



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

1660th meeting

Tuesday, 24 March 1970,
at 2.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 5

Narcotic drugs (concluded):

- (a) Report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/4785 and Summary, E/4785/Add.1);
- (b) Report of the International Narcotics Control Board (E/4788 (Summary) and E/INCB/5);
- (c) Technical assistance in narcotics control (E/4789)

1. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) observed that the problem of controlling the traffic in narcotic drugs was not a new one and that the services performed by the Commission were well known to everyone. What was most important now was to strengthen and broaden the Commission's sphere of action by implementing the General Assembly resolutions dealing with the problem and, in particular, by convening a conference of plenipotentiaries in 1971 with a view to the adoption of the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances. In view of the highly technical nature of the subject, it should be dealt with by recognized experts and the Protocol as a whole should then be ratified by the Economic and Social Council and possibly by the General Assembly. Until such time as the treaty was ready for signature, and in order to strengthen joint action in the control of narcotics, Governments should be urged to take further steps to tighten controls. In that connexion, his delegation regarded as particularly appropriate the Norwegian representative's proposed amendment (see 1659th meeting, para. 4) recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1401 (XLVI), which recommended the application of urgent control measures pending adoption of the Protocol. There seemed to be general agreement that the Council should take note of the Commission's report, endorse the idea of convening a conference and call upon Governments to strengthen control measures. However, the present session of the Council was being held at a time when the narcotics problem was assuming crisis proportions and had become a veritable epidemic. That state of affairs, which was particularly obvious in the United States, also existed to a greater or lesser extent in other countries. The United States representative had spoken in moving terms of the scourge which was afflicting American youth and causing the leaders of the United States such great concern and distress. It was not merely a question of narcotic-drug production, traffic and control. The problem went much deeper and was far more complex, and it attested to the present alienation of young people throughout the world.

2. At the present time, Tunisia did not have a narcotics problem. During the 1930s, however, cocaine and heroin had wrought terrible havoc among his country's intellectuals and young people while bringing handsome profits to

those who trafficked in them. Strict control measures and appropriate legislation had put an end to the situation, but it could not be said that there was no longer any danger.

3. His delegation, which favoured the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries to prepare an international treaty from which all political considerations would be excluded, was prepared to associate itself with any other draft resolution drawn up, in conformity with the United States representative's proposal (1658th meeting), with a view to launching a world-wide campaign against the production, sale and use of narcotic drugs and also devising psychological and educational means of saving young people from that dread affliction. Technical measures alone were not enough. An awareness of the problem on the part of Governments, teachers and the general public was essential to the success of a struggle which would be long and difficult, and it would be helpful if those countries in a position to do so assisted, through better publicity measures, in informing people of the many great dangers of drug use.

4. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) said that throughout history various countries had suffered, to a greater or lesser extent, from the problem of drugs; where drug use had been widespread, it had constituted a major obstacle to economic and social development. In recent years, improved transport and increased travel had promoted the spread of drugs. There had been an alarming increase in the number of addicts and in the quantities of drugs produced, with cannabis heading the list in terms both of quantity and of the geographical extent of its use. Most alarming of all was the rapidity with which the abuse of psychotropic substances was spreading around the world and the fact that addicts included so many young people, some of them no more than twelve years of age. If the current trend continued, 30 per cent of the population of some countries could be affected by drug abuse within a generation. While certain countries, including her own, were as yet only slightly affected by the problem, Indonesia was aware of the threat posed by the epidemic spread of what was becoming an international disease.

5. Governments and the general public had responded to the clear and present danger by contributing more funds for research on the prevention and control of drug abuse. However, no country could by itself effectively or completely solve a problem of that nature. The complex character of the illegal production of narcotics, the widespread illegal traffic in cannabis and psychotropic substances, and drug consumption called for international co-operation on a world-wide scale. Her delegation therefore supported the proposal that there should be collective international action and that representatives of Governments should meet to integrate their anti-narcotics measures.

