

Geneva,

February 7th, 1923.

League of Nations

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES

OF THE

FOURTH SESSION

HELD AT GENEVA FROM JANUARY 8th TO 14th, 1923.

CONTENTS.

	Page
LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES	4
AGENDA	4
FIRST MEETING (January 8th, 1923, at 10 a.m.).	
1. Absence of Surgeon-General Blue	5
2. Election of Chairman	5
3. Election of Vice-Chairman	6
4. Proposals to be discussed at the next Session	6
5. Publicity of Meetings	6
6. Minutes of the last Session (Third (Emergency) Session), First Meeting. . . .	8
SECOND MEETING (January 8th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.).	
7. Arrival of the Representative of the United States	9
8. Corrections to the Minutes of the last Session (Third (Extraordinary) Session), Second Meeting)	9
9. Publicity of Meetings	9
10. Proposal of Mrs. Hamilton Wright	9
11. Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly regarding Opium	10
THIRD MEETING (January 9th, 1923, at 10.30 a.m.).	
12. Resumption of the Discussion of Assembly Resolution No. 2	14
FOURTH MEETING (January 9th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.).	
13. Resumption of the Discussion on Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly, as applied to Manufactured Drugs.	19
FIFTH MEETING (January 10th, 1923, at 10.30 a.m.).	
14. Minutes:	
(a) Minutes of the First Meeting	22
(b) Minutes of the Second Meeting	22
15. Resolution regarding the Adhesion of Turkey to the Opium Convention	22
16. Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly regarding Opium (<i>continued</i>)	22
SIXTH MEETING (January 10th, 1923, at 3 p.m.).	
17. Departure of Prince Charoon	25
18. Progress Report by the Secretariat	25
19. Discussion on the Extension of the Import and Export Certificate System . . .	28
SEVENTH MEETING (January 11th, 1923, at 10 a.m.).	
20. Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings	30
21. Traffic in Turkish and Persian Opium	30
22. Progress Report (<i>continued</i>). Reports by Governments.	30
EIGHTH MEETING (January 11th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.).	
23. Proposal regarding Statistics of Medical Preparations	34
24. Annual Reports. Resolution No. 10	34
25. Statistics of the Manufacture of Cocaine and Other Drugs.	35
26. Estimates of the total Annual Requirements for Internal Consumption	36
27. Observations of Governments on the list of Drugs supplied by the French Government	36
28. World's Requirements of Drugs.	36
29. Traffic in Free Ports and Zones	37
30. Exchange of Information between Governments regarding Seizures	37

NINTH MEETING (January 12th, 1923, at 10 a.m.).

31. Minutes of the Fifth and Sixth Meetings	38
32. Publicity of Meetings	38
33. Prepared Opium. Question of the Reports to be submitted by Governments. .	38

TENTH MEETING (January 12th, 1923, at 3 p.m.).

34. Resolution regarding Medical Preparations	41
35. Prepared Opium. Reports of Governments	41
36. List of Drugs prepared by the French Government	43
37. World's Requirements of Drugs. Report of the Mixed Sub-Committee . . .	43
38. Opium in Free Ports. Transit Sub-Committee's Report	44
39. Black List	45
40. Bonded Warehouses and Entrepôts	45
41. Letter from the Chinese Government regarding the Manufacture of Cocaine .	45
42. Opium Trade in Chinese Turkestan	46
43. Appointment of the Commissioners to investigate the Opium Provinces in China	46
44. Additional Staff for the Opium Section	46
45. Date of the next Session	47
46. Seizures at Shanghai.	47
47. Statistics for 1921	47

ELEVENTH MEETING (January 14th, 1923, at 11 a.m.).

48. Absence of several Members of the Committee	48
49. Minutes of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Meetings	48
50. Comments of the Secretariat on the Annual Reports	48
51. Examination of the Committee's Report	48

TWELFTH MEETING (January 14th, 1923, at 3 p.m.).

52. Continuation of the Discussion on the Committee's Report to the Council . .	52
53. The Question of the Publicity of Meetings	55

LIST OF ANNEXES.

	Page
1. Estimated Amount of Annual Traffic in Persian and Turkish Opium	56
2. Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs: Progress Report by the Secretary.	59
3. Annual Report: Resolution No. 10. Summary of Replies received on Traffic in Opium and Drugs	81
4. Supplementary Progress Report	117
5. Extension of the Import and Export Certificate System	123
6. Report on the Discussions of the Mixed Sub-Committee of the Health Committee. and of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium	126
7. Report of the Sub-Committee to consider the Question of Opium in Free Ports.	129
8. Report on the Drawing-up of a Black List.	130
9. Letter to the Secretary-General from the Government of the Netherlands con- cerning Free Ports	131
10. Reply of the Chinese Government to letter of June 1st, 1922, on Manufacture of Cocaine, etc.	132
11. Opium Trade in Chinese Turkestan and Central Asia: Notes by the British Consul- General at Kashgar in Chinese Turkestan	133
12. Enquiry in China concerning the Cultivation of the Poppy	135
13. Traffic in Cocaine: Reply from the Government of Japan	137
14. Traffic in Cocaine: Reply from the Swiss Government	138
14a. Further Letter from the Swiss Government concerning Manufacture of Cocaine .	139

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

FOURTH SESSION

Held at Geneva from January 8th to 14th, 1923.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Representatives of Governments:

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Chairman) (Great Britain).
M. BOURGOIS (Vice-Chairman) (France).
M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China).
Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany).
Mr. CAMPBELL (India).
M. ARIYOSHI (Japan).
M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands).
M. FERREIRA (Portugal).
Prince CHAROON (Siam).
Surgeon-General BLUE (United States of America).

Assessors:

M. Henri BRENIER.
Sir John JORDAN.
Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT.

Secretary:

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

AGENDA.

