

Continued from page 1

LEDAIN REPORT NIXED

search workers in medical or scientific institutions directly under the Parties control, or specifically approved by them."

Canada needs no further governmental interference in scientific research on drugs. Already many scientists interested in such research have expressed feelings of dissatisfaction and frustration with governmental research policy. They have stated to the Le Dain Commission that they have been unable to carry out such work under their own authority as scientists in the present atmosphere of restraint.

The Government appears akin to the Pope who refused to look through Galileo's telescope for fear of what he might discover.

It is well-known that many American government-sponsored research reports are tinged with an anti-drug bias and assume conclusions which lack substantial scientific evidence. The public must demand that research into the effects of non-medical drug use should be pursued with all possible vigour in an environment of flexibility and freedom, not stifled by imposed protocol restrictions.

Article 18 states, "Subject to its constitutional limitations, each party shall adopt such measures as will ensure that production, manufacture, possession, offering for sale, delivery on any terms whatsoever of psychotropic substances . . . shall be punishable offences when committed intentionally, and that serious offences shall be liable to adequate punishment, particularly by imprisonment or other penalties of deprivation of liberty."



Visit the
Royal Stores



Methods of deterrence have proved non-effective in stemming non-medical drug use. The Le Dain Commission is of the opinion that no one should be liable to imprisonment for simple possession of a psychotropic drug. The protocol would make possession of amphetamines and tranquilizers a criminal offence. The Le Dain Commission notes that the extent to which these drugs can presently be obtained and used under prescription by the adult world - and indeed are used, if we are to draw the logical inferences from production figures - is such that the enforcement of a prohibition against simple possession for non-medical use of such drugs would inevitably involve even greater discrimination and sense of injustice than that which is bringing the law with respect to cannabis into ill-repute.

Since such a prohibition might be expected to be directed and enforced mainly against what the police considered to be excessive use by young people, it would be a further cause of youthful alienation and resentment of the older generation. This would only be reinforced by increasing use of amphetamines and barbituates by adults.

In the name of justice, Canada has already imprisoned and given criminal records to many of the nation's youth. There are 2,000 drug cases awaiting trial in Toronto alone. The public must urge Canada to develop her own national policy without being overly concerned with international implications. Why should we waste more of our police's time, further clog the courts, and imprison more of our youth because of the whims of Vienna diplomats?

Article 16 states, "The parties shall take all practical measures for the prevention of abuse of psychotropic substances and for the early identification, treatment, education, after-care, rehabilitation and social reintegration of the persons involved, and shall coordinate their efforts to this ends."

Compulsory treatment and social reintegration are viewed with extreme distrust by the medical and psychiatric profession since no one is sure which, if any, methods work for particular drugs and particular circumstances. What is the treatment for marijuana disease? What, for that matter, are the symptoms? What is the meaning of social reintegration? Does it mean hair cuts and work camps and social indoctrination?

Conservative law makers in the U.S. give strong support to the compulsory treatment approach to drug offences since it ensures the segregation of drug users from society without the necessity of laying criminal charges.

The Toronto "Globe and Mail" is to be commended for opening this story to the Canadian public. On October 22, 1970, its editor concluded, "Canada has international as well as national responsibilities, but the laws governing the citizens of this country are evolved by the Parliament of this country. It would be unfortunate if this fact were lost sight of as Canada is pressured intensely by the international community. Canada must not sign any protocol or agreement until it has a chance to study the final report of the Le Dain Commission".