

marihuana: a signal of misunderstanding

**First Report
of the ^{US} National
Commission on
Marihuana and
Drug Abuse**

March 1972

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE LAW

Under existing state marihuana laws, cultivation, distribution and possession with intent to distribute are generally felonies and in most states possession for personal use is a misdemeanor. The Commission strongly recommends uniformity of state laws and, in this regard, endorses the basic premise of the Uniform Controlled Substances Act, drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. The following are our recommendations for a uniform statutory scheme for marihuana, by which we mean, as under existing federal law, only the natural cannabis plant and its various parts, not the synthetic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) :

Existing Law

- **CULTIVATION, SALE OR DISTRIBUTION FOR PROFIT AND POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO SELL WOULD REMAIN FELONIES (ALTHOUGH WE DO RECOMMEND UNIFORM PENALTIES).**

some of the anecdotal law enforcement testimony heard by the Commission regarding criminal behavior exhibited while under the influence of marihuana.

Commissioner Ware feels that some penalty short of criminalizing the user, such as a civil fine or some type of intensive drug education, will act as a positive deterrent toward minimizing the incidence of marihuana use especially among the young. Further, he is opposed to the use of *any* drug for the express purpose of getting intoxicated, and includes alcohol within this category. The Commissioner feels that what is needed is an internalizing of discipline among our citizenry, with the legal system assisting this process through the use of disincentives.

Commissioners Hughes, Senator from Iowa, and Javits, Senator from New York, feel that the Commission has taken a major, highly laudable step in recommending that the private use of marihuana be taken out of the criminal justice system. They concur in its threshold judgment that overall social policy regarding this drug should seek to discourage use, while concentrating primarily on the prevention of irresponsible use. They disagree, however, with three specific recommendations relating to the implementation of this discouragement policy.

First, they would eliminate entirely the contraband provision from the partial prohibitory model adopted by the Commission. They want it eliminated first because its legal implications are confusing and the subject of disagreement even among lawyers. Whether or not possession of a given substance is criminal, possession of material designated as contraband makes that possession *unlawful*. Also, marihuana designated as contraband would be subject to government search and seizure, even though the underlying possession is no longer criminal. The provision—which does not apply to marihuana held for personal use within the home—is considered by both Commissioners to be an unnecessary “symbol” of the discouragement policy. It will not foster elimination of the misunderstanding and mistrust which is a hallmark of our current marihuana policy.

Commissioner Hughes and Javits seek to eliminate it also because as a practical matter it serves no useful law enforcement purpose within the overall partial prohibitory model. If marihuana held for personal use within the home is not contraband, why should marihuana held for personal use within one's

Private Activities

- POSSESSION IN PRIVATE OF MARIHUANA FOR PERSONAL USE WOULD NO LONGER BE AN OFFENSE.
- DISTRIBUTION IN PRIVATE OF SMALL AMOUNTS OF MARIHUANA FOR NO REMUNERATION OR INSIGNIFICANT REMUNERATION NOT INVOLVING A PROFIT WOULD NO LONGER BE AN OFFENSE.

Public Activities

- POSSESSION IN PUBLIC OF ONE OUNCE OR UNDER OF MARIHUANA WOULD NOT BE AN OFFENSE, BUT THE MARIHUANA WOULD BE CONTRABAND SUBJECT TO SUMMARY SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE.
- POSSESSION IN PUBLIC OF MORE THAN ONE OUNCE OF MARIHUANA WOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE PUNISHABLE BY A FINE OF \$100.
- DISTRIBUTION IN PUBLIC OF SMALL AMOUNTS OF MARIHUANA FOR NO REMUNERATION OR INSIGNIFICANT REMUNERATION NOT INVOLVING A PROFIT WOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE PUNISHABLE BY A FINE OF \$100.
- PUBLIC USE OF MARIHUANA WOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE PUNISHABLE BY A FINE OF \$100.
- DISORDERLY CONDUCT ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC USE OF OR INTOXICATION BY MARIHUANA WOULD BE A MISDEMEANOR PUNISHABLE BY UP TO 60 DAYS IN JAIL, A FINE OF \$100, OR BOTH.

automobile be contraband? The area of operation of the contraband provision is extremely narrow. If one possesses *more* than one ounce of marihuana in public, it may be seized without regard to the contraband doctrine since such possession is a criminal violation.

Since the contraband provision does not apply to marihuana possession and use in private, the only effective area covered by the contraband provision is the area of possession in public of *less* than one ounce. The Commission has chosen to remove the stigma of the criminal sanction in this kind of case. To impose instead a contraband provision, which it is argued is in the nature of a civil "in rem" seizure which does not operate against the person, is to cloud the issue and to weaken the force of the basic decriminalization. A persuasive justification simply has not been made.

Both Commissioners seek to eliminate it also because they believe that the voice of the Commission should be loud and clear that the preservation of the right of privacy is of paramount importance and cannot be casually jeopardized in the pursuit of some vague public or law enforcement interest which has not been defined and justified with clarity and precision.

The second area of disagreement with the Commission's recommendations concerns the casual distribution of marihuana and the not-for-profit sale. As understood :

Generated at Massachusetts Institute of Technology on 2020-03-01 17:54 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015009582654
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google