1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.
 2. Adoption of Minutes of Third Session.
 3. Consideration of Assembly Resolution No. 2 on Opium.
 4. Progress Report by Secretary:
 - (a) Ratification of the Convention.
 - (b) Introduction of Import Certificate System.
 - (c) Annual Reports for 1921.
 - (d) Statistics of Cocaine and Other Drugs.
 - (e) Estimates of Total Requirements for Internal Consumption.
 - (f) Observations of Governments regarding the List of Drugs prepared by the French Government.
 - (g) Enquiry by the Health Committee of the League into the World's Requirements of Drugs.
 - (h) Free Ports.
 - (i) Other Matters.
 5. Prepared Opium. Measures taken for the gradual and effective Suppression of Manufacture, etc. Question of Reports to be supplied by Governments.
 6. Black List. Consideration of the Question of establishing this List.
 7. Bonded Warehouses and Entrepôts. Question of referring the Matter of the Trade in Bonded Warehouses and Entrepôts to the Transit Sub-Committee.
-

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SESSION

held at Geneva from January 8th to 14th, 1923.

FIRST MEETING

held on Monday, January 8th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee (except Surgeon-General BLUE) and the Assessors

1. *Absence of Surgeon-General Blue.*

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) announced that Surgeon-General Blue, the representative of the United States of America, had not yet arrived.

2. *Election of Chairman.*

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the first item on the agenda was the election of a Chairman and reminded the Committee that, under the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman was elected at each session. It had hitherto been the practice to regard the Chairman as elected for the year, because it had been thought that the Committee would ordinarily hold only one session each year. This had been a convenient practice and, though it was not perhaps strictly in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, he suggested, as the Committee would be holding more than one meeting, that the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should be elected to hold office for one year, in order that they might be able to present the whole work of the Committee during the year at the meeting of the Assembly.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) asked whether the Rules of Procedure could be altered, in order to allow Assessors to be elected as Chairman or Vice-Chairman, though possibly without the right to vote.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that a proposal of this nature would ordinarily require three months' notice before it could be included in the Agenda, and it would, he thought, be contrary to the usual practice to make alterations in the Rules of Procedure without previous notice.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that there seemed to him to be nothing in the Rules of Procedure which prevented his proposal from being submitted immediately if the Committee so desired.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the Committee should regard the present session as an emergency one, and should re-elect Sir Malcolm Delevingne as Chairman in order that he should by this means be able to complete one year's term of office. M. Ferreira's proposal could be left over until the next session.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that it was desirable that the term of office of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should be concurrent with the calendar year, or else that their year of office should run from one Assembly to another. The latter procedure seemed preferable. It was essential to have the Chairman of the Committee present at the meetings of the Assembly.

M. BRENIER, speaking in the name of the Assessors, said that they were agreed in considering that, even if the Assessors could be allowed the right to vote — and this was a matter which they were not qualified to decide — the office of Chairman lay outside their functions, which were of an advisory nature. He supported Mr. Campbell's proposal.

M. BOURGOIS (France) and M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) supported Mr. Campbell's proposal.

The Committee unanimously elected SIR MALCOLM DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking the Committee for his election, said that at the next session the Chairman for the year would be elected, and that any proposals regarding alterations in the Rules of Procedure should be handed in during this session, in order that they might be discussed at the next session.

3. *Election of Vice-Chairman.*

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India), M. BOURGOIS (France) *was unanimously re-elected Vice-Chairman.*

4. *Proposals to be discussed at the next Session.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) desired to amplify his previous motion, and to propose that, in addition to possessing the right to be elected Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the Assessors should also possess the right to vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to propose that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should remain in office for the period of one year.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should be elected for the period of one calendar year or that the year should run from one Assembly to another.

5. *Publicity of Meetings.*

Sir John JORDAN desired to re-submit the proposal which he had been making for the last two years, that the meetings of the Committee should be held in public.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would have to consider this important question immediately, as a request had been received that members of the Press should be admitted.

The matter was one which rested entirely in the discretion of the Committee, which had hitherto treated its meetings as private on various grounds. The Committee was an advisory one, and its duty was to consider the business which came before it and to advise the Council upon it. The Council of the League considered the recommendations and took the decision whether the reports and recommendations of the Committee were to be made public or not.

The Committee would remember that its report of April 1922 was finally published by the Council after certain paragraphs had been omitted. The Committee had hitherto considered that it was in the discretion of the Council to make public or to keep secret the reports of the Committee. This meant that there was considerable freedom in the Committee's relations with the Council, because the members of the Committee were at liberty to say exactly what they thought, and to refer to matters to which in a public meeting they might have hesitation in alluding.

Further, during the meetings of the Committee, it not infrequently occurred that questions of considerable delicacy were discussed, and hitherto these questions had been discussed with perfect freedom. Members had said what they had thought without fear of having their remarks reported to the outside world, possibly in a mutilated or misrepresented form. Whether the Committee would enjoy the same freedom were its meetings made public, and everything its members said canvassed outside and liable to be reported in the Press, was an open question. He did not wish to express any opinion for the moment. The subject was a very important one, and the Committee would have to take a decision. Lord Robert Cecil, whose advocacy of universal publicity regarding all matters connected with the work of the League was well known, was in favour, and had strongly recommended that the meetings of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium should be made public. He asked the members of the Committee to express their views.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that in America public opinion was most unfavourably impressed by the fact that the Committee sat in secret. It was not necessary for every meeting to be public, but certain meetings could be thrown open to the Press and the outside world. Geneva was a very isolated place, and therefore the audience would not be large.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) had no objection to the principle of publicity, but he thought that the meetings of the Committee should be held in private, since the members were Government representatives and would hesitate to express their Governments' opinion quite frankly were the meetings to be public. The Committee could publish from time to time a statement on its work.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed with the Chairman and with M. Ariyoshi. He attached special importance to the fact that the Committee was an advisory one. At the April 1922 session, for instance, had the Committee's meetings been in public, the Council would have been faced with an embarrassing position, as it would have had to change resolutions publicly taken by the Committee. Further, it was impossible to have a full and frank discussion before journalists, partly because they not infrequently published isolated statements and thereby distorted the sense of the discussion. The ordinary procedure of the League secured adequate publicity. The meetings of the Council were frequently in public, the plenary meetings of the Assembly were invariably so, and the meetings of the Assembly Committees which discussed the work of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium were also held in public.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) supported Mr. Campbell and M. Ariyoshi.