6. Immediate action must obviously be taken to lessen the gravity of the narcotics problem. The international community had responded to that need once before by adopting in 1961 the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.¹ A renewed effort to deal with the question through international co-operation must now be made by adopting the draft Protocol on Psychotropic Substances. However, treaties alone were not sufficient to deal with problems which were attacking the social and economic fibre of countries. Before appropriate measures could be taken, sufficient evidence and documentation must be assembled. Accordingly, with reference to the interim report of the Secretary-General on technical assistance in the narcotics field (E/4789), her delegation shared the view expressed by several other delegations that more intensive research should be undertaken in that field for the purpose of assembling complete data on the problems prevailing in various countries. Her delegation also supported the suggestion that the Secretary-General should prepare a detailed report on present and future measures to be taken by United Nations bodies.

7. The international community should endeavour to destroy the foundation of the illicit drug traffic by reducing both supply and demand. In order to decrease the production of narcotics, a comprehensive programme for the substitution of the illegal crops must be put into effect and other means of support must be found for those who now depended exclusively on illegal crops for their cash income. The task was difficult because it involved combating firmly established types of activity and economic and social attitudes.

8. If the programme of action was to succeed, a concerted international effort was essential. The problem affected every country in the world, whether it was already stricken with the disease or was in danger of contracting it. For that reason, no country should be excluded from the common undertaking.

9. Lastly, narcotic drug abuse had become so widespread that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board were no longer equal to the task of controlling it. Every organization of the United Nations family, including the specialized agencies, should participate in the fight, and the problem should be tackled simultaneously in all its aspects: production, traffic and consumption. An appropriate place for the narcotics control effort should be made in the development strategy of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

10. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) expressed satisfaction at the documentation before the Council and observed that the problem of drug addiction was now assuming such proportions that prompt and effective action must be taken to prevent what was regarded in various countries as a national disaster from growing into a world-wide disaster. Specific steps had already been taken at the national and international levels, and others were suggested in the documents now before the Council. However, if the scourge of drug addiction was to be eliminated, it was essential first to ascertain what were its underlying causes.

11. As was stated in the interim report of the Secretary-General, the problem of traditional narcotics was closely linked to the over-all question of development. In his delegation's view, that was the crux of the problem and must be made the starting-point in the search for a satisfactory and definitive solution for both the developed and the developing countries. It must be remembered that the developing countries were not only producers but also consumers of psychotropic substances and therefore even more affected by the fact that drug abuse was detrimental to the working capacity of the individual and could eliminate a segment of the population from the process of production, thus creating a heavy burden on society.

12. The causes of narcotic drug production were clearly set forth in paragraph 8 of the interim report, which stated that the population in remote underdeveloped regions of a number of developing countries depended for their livelihood on the narcotics crop. The causes of consumption, on the other hand, were less evident and should be fully and thoroughly studied. The narcotics problem unquestionably was closely related to the general problem of development. In the present age of affluence and waste, large segments of the population which had for centuries resigned themselves to living in misery and near-destitution were now finding an outlet in violence and drugs. Young people by the thousands, confronted with injustice and war and a world which they did not understand and which did not always try to understand them, were taking refuge in violence and drugs. Lastly, in a world which had made happiness its credo, the man in the street was finding to his dismay, that he was unhappy, and he, too, sought some means of escape. Those behaviour patterns, particularly drug addiction, all arose from the same cause: refusal to accept the world as it was. In such a situation, a leap into the unknown, no matter how much it cost, seemed preferable to remaining in a world that one rejected. After that came habit, which became second nature.

13. However, action against that evil alone, even in the right direction, was not enough. He had some reservations concerning the conclusion in paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's report to the effect that the problem of narcotic drugs justified an international priority if global development aims in the coming decades were to succeed fully. In his own view, an effective fight against drug addiction required that the development problem itself should be given first priority. The production of narcotic raw materials could not be reduced, much less eliminated, unless the people deriving their livelihood from such illicit crops were enabled to undertake other economic activities which would give them an adequate income. Yet because of price fluctuations on the international market, the growing of other primary commodities often brought such people less and less income, thus encouraging them to resort to the production of psychotropic substances, which were readily transportable and salable even under conditions where communication facilities were extremely poor or lacking.

14. The narcotics problem was thus related to the more general problem of stabilizing the prices of primary commodities and, as was clear from paragraph 10 of the interim report to the problem of development assistance. In that connexion he observed that it would be dangerous to provide only the countries currently producing narcotics

¹ United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.XI.1.

with the maximum aid that their economies could absorb, for such action might be interpreted by non-producing countries as indicating that if they produced psychotropic substances, they too would receive aid. In that sphere, too, the question of aid to developing countries must be viewed from a global standpoint.

