

United Nations

Nations Unies

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

INDEX UNIT

MASTER

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

LIMITED

E/CN.7/AG.1/SR.9

5 December 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

73

6 JAN 1950

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Ad hoc Committee of the Principal Opium-producing Countries

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

held at the Faculty of Agriculture, University of
Ankara on Monday, 5 December 1949, at 10.30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN: His Excellency Mr. Ali TARHAN

Contents:

1. ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT (continued)
2. QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE Ad hoc COMMITTEE
IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS TERMS OF REFERENCE (Item 4
of the Agenda) (continued).
 - (b) Methods of allocating exports of opium
(continued)

Present:

Members:

India	Mr. YUNUS
Iran	Mr. AMINI
Turkey	Mr. KARABUDA
Yugoslavia	Mr. KUSHEVITCH
	Mr. NIKOLITCH

Observers:

China	Mr. JEN KI-SIN
France	Mr. SUSINI
Netherlands	Mr. de JONGH

Secretariat:

Mr. Steinig	Representative of the Secretary-General, Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs
Dr. Masar	Division of Narcotic Drugs
Mr. Bolton	Secretary to the Committee

1. ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT (document E/CN.7/AC.1/L.14)
(continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited observations on the draft report prepared by the Secretariat (document E/CN.7/AC.1/L.14).

Mr. AMINI (Iran) recalled that at the preceding meeting he had associated himself with the remarks of the representative of India concerning the necessity of emphasizing in the report, preferably in an introductory summary, the important decisions taken by the Committee (see document E/CN.7/AC.1/SR.L.8, page 3). He also wished to support the observations made by the same representative in connection with the introductory paragraph to Section 11 of the report.

He further proposed the deletion of the words "statuts et" from line 23 of page 13 (French text), as he did not consider the Committee competent to deal with legal aspects of the constitution of the international Agency.

Finally, he would like to know precisely what was meant by the words "single resolution" in Section 13 of the draft report.

Mr. STEINIG (Representative of the Secretary-General) recalled that he had already undertaken to incorporate in the final version of the Report the suggestions of the Indian representative.

He thought that the second point raised by the representative of Iran was rather a matter of translation. The English words "rules and regulations" simply meant the rules of procedure of the proposed body. He thought the point could be met by deleting the words "statuts et" from the French text, leaving the English text as it stood.

The resolution referred to in the final section of the report could be drawn up only when all the decisions reached by the Committee were known, that was to say, when section 9 of the report dealing with the allocation of export shares had been drafted. It would be the usual type of resolution adopted by comparable bodies of the United Nations, setting out in general terms the decisions reached by the Committee, and requesting the other organs of the United Nations concerned and the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures required to implement those decisions.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) indicated his satisfaction.

Mr. NIKOLITCH (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation would prefer to see the phrase "since the latter would allow the importing countries to dominate the world market" deleted from the first sentence of the final paragraph on page 6 of the English text. It

was true that he had used similar words in his general statement, but to mention them in the report might unduly offend the susceptibilities of manufacturing countries. As a consequential amendment, the word "moreover" should be deleted from the penultimate line on the same page.

On page 7 of the English text, the figure "1940" should be substituted for the figure "1941" in lines 4 and 5.

The passage "and it was conceivable decrease in production" (lines 10-12, page 7) appeared obscure, and might even be interpreted as meaning the contrary of what he had actually said at the second meeting, as reported on page 8 of document E/CN.7/LC.1/SR.L.2. On that occasion he had pointed out that a country producing a fairly large quantity of opium, the great part of which would be used within the country, might find that it had been allocated a share in the export trade which would oblige it, in view of its large internal consumption, to increase its production; that would be contrary to the declared aim of the Committee's work, namely, the limitation of production. He thought that the sentence in question should be re-drafted to bring out his meaning more clearly. Similarly, referring to the immediately following passage, he had not specifically mentioned either India or Iran in his general statement, and would like the report to be amended accordingly.

Finally, in Section 11 of the report (third paragraph, page 11, English text) his delegation would like the words "or as far as her barter trade was concerned" to be inserted between the words "it was party" and the words "with the functioning of the agency".