Sir John JORDAN was very glad to hear that Lord Robert Cecil had expressed himself in favour of the Committee's meetings being held in public. He could wish that Lord Robert Cecil could be induced to take the Chair. The Committee had not achieved much progress through lack of publicity. His experiences in China had convinced him of the great power of the Press. The Chinese Government had made great use of the Press in its campaign against morphia traffic, and it had been almost entirely due to the Press that that campaign had enjoyed so large a measure of success. The Advisory Committee was in a backwater at Geneva; no outside interest was taken in its meetings, though publicity was in reality the only effective weapon at its command.

It was, no doubt, true, as M. Ariyoshi had said, that the Committee's proceedings would run more smoothly in private, but would they be more effective? The Committee should not be too anxious to save the susceptibilities of the Council.

The Press should be present at its meetings, in order to dissect and analyse its report. He had been present at the Washington Conference, and the fullest information on all the questions which had been of the greatest importance to thirteen countries had always been available.

As things stood at present, the Advisory Committee's report on its work was published months after it had been drawn up, and published in such a way that hardly anyone in the outside world read it. No one read blue books. And yet the salient features of the report had only to be emphasised by expert journalists to make it intelligible and interesting to the general public. Many questions with which the Committee dealt were hardly ever mentioned in the Press. The export of opium from India to the Far East, for example, has passed unnoticed by the Press, and nothing ever appeared regarding the situation of the opium question in China. He did not share Mr. Campbell's views regarding the Press, which, with all its imperfections, yet formed and guided public opinion.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed with Sir John Jordan. Some of the Committee's meetings, at any rate, should be held in public. The Committee could decide which these should be. In China the opium problem could never be solved without the help of public opinion. He desired publicity to be given at least with regard to China. Chinese people were afraid of foreign intervention. If proper publicity were given to the proceedings of the League with regard to the opium question, that fear would be removed, and public opinion in China stimulated. That opinion would have its effect on the Chinese military leaders, and compel them to suppress the cultivation of opium. The work of the League must be made known in China.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT agreed with M. Chao-Hsin Chu that, unless public opinion were appealed to, a potent weapon in the struggle against opium would be lost.

Sir John JORDAN noted M. Chao-Hsin Chu's statement with great satisfaction. Public opinion was the only means in China of aiding the efforts of its Government to force the hands of the military governors, who ruled over two-thirds of the opium-producing provinces. Public opinion could not take action except through the intermediary of the League of Nations.

The work of the Committee would largely fail in its object unless its results and its deliberations were immediately made known in China. The reports received from China showed that that country had no idea of the work accomplished by the Committee.

The Chinese Government had the greatest difficulty in prohibiting entirely the use of opium, and the support of the public opinion of the whole world was indispensable for it.

M. BRENIER regretted not to find himself in agreement with his co-assessors. He was indeed much struck by the efforts that the Chinese Government had made to stop the cultivation of opium and by the welcome support which public opinion had given it in this undertaking. Nevertheless, other countries besides China produced opium. If during the course of the last session but one the question of the actual production of opium in China had been discussed in public, this procedure would have raised difficulties, because both Turkey and Persia would have learned from the Press that the cultivation of opium was still continuing in China, and the Turkish and Persian Governments might have asked if in these conditions the cultivation of the poppy in their own respective territories ought to be stopped.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a message from the Secretary-General asking the Committee not to take a decision on this matter at its present meeting. He was going into the question of precedents regarding publicity, and he would inform the Committee of the result of

this enquiry during its next meeting. Members of the Committee would thus have time to reflect and to consult each other, and possibly a compromise might be found which would satisfy everyone.

Sir John JORDAN wished to reply to M. Brenier on the question whether the publishing of the Committee's discussions regarding the poppy cultivation in China could have had any effect on Turkey and Persia. He was himself sure that the situation in China had been known to these two countries through the Press. Further, it was always preferable to know the truth.

Since 1907, China, in the opinion of the International Opium Society at Peking, which was the most competent body to judge the situation, had reduced its production of opium by 90 per cent; other countries had perhaps not yet reached so surprising a result.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU also desired to remove any misunderstandings which might have been caused by M. Brenier's remarks. The cultivation of the poppy and the traffic in opium were prohibited by law in China; nevertheless, an illicit traffic existed, and there was also an illicit traffic in cocaine and morphia in other countries of the world. If the Chinese authorities discovered the poppy growing in any province they destroyed it. This could not be said for Turkey and Persia.

The Committee decided to postpone taking a decision on the question of publicity until its next meeting.

6. *Minutes of the Last Session (Third (Emergency) Session), First Meeting.*

The Committee adopted the minutes of the first meeting with certain modifications and additions.

SECOND MEETING

held on Monday, January 8th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee and the Assessors.

7. Arrival of the Representative of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, welcomed Surgeon-General Blue, the representative appointed by the Government of the United States. The Committee would receive great encouragement and assistance from having a representative of America sitting as one of its members.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States), in thanking the Committee, said that he was ready to devote all his time to the problem before it.