15. The principle of taking action to suppress drug addiction should, of course, be maintained, but great care must be exercised in applying it and it must always be borne in mind that such action would not be effective unless a solution was found for the problems of poverty, hunger, discrimination and boredom.

16. His delegation believed that young people had a leading role to play in the fight against narcotics, which threatened them more than any other group. It was quite rightly emphasized in paragraph 9 of the interim report of the Secretary-General that educational programmes had to be launched especially to prevent potential addicts, among the younger generation, from becoming victims of that evil. Such programmes were obviously doomed to failure unless young people were fully associated with them as early as the planning stage. The convening of the World Youth Assembly in July 1970 would provide a unique opportunity for a debate on drug addiction by young people from all over the world and might yield useful information on how they viewed the problem.

17. His delegation shared the view that the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries would be the most suitable procedure for studying and adopting the draft Protocol on Psychotropic Substances. It believed, however, that the duration of ten weeks, suggested in document E/4785/Add.1, was unacceptable and that a duration of four to six weeks would be more reasonable. While he recognized the importance of the problem of an "all-States" formula, raised by the suggestion of the Soviet delegation (1658th meeting), he felt that political considerations should not enter into the search for a solution to the problem of drug addiction.

18. With regard to the conclusions and recommendations adopted at the inter-agency meeting of ACC held at Geneva on 26 and 27 June 1969, contained in document E/4789, several of the suggested measures required national efforts. It must be borne in mind in that connexion that the resources of the countries concerned were often limited and that the countries were already burdened by the efforts they were making in other high-priority fields.

19. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that as his country was not a member of either the Commission on Narcotic Drugs or the International Narcotics Control Board, it had not previously had an opportunity to refer to the great interest which it took in the problem of narcotic drugs. His delegation associated itself with those which had already emphasized the importance of that problem and the need for strengthening international co-operation in controlling the production and distribution of narcotics, and it thought that the campaign to be waged should be a joint undertaking by all countries, whether they were producers or consumers.

20. Narcotic drugs was a veritable scourge, especially where the younger generation was concerned. In that connexion, he noted that the World Youth Assembly was to convene in New York in the near future and suggested that on that occasion it might be advisable frankly to put the problem before the participants, since no solution could be found unless serious efforts were made to persuade young people of the evils of drug abuse. Also, young people should be invited to associate themselves with the action which Governments were expected to take.

21. The situation described in the Secretary-General's interim report (E/4789) was not satisfactory. After ten months of meetings, little had been done in the field of technical assistance. However, responsibility for that situation did not rest with either the Secretary-General, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) or the competent specialized agencies. UNDP stressed the fact that it was the sovereign right of Governments to decide and make known their needs for technical assistance. Consequently, if insufficient assistance was provided, the fault lay with the Governments themselves, which were not making enough requests for assistance and whose national development plans did not sufficiently stress the problem of narcotic drugs.

22. Italy's situation with regard to narcotic drugs had changed rapidly in recent years. It had doubled its imports of those substances for the use of the Italian pharmaceutical industry, whose turnover had been multiplied during the past ten years. Accordingly, it seemed essential to strengthen control measures, for with such a large increase in production there was a real danger that a part of that production might be diverted from medical use to illicit markets. Italy was therefore keenly interested in the activities of the international agencies concerned with controlling the production and distribution of narcotic drugs and felt that since the problem was universal the Economic and Social Council should consider the possibility of increasing the membership of one of the two agencies concerned with the problem.

23. He noted with satisfaction the draft resolutions which the Commission on Narcotic Drugs recommended for adoption in its report (E/4785), especially draft resolution B. He hoped that representatives would not raise anew controversial points, especially the technical points which had already been settled by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, and that the Council would endorse the conclusions of the Commission by accepting the latter's draft resolutions, taking into account the technical proposal made by the representative of Norway at the preceding meeting that a sixth preambular paragraph should be added to draft resolution C. He also mentioned the practical suggestion put forward by the representative of Greece and said that before the conference of plenipotentiaries took place, it might be a good idea to make known the amendments to the draft Protocol, which Governments wished to submit. The report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs contained a list of relevant documents for each article of the draft Protocol. The final summary records of the most recent session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs might be circulated to the Governments participating in the conference. Such practical measures should make it possible to expedite the work of the conference.

24. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan) said that his country was willing to enter into any co-operative effort for the effective control of the abuse and illicit production of narcotic drugs. It was stated in the report of the International Narcotics Control Board (E/INCB/5) that the available information on the illicit production of narcotic drugs and trade in them was now more comprehensive than in the past. However, paragraph 10 of the report referred to certain lacunae, especially where Mainland China was concerned, which showed how important the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations was to the world community.

25. The report concentrated on certain countries which were major producers of raw materials used in the manufacture of narcotic drugs. Iran and Afghanistan bordered on Pakistan and thus shared its concern with the question of controlling illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. Citing paragraph 42 of the report, which emphasized the need for close co-operation between the border authorities of Afghanistan and adjoining countries, he pointed out that the region in question included part of the tribal area along West Pakistan's north-west frontier. Narcotics laws had recently been extended to the tribal areas in the Hazara and Mardan districts. With regard to the remaining tribal areas, an effort was being made to persuade persons engaged in the cultivation and production of narcotic substances to replace them by other crops suited to the economic and climatic conditions of the area. Moreover, Pakistan had signed a bilateral agreement with Iran concerning illicit traffic across the Pakistan-Iranian border.

26. However, as the Soviet Union representative had rightly stated, the entire blame must not be shifted to the countries which produced narcotic raw materials. The Governments of those countries were faced with geographical, economic and social problems in the control of production. The geographical problems could be overcome by recourse to more modern means of communications. However, it was very difficult for a country at a relatively low stage of development to radically change the economic and social patterns of an entire area or community. It was to overcome the difficulties described in paragraph 78 of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board that the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2434 (XXIII), which recommended that the Governments concerned seek assistance from the specialized agencies, UNDP and bilateral sources in their efforts to develop alternative economic programmes and activities, such as the substitution of crops, to end illegal or uncontrolled cultivation of narcotic raw materials. Pakistan had voted for that resolution and he therefore welcomed the Secretary-General's interim report on that matter (E/4789). In particular, the Pakistan delegation agreed with the statement in paragraph 17 (i) that "measures must be taken to curtail both the illicit supply and demand for narcotic drugs. To achieve this aim, the relevant economic, social, technical and institutional aspects must be taken into consideration...". His delegation supported the proposal in paragraph 17 (iii) of the interim report for the establishment of a special fund for assistance in that field. The formulation of requests for technical assistance under resolution 2434 (XXIII) was under consideration by the Pakistan Government. However, it was not yet in a position to endorse the financing of such technical assistance

projects and especially the proposals for research (paragraph 17 (vi)) through the regular programme of UNDP. The Pakistan Government could support such projects if they were financed through the regular budget of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, or through a special fund established for that purpose and without the normal requirement of counterpart contributions.

27. Turning to the report of the first special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (E/4785), he agreed that stronger measures should be adopted for the control of psychotropic substances. However, his delegation was not certain whether it was necessary to convene an international conference for that purpose. Moreover, it believed that the resolutions proposed were inherently illogical. If an international treaty was to be adopted, there was no reason why its scope should be limited. Hence, his delegation was not able at present to support the adoption of draft resolutions B and C in chapter IV of the Commission's report.

28. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed again the extraordinary rapidity with which the problem of narcotic drugs was spreading. He feared that, if effective measures were not taken in time, that scourge would exert an evil influence on mankind as a whole. The Economic and Social Council must attack the very roots of the evil and not only its manifestations; it must not accept resolutions that were too restricted, like that concerning the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances, which would be of value only for half of mankind. That Protocol did not apply to all States and did not constitute a sufficient obligation even for the States to which it did apply. The USSR was in favour of convening a conference of plenipotentiaries but it felt that such a conference should be universal in scope. As the representatives of the organs dealing with the problem of narcotic drugs had stressed, the solution to the problem required a global approach and, in view of its humanitarian nature, all countries should be able to participate in the conference, whether they were Members of the United Nations or not. While Article 2 of the Charter, particularly paragraphs 1, 4, 5 and 6, was concerned essentially with the maintenance of international peace and security, it also was relevant to social problems. The problem of narcotic drugs was now so serious that it was just as important as the maintenance of international peace and security, and therefore came within those provisions of the Charter. For that reason, the Soviet delegation felt that in draft resolutions B and C, it should be clearly stated that all States seeking to solve the problem of addiction could participate in the conference of plenipotentiaries. The USSR had already submitted proposals for that purpose during the first special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It felt bound to repeat those amendments which should be made to draft resolution B in particular. Firstly, it was essential to add the words "open to all States" at the end of the first preambular paragraph. Secondly, at the end of the second preambular paragraph a reference should also be made to Article 2 (6) of the Charter and to say "also recalling Article 2, paragraph 6 of the United Nations Charter". Thirdly, a new preambular paragraph should be inserted to read: "*Being convinced* that the object and purpose of this Protocol are of interest to the international community as a whole". Fourthly, he proposed that in operative para-

graph 1 the discriminatory formula "Members of the United Nations etc." should be deleted so that it read "to all States and also to the World Health Organization . . .". Finally, he proposed that operative paragraph 3 (b) (i) should read: "all States".

29. The Soviet Union's attitude to draft resolution C would depend on the acceptance of its amendments to draft resolution B, which was closely linked to the former resolution. He stressed that the formula "all States" did not constitute a precedent, it was used in many resolutions of the Economic and Social Council, of the General Assembly and other bodies, and was constantly used by many specialized agencies and regional economic commissions where non-member States were working for the benefit of mankind as a whole. The Universal Postal Union, for example, comprised all States of the world which were in fact co-operating very well with that organization. The Council was therefore facing a technical problem—indeed an imaginary problem—which a little goodwill should be able to solve easily if artificial political arguments were avoided. In a struggle against a very real danger which threatened the whole of mankind, it would be useless to adopt a draft protocol which would discriminate against half of the human race.

30. Mr. OSANYA-NYNEQUE (Kenya) said that there was no drug addiction problem in Kenya, but that the matter was of some concern to his country, which had sometimes been involved in transit cases of narcotics traffic. Besides, any country could be contaminated by a scourge affecting neighbouring countries. Moreover, personally he was alarmed to see that drugs were posing such a threat to the children of New York.

31. The Kenyan delegation thought that the documents before the Council failed to devote sufficient attention to the need to combat illegal traffic in narcotics and that they placed too much emphasis on production as opposed to consumption. The interim report of the Secretary-General (E/4789) gave disproportionate emphasis to production and simply implied that the developed countries should provide the developing countries with the necessary technical assistance to control the production of narcotic materials. By failing to give equal emphasis to efforts to reduce narcotics consumption, the report implied that the culprits in narcotic traffic were the producers, who happened to be mostly from the developing countries. That lack of symmetry was misleading and should be corrected by ensuring that the two aspects of the problem were given equal prominence.

32. There was no doubt that sizable amounts of narcotic material were consumed in the countries that cultivated narcotic crops. However, consumption there differed from that in the developed countries. The raw material consumed underwent almost no transformation, apart from the drying of the leaves, and that greatly reduced the dosage of the toxic content of the material. The narcotics consumed in developed countries, however, were highly refined and dosages were more concentrated and consequently far more toxic. The problem of drug addiction was thus really aggravated by the developed countries, since they were responsible for the sophisticated manufacture of drugs.

33. It was also true that the spread of the use of narcotic drugs resulted from social conditions. Some social systems were more conducive than others to addiction. It would seem that the problem tended to spread more easily in industrialized capitalist societies. In any case, if there were no drug consumers, narcotics production would be bound to diminish. Any solution that disregarded the consumption aspects would therefore not be a true solution.

34. Apart from the fact that production and consumption complemented each other, it was important to note that one reason why countries produced narcotic crops was that they found them easy to sell. The choice of product was thus determined by economic considerations. No doubt if they turned to the production of other crops, narcotics production would decline, but it was also practically certain that they would be unable to sell the alternative products to their present chief customers, the developed countries. The problem therefore had social, physiological, psychological, economic and trade aspects. The solution was less simple than had been supposed, and efforts should be directed to dealing simultaneously with all those aspects.

