally as in that group of substances.

Senator THORVALDSON: However, was there not a committee of the United Nations which considered this problem in an international way some time ago, and is it not an international problem in the same manner as narcotics?

Mr. MCCARTHY: I believe that is so. From my understanding, they recognize and commend that approach, because otherwise it would make an inroad into the basic concept of control of narcotics as such. This is a distinct substance.

Senator THORVALDSON: You might answer this question, Mr. McCarthy: is it intended that the police and legal machinery of the Narcotics Control Act will be used for the purposes of enforcing the provisions of this part of the Food and Drugs Act?

Mr. MCCARTHY: No, I do not think so. This part of the Food and Drugs Act has its own enforcement and management provisions, and it picks up other provisions that are already enacted in connection with control work in the Food and Drugs Act now. So we have a parallel set of machinery for the control and enforcement of this law to that contained in the Narcotics Control Act.

Senator THORVALDSON: Would you say that the enforcement people, in their procedures under the Food and Drugs Act, have as much expertise as those who