8. Corrections to the Minutes of the last Session (Third (Extraordinary) Session), Second Meeting.

The Committee adopted the minutes of the second meeting with certain modifications and additions

9. Publicity of Meetings.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the Secretary-General, and the Secretary-General had informed him that it was the usual practice for an advisory committee of the League to sit in private, but in some cases one public meeting was held at the end of its session at which the decisions were communicated, and the reasons for them stated. It was, however, the practice of other advisory committees of the League to issue a much fuller daily communiqué of their labours than that which had hitherto been issued regarding the work of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium. This communiqué was prepared by the Information Section. The Committee should consider the adoption of this procedure. It would be difficult to hold its meetings in public for the reason that the Committee was essentially an advisory body.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the suggestions referred to by the Chairman should be adopted. Any remarks which he had made at the preceding meeting had been made solely from the point of view of the Committee and not from that of the Indian Government, which had always given the fullest publicity to its opium policy for the past sixty years.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN and Mr. CAMPBELL (India), *the Committee decided to issue a daily communiqué, to be approved by the Chairman, and to consider later the question of holding a public meeting at the end of its session.*

10. Proposal of Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Mrs. Hamilton Wright had proposed the following question for insertion in the Agenda of the present session: "Consideration of further means to render the control of the opium traffic effective".

As the proposal was of a general nature, the Chairman asked Mrs. Hamilton Wright to circulate a memorandum containing an explanation of her proposal.

Mrs. Hamilton Wright agreed.

II. *Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly regarding Opium* (Document A. 92. 1922. XI).

The SECRETARY read Resolution No. 2 of the Third Assembly, as follows:

"2. The Assembly inclines to the view that the Governments which are Parties to the International Opium Convention should be asked to agree not to issue licences for the import of opium, or the other drugs to which the Convention applies, from any country which has not yet ratified and put into force the Convention, and adopted the system for the control of exports and imports approved by the second Assembly in paragraph 1 (3) of the resolution adopted on September 30th, 1921, and previously approved by the Council on June 28th, 1921. The Assembly considers this question important and urgent, but, recognising the complicated and technical character of the issues involved, it is of opinion that the matter should be examined in detail by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium before any definite action is taken. It therefore requests the Council to convene a meeting of the Advisory Committee, as soon as possible, to study the question, and should that Committee report in favour of the proposal, the Council is asked to act at the earliest possible date on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in the form approved by the Council, and without further reference to the Assembly if the Council considers such reference unnecessary."

The CHAIRMAN said that the matter raised in this resolution had been referred to at the session of the Committee during the previous September and the possibility of some such action had been mentioned as a point which might have to be considered later. The Assembly's resolution had been brought forward by an independent member of the Fifth Committee and had received a large measure of approval and support. This member was Professor Gilbert Murray. He had proposed that the Assembly should adopt this resolution immediately. The Assembly had decided to give a general approval of its terms, but to refer it to the Advisory Committee to discuss in detail.

The resolution was a very comprehensive one and referred not only to countries which did not adhere to the International Opium Convention, but also to those which had not yet adopted the system of Import Certificates. Further, the resolution also dealt with manufactured drugs as well as raw opium. It had clearly been put forward in order to find means to cope with the very difficult situation, that some countries (those adhering to the Convention) were applying a self-denying ordinance with regard to the opium and drug trade, while some were not. Those countries enforcing the Convention were thus at a disadvantage compared with those which were not adhering to it. Further, at the moment, the protective measures embodied in the International Opium Convention were largely nullified. Obviously, if some countries remained outside, it was not only impossible for other countries to exert effective control over illicit traffic, but there was also illicit traffic in the hands of the countries which refused to take part in the work of giving effect to the Opium Convention.

The Secretariat had prepared some valuable statistics regarding the export of raw opium from Turkey and Persia, and these statistics were to be found in Annex 1. The Committee would have to consider not only the question of import but also that of export, and further, how the resolution of the Assembly should be applied if the Committee adopted it. He thought that the best means of applying it was by means of a Convention. Finally, the Committee should remember that it was called upon to discuss a resolution which had been unanimously adopted.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the resolution, if adopted, would have the effect of raising a barrier between States. This would entail the gravest consequences. Certain countries would be unable to obtain remedies prepared from narcotics manufactured in other countries, and would thus be deprived of scientific research and discovery to which the whole world had a right.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should divide its discussion into two parts, the first being the effect of the resolution upon raw opium, and the second the effect of the resolution on medicinal drugs.

M. BRENIER seconded this proposal.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

(a) *The effect of the Assembly's resolution on raw opium.*

M. BRENIER asked what would be the result of applying the resolution in practice. Would a country be prohibited from importing opium from another which had not adhered to the Convention? For example, would England be prevented from importing opium from Turkey, although Turkish opium was necessary for the manufacture of the legitimate supply of morphine?

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would have to examine whether the resolution would have the effect of stopping the supplies of the world's requirements of morphine, codeine and other drugs derived from opium.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that in practice this meant the boycotting of Turkish opium. She had information from the Turkish Delegation to the Lausanne Conference that Turkey would adhere to the International Opium Convention of 1912 in the near future.¹

The Persian Minister at Washington had informed her that Persia was trying to find means to adhere to the Convention and was revising her budget with this end in view.

The CHAIRMAN said that information had reached England to the effect that the opium growers in Persia had complained to the Persian Government about the bad effects that the efforts of the League were having on the opium trade. The Persian Government had decided to appoint a Royal Commission to enquire into the matter.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, although the Committee had decided to separate, for the purposes of its discussion, the question of raw opium and the question of medicinal drugs, it should not be forgotten throughout the discussion that these two questions were intimately connected and that any restriction placed on the supply of opium would have an effect on the manufacture of medicinal drugs.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) stated that the United States had already adopted measures on the lines proposed, and quoted Section 6, paragraph (a), of the law passed in 1922, which dealt with the export of opium.