35. In conclusion, the Kenyan delegation shared the view that a world-wide problem such as the narcotics problem could be solved only by a concerted effort on the part of all mankind.

36. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that since the representative of the Soviet Union had referred to the discussions in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, he would like to point out that the French delegation had voted in the Commission for operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B, and also in favour of article 21 of the draft Protocol on Psychotropic Substances, which embodied the same clause. The French delegation would vote against the Soviet amendment since it was designed to alter the provisions contained in the paragraph in question.

37. Mr. SAM (Ghana) thought the spread of drug addiction, a problem that also affected the developing countries, was due to the frustrations and hardships of existence. To prevent the evil from spreading, or from breaking out in new areas, an effort should be made to publicize the dangers of narcotics, to strengthen moral standards in educational institutions and to improve living standards. Like the germs of a contagious disease, the propagators of the evil should be rendered harmless. The choice of suitable measures lay with the Governments of various countries rather than with United Nations agencies. The Ghanaian delegation approved of the draft resolutions appearing in the report of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs; it favoured the convening of a conference of plenipotentiaries to adopt the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances and thought that all States should be invited to the conference since the problem should be viewed on a world-wide basis. The Ghanaian delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations in paragraph 17 of the Secretary-General's interim report. It approved of the report by the International Narcotics Control Board, whose efforts deserved to be commended. However, it believed that further efforts should be made to regulate the sale and use of narcotics.

38. Mr. KUSEVIC (Director, Division of Narcotic Drugs) said, in reply to the representatives of Greece and Italy, that the third draft Protocol on Psychotropic Substances had been transmitted to the various Governments and they had been asked to submit their views on the text. The replies had been published in document E/CN.7/518 and Add.1. At the session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, held in January 1970, an effort had been made to narrow the area of disagreement. The summary records of the session would be distributed five months before the opening of the conference of plenipotentiaries, so that it should not be necessary to send Governments a new questionnaire.

39. He would also point out, for the benefit of some other delegations, that in terms of narcotics and drug addiction countries could be classified in three groups: countries that produced the raw materials needed for the manufacture of narcotic drugs and had a drug-addiction problem; countries which produced the raw materials but had no drug-addiction problem; and countries which did not produce raw materials used for the manufacture of narcotics but had a problem of addiction. In recent years the traffic in narcotics had tended to involve heroin rather than opium. Furthermore, while opium had hitherto been produced in South-East Asia and in the Near and Middle East, it had been processed in the developed countries. Now, however, opium was being processed in the producing countries. Lastly, drug addiction was tending to spread in all countries, including the African countries, where the abuse of psychotropic substances was beginning to grow.

40. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, though he certainly recognized the seriousness of the problem, he regretted that the Soviet representative had raised the question of the participation of all States in the conference of plenipotentiaries, since that was a problem which arose each year at the session of the General Assembly. The General Assembly had never accepted the views put forward on that subject by the Soviet Union and certain other Member States. Even on a matter so important as disarmament, the General Assembly had not invited States other than States Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to participate in the Conference. The Council could not disregard the General Assembly's decisions, since the General Assembly was the only body competent to deal with the matter. Furthermore, the "all States" formula would place the Secretary-General in a difficult position. At the 1258th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had stated² that "if the 'any State' formula were to be adopted, I would be able to implement it only if the General Assembly provided me with the complete list of the States coming within that formula, other than those which are Members of the United Nations or the specialized agencies, or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice". The United States delegation would vote for the third amendment submitted by the Soviet Union. However, though the problem of drug addiction might well be world-wide, the General Assembly was the only body competent to take a decision on the question of inviting "all States". With regard to the argument that the Protocol would exclude half the world's population, he pointed out that article 21, as amended,

would enable all States to become Parties to the Protocol. Perhaps the United Nations was not as universal as it ought to be; but, in any case, that problem was beyond the competence of the Council. He hoped that the Protocol would be accepted by the majority of States, and he urged the Soviet representative not to insist on his amendments.

41. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that the amendments proposed by the Soviet representative raised a political question, which it was inappropriate for the Council to discuss, especially when it was discussing a purely non-political issue. He recalled a precedent in the case of the 1961 Conference on the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and said that the Council should follow the procedures adopted in the past. His delegation would therefore vote against the Soviet amendments, with the exception of the third amendment to insert a new paragraph in the preamble of draft resolution B.

42. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that he understood the seriousness of the drug abuse problem, although such a problem did not exist in his own country. His delegation approved the idea of convening a conference of plenipotentiaries for the adoption of the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances. However, if the conference were to be effective, all countries should participate in it, since the problem involved was a world problem. His delegation would therefore support the amendments submitted by the Soviet representative.

43. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the objections which had been raised to his delegation's amendments, said it was not the socialist countries which had introduced a political element into the discussions, but rather the Western countries. The accusations made by the United States delegation would not deceive anyone. The United States delegation, which was incapable of abandoning its out-dated and reactionary ideas and political prejudices, had insisted on having a political discussion on the "all States" formula, and had done so on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany whose "observers" had moreover tried to exert pressure on all delegations.

44. It had been asserted that the General Assembly had rejected the "all States" formula. On the contrary, when the Second Committee had adopted a resolution on a Conference on the Human Environment, it had decided to delete a discriminatory clause similar to that which appeared in the draft resolution now under consideration.

45. It had also been asserted that the Council was not competent to take a decision on the matter. However, the Council was authorized under the Charter to take measures to prevent drug addiction and, as part of its functions in that regard, it was entitled to specify which States should participate in the prevention of drug addiction. There were also dozens of resolutions in which the Council had used the "all States" formula.

46. He could not see how the participation of all States without exception could prejudice the success of the conference of plenipotentiaries. The question of narcotic drugs was a universal problem involving not only all Governments but also all governmental and non-govern-

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1258th meeting, para. 101.

mental organizations and all individuals. The argument that the Secretary-General would be placed in a difficult position if all States were invited could not be taken seriously, particularly as the conference was to be of a technical nature and would not confer any political rights on the participants. A list to be prepared of all the States which would be invited to participate in the conference would not solve the problems and, in any case, the Charter did not make provision for the establishment of any list of that kind but referred in Article 2(6) simply to "States which are not members of the United Nations".

47. Mr. SEN (India) pointed out that the Council was required to take a decision only on the three draft resolutions which had been submitted to it and not on the draft Protocol. All considerations based on the content of the articles of the Protocol were therefore irrelevant to the question under consideration.

48. As the General Assembly had on different occasions taken different decisions regarding the "all States" formula, it was useless to try to invoke a General Assembly precedent in order to settle the question.

49. Non-member countries which might be invited to the conference of plenipotentiaries could be divided into a number of categories. China was in a special position, since the issue in China's case was merely one of representation. The colonial and the Portuguese territories raised a problem only for the United Kingdom and Portugal and, with the co-operation and goodwill of those countries, it would be possible to settle that question. The countries which gave rise to controversy were the divided countries. Informal consultations should be held with a view to reaching a compromise on that question; and he suggested, therefore, that the vote should not be taken immediately but that the delegations concerned should be given time to reach agreement.

50. With regard to the draft resolutions, his delegation would vote in the same way as it had voted in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, since the discussions in the Council had not brought to light any new elements.

51. Mr. OSANYA-NYNEQUE (Kenya) said he regretted that political considerations had been introduced into the discussion of a problem which was essentially humanitarian.

52. The problem of narcotic drugs was a universal problem, and all States should therefore participate in the conference, particularly since, under the terms of article 21 of the draft Protocol, all States invited by the Council could become Parties to the Protocol. That being the case, they should be invited to participate in its elaboration. His delegation would therefore vote for the USSR amendments.

53. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) pointed out that the problem of universality had arisen on a number of occasions in many United Nations bodies. His delegation took the view that the prevention of drug addiction should be universal; on the other hand, the Council must find some way out of the present impasse. It should therefore either accept the fact that a compromise solution was impossible—and in that case it should proceed to the vote forthwith—or it should try to reach a compromise by stating, for instance, in the

preamble to the draft Protocol that the Protocol applied to the States invited by the Council, as indicated in article 21. However, that approach would not solve the political problem, and the best solution would still be for the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union to reach agreement in further informal consultations.

54. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that all views had been expressed in detail and that the Council should therefore proceed to the vote without further delay.

