

cites an example where the report "omits some of the prime statements of the 1968 British commission study entitled 'Cannabis' which would discourage any suggestions that cannabis be legalized".

Dr. Andrew Malcolm, a well known practising psychiatrist of Toronto, who has devoted the past ten years to a study of the illegal use of drugs as a senior officer with the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation, gave to the Canadian Press and the Canadian Medical Association on January 31, 1972, a detailed analysis of the first volume of the Le Dain commission's final report entitled "Treatment", followed by a highly detailed medical criticism of chapter VI of the treatment report on February 20, 1972. Admitting that the treatment report contains much information that is perfectly acceptable, it is, he states, "frequently out of date; it contains a staggering amount of misinformation; its proposals are often misquoted and unrealistic". Dr. Malcolm then detailed 22 major and minor errors.

Equally serious is the February 14 Canadian Medical Association's press statement about the treatment report. After mild praise and acceptance of some recommendations, the CMA statement makes the startling request "that the federal government consider attaching a letter to the report to bring it up to date and to make the important corrections that are required" before sending it out to Canadian doctors and medical institutions.

Imagine the implications when medical experts say we should correct the Le Dain report before sending it out for doctors to use as a "manual of treatment" on Canadian citizens! I am informed that proper information was available to Le Dain in ample time to have been included in the manual. This is inexcusable. The British Columbia Medical Association in a statement to the press on March 10 said:

In our opinion the section on short-term medical management contains so many confusion and questionable points that its distribution to physicians, hospitals and agencies in its present form would only tend to destroy the credibility of the commission in the eyes of many professionals. We request that this chapter VI of the report be not sent to physicians in British Columbia until either it is rewritten or accompanied by a detailed list of corrections of the points which we and others have noted.

It further added:

We are concerned at the rather casual approach in this document to LSD and cannabis.

I am informed that certain other provincial medical associations are equally critical and will soon make their reports public. These documents, and the one to come, cost the Canadian taxpayer \$3 million. The British Columbia Medical Association also strongly criticized Le Dain for not making use of the important work of Dr. Andrew Malcolm. I am disturbed that immediately following his public criticism of the Le Dain treatment volume, Dr. Malcolm was fired on one day's notice by the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation, after ten years' service, on the grounds of budget requirements. The March 10 edition of the Toronto *Sun* states the firing "was the latest in what critics claim is a dispute over the foundation's alleged tacit support of legalizing marijuana."

In view of the Commission's bad track record in its first two publications, I fully support the insistence of the ten eminent Canadian doctors when they say:

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Our most immediate and grave concern is the possibility that the Le Dain commission may publish a highly permissive fact-hiding and vacillating final report similar to its interim statement of a year ago. Like other commission reports it would be freely available throughout the country and as with the interim report, readership would be promoted and encouraged in some cases by government departments.

And further:

Should the document fail to identify clearly the harmful effects of cannabis use, immense pressures would be created, especially on youth, to increase use of the drug.

It goes on:

If it is placed before the public it must contain a clear and unequivocal statement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare pointing out the extremely serious problem which arises from the taking of soft drugs and the necessity of abstinence at this stage of our knowledge and experience.

For example, the month-old study of the National Institute of Mental Health, reported in the February 28, 1972, edition of U.S. News and World Report, warns, as do the ten doctors, that women of child bearing years would be unwise to use cannabis due to abnormalities found in a few children born of marijuana-smoking mothers, possibly due to the drug and also from experiments with rats which demonstrated serious deformation of offspring as reported in the statement of the ten doctors.

I have also been informed that the so-called leak of the United States President's Commission on Cannabis which appeared in the February 28, 1972, edition of *Time* magazine does not properly represent the findings of the commission, which are to be published in Washington in late March. To further support their concern, the ten Canadian doctors strongly condemn the recent commission on youth report prepared for the Secretary of State for its "inexcusably dangerous claim" that, in the words of the youth commission, "soft drugs are relatively harmless or at least so they seem in the absence of any medical evidence to the contrary". The doctors point out that large amounts of available research suggesting harmful effects are available.

What happened to this youth report? Thousands of copies were distributed across Canada by the Secretary of State's department, including Information Canada. I have a newspaper published by the Canada YMCA last fall called, "It's your turn". It was distributed to all its branches across Canada calling on youth to buy and study this youth report, with special emphasis on its inexcusable drug recommendation and calling on youth to write to the Secretary of State encouraging him to pass laws supporting youth demands.

I therefore implore the government to withhold the public presentation of the cannabis report of the Le Dain commission until a team of appropriate medical experts has examined it. On the team must be Dr. William Craig, head of research for the Department of Health, as well as Drs. Swartz, Malcolm and Lundell. If their findings warrant it, an appropriate, cautionary foreword should then be written warning all readers of the biases, inaccuracies and incomplete information and advising them of the danger of soft drug use in the light of our present incomplete knowledge. Such action would be one of responsibility toward one of the most vital social problems of the day. If soft drugs are not harmful, we should not restrict