Section 6 was as follows:

"Section 6. — (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Government to export or cause to be exported from the United States, or from territory under its control or jurisdiction, or from countries in which the United States exercises extra-territorial jurisdiction, any narcotic drug to any other country: provided that narcotic drugs (except smoking opium and opium prepared for smoking, the exportation of which is hereby absolutely prohibited) may be exported to a country only which has ratified and become a party to the convention and final protocol between the United States Government and other Powers for the suppression of the abuses of opium and other drugs commonly known as the International Opium Convention of 1912, and then only if:

"(1) such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with that Convention, a system, which the Board deems adequate, of permits or licences for the control of imports of such narcotic drugs;

"(2) the narcotic drug is consigned to an authorised permittee; and

"(3) there is furnished to the Board proof deemed adequate by it that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and legitimate uses within the country to which exported, that it will not be re-exported from such country, and that there is an actual shortage of and a demand for the narcotic drug for medical and legitimate uses within such country."

M. BRENIER said that Section 6 (a) quoted by Surgeon-General Blue covered the question of the export but did not appear to cover that of the import of raw opium. Were there any laws in America to control this?

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the law just quoted had been passed to prevent the sending of drugs to China.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) promised to enquire into the matter and to inform the Committee at a future meeting.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Assembly's resolution was of great importance. He wished to give some approximate statistics regarding the production of opium in Turkey and Persia, with the object of affording a concrete idea of the gravity of the position. These had been obtained partly from trade sources and the figures for Turkey referred to the pre-war Turkish Empire. From these statistics it appeared that about two-thirds of the whole quantity of raw opium available for world consumption outside the producing countries was produced in Persia and Turkey. This was the central fact which the Committee should keep in mind. India was responsible for about one-third of the total quantity, and the control of this was already most strict. The Committee's labours would, he suggested, clearly be vain unless the other two-thirds could be controlled.

When the resolution came before the Assembly there had been every prospect that it would be immediately accepted. The original suggestion that the matter should be referred to the Advisory Committee for further examination had come from India, although the effect of the resolution, if adopted, would possibly be to give the Indian Government a practical monopoly of the legitimate opium trade.

¹ Mrs. Hamilton Wright subsequently stated that it had not been her intention to convey the idea that she had either received this information officially from the Turkish Delegation, or been asked by it to communicate it to the Committee.

With regard to M. Brenier's question, Mr. Campbell pointed out that during the war supplies of Turkish and Persian opium had been almost entirely cut off. Practically all the morphine used by the Allied armies had been made from Indian opium which the Indian Government supplied at pre-war prices. What had been accomplished then could be done again. Indian opium was quite suitable for the manufacture of morphia. The opium exported at the moment from India did not contain a high percentage of morphia, but it could be made to do so if necessary. He wished to make it quite clear that the Indian Government had no desire to press the resolution, but it was anxious that some practical proposal should be adopted which would have the effect of controlling the other two-thirds of the world's supply.

M. BRENIER enquired whether, if, by the adoption of the resolution, the monopoly for the legitimate supply of opium necessary for the world's consumption were given to India, this would in practice mean the extension of the cultivation of poppy to other districts in India than those which already produced it. Benares opium, for instance, did not contain sufficient morphia, though this was not the case with the opium produced in the Native States (Malwa opium).

MR. CAMPBELL (India), in reply to M. Brenier's question, said that if the Assembly's proposal were accepted, India could grow enough opium to provide for the world's legitimate requirements of morphia. The difference between Malwa and Benares opium lay merely in the process followed. In Malwa the exudations were collected with an oily knife, whilst in the Benares district the poppy capsules were cut with a dry knife. The percentage of morphia in Turkish opium was about 12 %; in Indian opium about 8½ to 9 %. In Turkey the poppy capsules were only lanced once; in India they were lanced about five times, and the exudations collected and mixed. If the Turkish method were followed in India, and only one exudation were collected, an opium would be produced containing the same percentage of morphia as Turkish opium.

M. BRENIER said that the statistics regarding Turkey could be checked by reference to British Consular Reports, and approximate figures of production thus obtained if the returns for a sufficient number of years were examined.

MR. CAMPBELL (India), in reply to questions, said that he had obtained his statistics from various sources. One of the largest drug-broking firms had informed him that production in Turkey was between 7,000 and 12,000 chests a year, each chest containing 150 lb. He found a similar figure in various German publications and in a Bulletin of the Imperial Institute. His recollection was that the Turkish reply to the questionnaire gave a production before the war of 7,000 chests. The article on Opium in the Encyclopædia Britannica by the President of the Pharmaceutical Society, and therefore, he thought, quite unbiased, put the production of opium in Persia at 10,000 chests a year. He made no claim that his estimate was accurate, but he thought there was no doubt that Turkey and Persia produced an amount which varied between one-half and two-thirds of the total supply.

Sir John JORDAN said that the effect of the resolution would be to give India the monopoly of supplying the world's legitimate requirements in opium. Most of the Turkish and Persian opium trade was an irregular one. The production of opium in Turkey and Persia amounted to about 1,000,000 lb. a year. Would the resolution cause this production to cease, or would it not rather increase the world's production of opium, since Turkey and Persia would not put an end to their irregular trade? Thus, in practice, the adoption of the resolution would mean an increased production. From his point of view, production was the root of the whole question.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) raised two objections to the adoption of the resolution. First, it was not commercially sound to establish a monopoly. Secondly, the price of opium would immediately rise, and thus smuggling be increased.

MR. CAMPBELL (India) said that M. Van Wettum's objections were legitimate. Perhaps they might be removed if the Indian Government could be induced to guarantee to sell opium at a price not higher than that already paid by the Governments which bought their opium from the Government of India.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the strongest objection to the resolution was that the illicit traffic in opium would not be stopped, but would rather be increased if it were adopted.

MR. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China, being not legally an opium-producing country, the Chinese Government had no official objections to the resolution. A certain amount of opium was produced clandestinely, but whenever poppy cultivation was discovered, it was at once destroyed. China could import what opium she needed for her legitimate requirements from either America or Great Britain.