Mr. KARABUDA (Turkey), referring to the opening sentences of the first paragraph on page 8 of the English text, pointed out that what he had in fact said in his general statement was that the domestic trade, although subject to Government control, was nevertheless free, in the sense that, although opium could only be exported by the Government opium monopoly, private traders could still trade in opium inside the country. The reference to the draft bill before the Turkish Parliament was correct.

Mr. STEINIG (Representative of the Secretary-General) asked whether the representative of Turkey could accept the following revision of the passage in question.

A semi-colon would be inserted after the word

"controlled" in line 4 of page 8, and the passage beginning with the words "except the domestic trade" and ending with the words "before Parliament", would be replaced by the following sentence: "the domestic trade, although subject to ^{Government} / control, was nevertheless still free, but a draft bill intended to bring such trade within the purview of the Government opium Monopoly was at present before Parliament."

Mr. KARABUDA (Turkey) assented.

There being no further observations,

the CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had completed the first reading of its draft report. The Representative of the Secretary-General would prepare a revised version thereof, which would be distributed to representatives the following morning to enable them to study it before the meeting to be held the next afternoon, at which it could be adopted together with the final resolution.

2. QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS TERMS OF REFERENCE (Item 4 of the Agenda)
(continued)

(b) Methods of allocating exports of opium (continued)

Mr. KARABUDA (Turkey) considered that it might now be proper to ask the representative of Iran whether he had anything to communicate to the Committee in connection with the reply of his Government to the proposals made last week.

He therefore moved that the Committee go into closed session.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) thanked the Turkish representative for his suggestion, which anticipated a similar proposal he had himself been about to make. He would suggest that the Committee adjourn, in order to enable him to communicate to representatives, at an informal meeting, his Government's reply. When representatives had agreed informally as to what consequential action was required in Committee, the meeting could be resumed, either in closed or open session.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee could take no decision at an informal meeting.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) agreed, but maintained his proposal that representatives first meet informally.

Mr. NIKOLITCH (Yugoslavia) supported the Iranian proposal, and further suggested that after the informal meeting the Committee resume in closed session.

Mr. de JONGH (Observer for the Government of the Netherlands) said he would much appreciate it if the Chairman could explain why the Committee should find it necessary to hold closed meetings. The Indian representative might well have been justified in requesting, as reported on page 2 of document E/CN.7/AC.1/SR.L.8, that the Committee go into closed session, since he did not wish the figures on which agreement had been reached to be made available to the general public pending their approval by his Government. He (Mr. de Jongh) could not, however, understand why observers sent by the Governments of countries interested in the production of opium should be asked to accept the general results reached by the Committee without being permitted to follow the whole course of the discussions. Why could they not be trusted with the agreed figures?

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that under the rules of procedure the Committee was perfectly free to decide whether or not it wished to hold closed meetings. If it did so, only representatives, and not observers, could attend such meetings.

Mr. SUSINI (Observer for the Government of France) regretted that he must, despite the Chairman's explanation, press the point raised by the Observer for the Netherlands Government. He would point out that, had the Committee decided at its first meeting to hold all its meetings in private, the presence of observers would have been entirely superfluous. They would have been able only to take note of the results achieved by the Committee which they could just as easily do by studying the press release issued at the close of the session. Moreover, had such a course been taken, the action of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs itself, which had seen fit to ask interested Governments to send observers to the Committee's meetings, would have been rendered pointless.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) begged the Observers for the Governments of France and the Netherlands to appreciate the delicacy of the situation. Both know that the crux of the problem was the allocation of quota shares, and that had the discussions on that point been held in open meeting throughout, the probability was that the Committee would have been obliged to record failure. The decision to go into secret session had been taken in order to avoid such an unfortunate eventuality. Although he was now in a position to give an affirmative answer on behalf of his Government, the acceptance of the representative of India was still subject to the approval of the Indian Government. Once that approval was

forthcoming, the figures for the percentages could be made available to the observers.

The CHAIRMAN wished, before putting the Turkish proposal to the vote, to draw the attention of the Committee to a point of procedure. Were no decision taken with regard to the closed session at the present meeting, another open meeting would be required after the informal talks had taken place, to enable the Committee to take such a decision. It would therefore be wise if the Committee were to decide forthwith that its next meeting should be held behind closed doors.

After some discussion,

the Committee decided that its next meeting should be closed, and should take place on Monday, 5 December 1949, at 9.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.