55. Mr. SEN (India) said he would agree that the Council should vote on the draft resolutions forthwith, if the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States made it clear that they had exhausted all the possibilities of reaching a compromise. On the other hand, if there was still the smallest hope of a compromise, it would be better to postpone the vote until the following day.

56. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the large amount of work which the Council still had to complete, it would be better to close the debate and proceed to the vote forthwith.

57. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) suggested that the decision on the matter should be left to the President. As questions of principle and of procedure were involved, he thought it would be difficult to reach a compromise. He pointed out that he accepted the principle that the object and purpose of the draft Protocol were of interest to the international community as a whole.

58. Mr. WATTLES (Representative of the Legal Counsel), replying to a question by the United States representative, said that it was for the Council to decide which States to invite to the conference. With regard to the wording to be used, he recalled that in 1963 the Secretary-General had stated³ in similar circumstances that he would be able to implement a decision by the General Assembly inviting "all States", only if the General Assembly provided him with a complete list of the States coming within that formula, other than those which were Members of the United Nations or the specialized agencies or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Also, in a note verbale⁴ which he had addressed to the representative of the Soviet Union in 1967, the Secretary-General had expressed the belief that it was beyond his competence to determine such a highly controversial question, unless he was provided with a list of States. Consequently, unless the Council clearly specified which States it had in mind, the Secretariat would interpret the "all States" formula in the manner indicated in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B.

59. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that that explanation merely complicated the question still further. In fact, the Secretary-General was leaving the matter open and the organs were entitled to invite whomever they wished.

60. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions in chapter IV of the report of the

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967, document S/7891.*

Commission on Narcotic Drugs and on the various amendments to them. If there were no objections, he would consider that draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution A was adopted.

61. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the statement of financial implications of the draft resolution B (E/4785/Add.1). He invited the Council to vote first on the amendments proposed by the USSR representative.

The amendment to the first preambular paragraph was rejected by 12 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

The amendment to the second preambular paragraph was rejected by 10 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

The amendment proposing a new preambular paragraph was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The amendment to operative paragraph 1 was rejected by 12 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

The amendment to operative paragraph 3 (b) (i) was rejected by 12 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution B, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

62. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution C. He first put to the vote the amendment proposed by Norway (1659th meeting, para. 4) for the addition of a paragraph at the end of the preamble.

The amendment was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution C, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

63. Mr. SEN (India) noted that delegations which were also members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had not changed their position and he had not changed his either.

64. Miss MUTER (Indonesia) said she had voted for the amendments proposed by the Soviet delegation; although they had been rejected, she had voted for draft resolution B as a whole, in view of the urgency of the problem.

65. Mr. OSANYA-NYYNEQUE (Kenya) expressed regret that political questions had been introduced into the debates. Although the Soviet amendment has been rejected, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, considering that a half measure was better than complete inaction.

66. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the USSR amendments, as it had done in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It had not done so because of a question of principle, but it was quite clear that a problem of such magnitude should be tackled by the international community as a whole.

67. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions B and C for reasons of principle. His delegation considered that resolutions of that kind should be universal in character because of their humanitarian role. He wished to express reservations on the financial implications of draft resolution B.

68. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said he had voted against all the USSR amendments except one, on which he had abstained. He considered that it was neither the time nor the place to adopt the "all States" formula.

69. In reply to a question raised by the representative of India on the manner in which the Protocol would apply to Southern Rhodesia, he pointed out that that was a hypothetical question, since it was not yet known whether the draft Protocol would be adopted. However, in the present situation, it was obvious that the Protocol could not apply to Southern Rhodesia.

70. Mr. SEN (India) thanked the United Kingdom representative for his reply and agreed that it was a hypothetical question.

71. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft resolution on item 5 (b) of its agenda:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Takes note with appreciation of the report of the International Narcotics Control Board on its work in 1969."

If there were no objections, he would consider that the above draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted.

72. The PRESIDENT suggested that, with regard to item 5 (c) of its agenda, the Council should decide to take note of the interim report prepared by the Secretary-General on technical assistance in the narcotics field in conformity with General Assembly resolution 2434 (XXIII) of 19 December 1968 and to transmit it to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.