Sir John JORDAN asked Mr. Campbell if he did not think that the adoption of the resolution would mean increased production.

MR. CAMPBELL (India) said that, in his view, the effect of the resolution depended on the honesty of the respective Governments and on its universal adoption. The financial position of Turkey and Persia was, he believed, somewhat precarious. Opium was, he thought, one of their chief articles of export. He considered that the practical effect would be to force Turkey and Persia to adhere to the International Opium Convention, but he did not believe that any very important practical results would be achieved even if they did so, as neither Government was perhaps strong enough to prohibit or adequately control the production of opium within its territory, or to regulate satisfactorily the export of the opium produced.

Sir John JORDAN thought that it was preferable first to consult Turkey and Persia as to whether they would be willing to adhere to the Convention, rather than to threaten them as this resolution would seem to do.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT agreed with Sir John Jordan. The resolution would merely antagonise these two countries. Collaboration should be tried before coercion.

M. BRENIER agreed with Sir John Jordan, Mrs. Hamilton Wright and Mr. Van Wettum. He further thought that the adoption of the resolution would mean in fact an increase in cultivation, because countries which had not hitherto cultivated opium would begin to do so in order to break the monopoly which would be established. This was the exact opposite of the work which the Committee was doing. The resolution was not a practical one, especially as Turkey and Persia appeared to be on the eve of adhering to the Convention.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that Indian opium was being used mostly for smoking purposes. There was no import of it into China, but much of it reached Hong-Kong, the Malay States and the Dutch Colonies. If, in future, Indian opium were to be used only for legitimate purposes, the supply would then be quite sufficient to meet the demands of the whole world, without taking into account Turkish and Persian opium. The Indian Government must be asked not to export opium for smoking purposes. He wished to state, on behalf of his Government, that, if the proposal were adopted, China would not take the opportunity to produce opium in order to compete with India. As far as China was concerned, the production of opium would be ended for ever.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee adjourned the discussion until its next meeting.*

THIRD MEETING

held on Tuesday, January 9th, 1923, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee and Assessors.

12. *Resumption of the Discussion of Assembly Resolution No. 2:*

(a) *The effect on raw opium.*

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) agreed with Mr. Campbell that the resolution would be the most effective method of inducing Persia and Turkey to adhere to the International Opium Convention.

Japan was an importing country, and the Japanese Government purchased a certain quantity of opium yearly for legitimate purposes. The Japanese Government would support the resolution and undertake to purchase all its opium from India, provided that the price it would have to pay would not be higher than the price charged by countries outside the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether M. Ariyoshi could give the figures for Japan's legitimate requirements of opium.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) replied that they were not in his possession.

The CHAIRMAN said that Japan had bought large supplies of Persian and Turkish opium, and the statement of the Japanese delegate that the Japanese Government would be willing to buy from India only, provided that the price was satisfactory, was important.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Japanese delegate had raised practically the same point as had been raised by M. van Wettum at the previous meeting.

The Indian Government could, he thought, be induced to guarantee to sell opium direct to Governments at a price not higher than that obtaining at present if that guarantee promised to lead to an effective solution. The difficulty in accepting Mr. Ariyoshi's suggestion was that, if the Assembly's proposal were adopted, there would probably be no legitimate market for opium outside India, therefore no market price. He did not wish to press for the adoption of the Assembly's proposal on behalf of his Government, but he thought that, if it was unanimously adopted and properly enforced, his Government would be willing to guarantee not to charge a higher price than Rupees 4,000 a chest, which was the present price, to Governments and about Rupees 500 per chest lower than the public auction price. This would be a considerable sacrifice on the part of the Indian Government, but it would, he thought, be prepared to make it, provided that the resolution were unanimously adopted.

Sir John JORDAN enquired what use was made in Japan of the large quantity of opium imported from Turkey and Persia.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) replied that nearly all the opium imported by the Japanese Government was Persian and Turkish. It was imported for the purpose of the manufacture of drugs and was sold by the Government to licensed dealers, who in return re-sold it to doctors, chemists, etc.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether, in view of the very large quantity imported, any of it was smoked.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) replied that no opium was smoked in Japan proper, but that some of the opium imported was used in Formosa for smoking purposes. There were thus two uses for the opium imported: (1) for medicinal use and (2) for smoking in Formosa.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether the opium sent to Formosa was made into morphia.

M. BRENIER said that, by subtracting the quantity of opium exported from the total import into Japan and Formosa, the quantity manufactured into morphia in Japan could be obtained since the Japanese Government prohibited the smoking of opium in Japan.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether M. Ariyoshi could give the figures for the amount of Turkish and Persian opium used in Japan for medicinal purposes.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) replied that the statistics up to 1920 were to be found in the Japanese reply to the questionnaire.

The CHAIRMAN said that, since 1920, the situation had changed considerably, and that the statistics for 1921 and 1922 were very important.

Sir John JORDAN said that at a previous session he had quoted the figure of 170,000 ounces of morphia for some nine months of 1921 as having been imported into Japan. He wished to know what was being done with all this opium. It was useless to discuss the effect of the resolution before the Committee until the Committee was in a position to know exactly what was happening with regard to the opium situation in Japan.

The CHAIRMAN enquired at what date M. Ariyoshi could give the figures for imports in 1921 and 1922.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that he could obtain the figures in a few months. The Japanese Government had no objection to giving the figures required.

Sir John JORDAN said that, after careful examination by experts, the pre-war consumption of morphine in a normal year in Japan had amounted to 35,000 ounces.

The CHAIRMAN said that, according to Mr. Campbell's figures, the present price of Indian opium worked out at between 40s. and 42s. per lb. The present average price of Turkish and Persian opium varied between 15s. and 20s. a lb. It therefore appeared that Indian opium cost between two and three times as much as Turkish and Persian. He enquired what effect this would have on the price of morphine were the resolution under discussion to be adopted and a virtual monopoly of production thus granted to India.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the price of morphia in London was, he believed, about 15s. an ounce, and he understood that the medical profession fixed the normal legitimate number of injections per ounce of morphine at 1,000. Assuming therefore that the cost of Indian opium was three times the cost of Turkish, and that this would raise the price of morphine three times if the resolution were passed, the cost per injection would be almost exactly $\frac{1}{2}$ d. This was a price to which, it seemed to him, no objection could be taken.

Sir John JORDAN asked what effect the enhanced price of morphia would have on the production in Persia and Turkey of opium for the manufacture of morphia, and on the smuggling of it from those countries to the rest of the world.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that no one would buy Indian opium if the resolution were adopted, because it would be three times the price of Turkish and Persian opium.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India), in answer to Sir John Jordan's question, said that, at the moment, the Indian Government was selling all the opium which it produced for export at not less than 4,000 rupees per chest. Turkey and Persia, he thought, were selling their opium at about 15s. a lb. He did not see that that position would be altered if the resolution were passed. The Indian Government, at the moment, sold at a high price and the Turkish and Persian Governments at a low price. If the resolution were properly carried out, that is to say, if it were universally adopted and honestly and efficiently applied, those countries who put it into force would have to accept the resulting pecuniary sacrifice. The position with regard to the illicit traffic would remain the same. There would be no inducement to Turkey or to Persia to increase their production of opium since there would be no legitimate market for it, and economic forces would oblige them either to adhere to the Convention or to abandon their cultivation. At the present moment, from the Committee's point of view, the position could not be worse. If the resolution were adopted, it seemed to him that it would be improved.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) was of opinion that the establishment of a virtual Indian monopoly would result in a rise in the price of drugs in the illicit market. This would tend to increase smuggling by reason of the greater profits which could be obtained.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) replied that the position would be the same as it was at the moment, except that all countries of the world would draw their legitimate supplies from India or from other countries legitimately producing opium instead of from Turkey and Persia. The illicit traffic, however, would continue at first much as it stood at present.

M. BRENIER said that, as Mr. Campbell had remarked at the previous meeting, India at the moment probably produced one-third of the world's supply of opium. If the resolution were passed India would have to produce more opium in order to replace an important part of the two-thirds now produced by Turkey and Persia. It was certain, however, that Turkey and Persia would not put a stop to their production on the passing of this resolution, which was aimed against them, and consequently the world's production of opium, which was already abnormal, would be increased by if not two-thirds at least in a very considerable degree.

The CHAIRMAN said that if the legitimate market for Turkish and Persian opium was cut off, the prices in the illicit trade would undoubtedly rise, just as had been the case with regard to cocaine. The more restrictive the measures placed on the legitimate trade, the higher the prices

in the illicit trade. That, however, had not been considered as a reason for not placing restrictions on the trade.

In reply to M. Brenier, he said that the discussion seemed to have proceeded on the assumption that the whole of the world's production of opium was required for legitimate purposes. Hitherto the Committee had always been of opinion that a large amount of opium was produced in excess of legitimate requirements. The Committee must not forget, when considering the effect of the proposed resolution, that it was not yet in a position to know the exact amount of the world's legitimate requirements of opium. It was obvious, however, that this amount was far less than the present production. When the fear was expressed that the result of the resolution would be to stimulate the smuggling of opium, it should be remembered that a large illicit trade already existed, in particular between Persia and the Far East, and that the object of the proposal was to restrict this trade. The proposal might not be a complete solution of the problem, but if the Committee did not take it up the problem still remained and no other solution had been suggested.

Further, it was not quite accurate to say that the resolution would in fact give a monopoly to India, because the estimate which the Committee was considering of the world's total production of opium was based in part on figures for the pre-war Turkish Empire. Before the war, a large part of the opium from which morphia was made was grown in the European provinces of Turkey which now belonged to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. If the resolution were adopted, the opium grown in these provinces would still be available for the legitimate market.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the greatest problem before the Committee was the control of the illicit trade. It seemed to him inevitable that that trade would be stimulated if the resolution were adopted.

Sir John JORDAN fully agreed with M. Brenier. There was no doubt that the adoption of the resolution meant a definite increase in production. He did not believe that any restrictions could be placed on Persia or Turkey, and the only argument of weight in support of the resolution was that it might perhaps force Turkey and Persia to adhere to the Convention.

M. BRENIER said that he had another objection to raise, which was that, in so far as the production of opium was legitimate, Turkey and Persia would be excluded by the resolution from the legitimate trade.

In amplification of the Chairman's remarks about the European provinces of Turkey, M. Brenier said that, from an unofficial source, he thought the production of opium in Macedonia in 1912 amounted to 150,000 kg.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that Dr. Anselmino had just handed him some quotations of a London firm supplying opium, which showed that there was very little difference between the prices of Persian and Indian opium at the present moment. If this were so, the objections on the score of increased cost would be to some extent removed.

The number of questions relating to the Assembly's resolution which he had been requested to answer had put him somewhat in the position of supporting and defending a scheme which his Government had no desire to press. He would vote for it, but he wished it to be clearly understood that the Indian Government did not desire to press this measure and was supporting it mainly because of its great anxiety to obtain a solution of the problem.

In reply to M. Brenier's first objection, Mr. Campbell said that the first effect of the resolution would undoubtedly be to increase the total production of opium; Turkey and Persia would continue to produce until forced to cease or to diminish their production by economic circumstances. In his opinion, however, these circumstances would soon arise, for, if the proposal was adequately carried out, there would be no legitimate market for Turkish and Persian opium, and these two countries would in a comparatively short space of time be compelled to reduce their cultivation.

M. Brenier's second objection did not, he suggested, raise a practical difficulty, since Turkey and Persia could always enter the legitimate trade by adhering to the Convention.

M. BRENIER asked whether, if the Indian monopoly were established and if Turkey and Persia adhered to the Convention after a lapse of a few years, the Indian Government would reduce production in India which would have been increased by the monopoly.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the moment Turkey and Persia put the Convention into force the Indian Government would certainly reduce its production to the amount legitimately required by the importing countries. India had always, in fact, followed the import certificate system, and he could give the most definite assurance to the Committee that there need be no fear of over-production as far as India was concerned.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that it was much better to try to co-operate with Turkey and Persia than to force them by threats to reduce production.

In spite of the strict legislation in the United States, 50 % of the importation of opium was illicit. This proved that the real problem was how to control production, especially in Turkey and Persia. Turkey had announced two days ago her willingness to adhere to the Convention, Persia had already accepted it with reservations, and she believed that the line of least resistance should be followed and persuasive methods should be tried.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that the most serious factor of the opium problem was the over-production of the raw material, illicit traffic in raw material and the illicit traffic in the manufactured article. If the adoption of the proposal would definitely mean the adherence of Turkey and Persia to the International Opium Convention, then it should be recommended. If, however, it would merely mean an increase in the illicit traffic and an increase in production, as some members thought, then the adoption of the proposal was hazardous. The Committee should

not run any risk of augmenting the evils which it sought to cure. Should not the Committee delay its decision and await further information?

Sir John JORDAN said that Mr. Campbell had admitted that the first effect of the resolution would be an increase in the production of opium and that the production would only decrease if economic circumstances compelled Persia and Turkey to adhere to the Convention. He endorsed Surgeon-General Blue's opinion and thought the danger that these countries would not do so too great to justify the adoption of the proposal.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) enquired whether a country adhering to the International Opium Convention would be permitted by the proposed resolution to purchase drugs containing opium from a country which did not adhere to the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that this point would be discussed when the Committee had finished with the resolution concerning its effect in regard to raw opium.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, after having discussed certain details of the question, the Committee might be able to obtain a comprehensive view of it. The Committee's aims were two-fold: it desired to reduce the consumption of opium, particularly in the Far East, and the consumption of other narcotics throughout the world. What effect would the proposed measure have on these two aims? The production of opium and consequently its consumption would increase in the Far East. The legitimate drug trade would be interfered with to the profit of the illicit traffic. This would mean an increase in the illegitimate use of drugs. The vague, indirect and hypothetical advantages of the proposal would be far outweighed by its certain, immediate and direct disadvantages.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that, during the course of the meeting, statistics for the import of opium into Japan, down to August 31st, 1922, had been handed to him. He asked the Secretary to read these to the Committee.

The SECRETARY read the following table:

1920: first eight months	51,593	Japanese lb.
1921: " " "	14,512	" "
1922: " " "	13,043	" "

(1 Japanese lb. = 603 grammes.)

These statistics did not include Formosa or the Japanese Colonies.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India), in reply to a question, said that the average export of opium from India to Japan had been about 900 chests a year. In 1921, it had certainly been less than 700 chests. He could not give at the moment a more exact figure. M. Ariyoshi had said that nearly all the opium going to Formosa was Turkish or Persian. The exports of opium from India to Japan showed that this trade had very materially diminished in the last few years. He was unable to say to what extent the Japanese Government had supplemented its import of Indian opium by importing opium from Turkey and Persia, but he knew that the imports from Turkey and Persia had lately very greatly increased.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *it was decided to consider the resolution as applied to manufactured drugs.*

(b) *Effect of the resolution on manufactured drugs.*

The CHAIRMAN said that, from Document O.C.73, it appeared that there were no countries which manufactured drugs which had not adhered to the Convention, with the exception of Switzerland. Further, according to that document, the following Governments had put the Import Certificate System into force on January 1st, 1923: Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Esthonia, Great Britain, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Poland; and the following countries had accepted the Import Certificate System in principle, but have not fixed the date from which to put it into force: Australia, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Germany, Haiti, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Norway, Peru, Siam, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands accepted the Import Certificate System in principle, but would have to alter its legislation before adopting it. The Dutch East Indies already had such a system in force since 1912, but had only adapted it last year to the system proposed by the League. He could not as yet give any information as to the acceptance of the form of the Import Certificate System; this would be done as soon as possible.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that Siam had put the Import Certificate System into force from January 1st, 1923.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) enquired what had been done in the United States with regard to the Import Certificate System.

The CHAIRMAN said that the League had, through the Netherlands Government, invited the United States to adhere to the system.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he had no information regarding the reply of the United States to this invitation. His personal opinion was that the system was an excellent one.

The SECRETARY explained that the United States had never answered the invitation direct, but had placed the Netherlands Government in the possession of certain information to the effect that the United States possessed an Import Certificate System.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that this was not quite accurate. The United States possessed an export licence system but not an Import Certificate System, except with Great Britain. She quoted the following regulation upon the subject:

“*Regulation 7: Importations of Unusual Amounts.* No amount of crude opium or coca leaves which may be imported within any certain period as necessary to provide for medical and legitimate uses only will be fixed by the Board at present, but special explanation of importations of unusual amounts of such articles, either in single shipments or in the aggregate, will be required and carefully investigated by the Board.”

New legislation had been passed prohibiting the import of all manufactured drugs. Any import certificate for the United States would therefore only apply to raw opium and coca leaves.

The CHAIRMAN said that there was an Import Certificate System in use between the United States and Great Britain. Perhaps the United States could extend this system to other countries.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government, which was anxious to check and to suppress the illicit traffic in opium and narcotics in France, as the large number of arrests and seizures proved, had carefully examined the proposed Import Certificate System. It had reached the conclusion that its adoption in France would not create any new defence against the abuse of opium and narcotics, but would, on the other hand, be likely to interfere with the legitimate trade in pharmaceutical preparations prepared from opium, morphia or cocaine. The Ministry concerned, however, was again studying the question, and if the system proposed could be adopted with certain modifications and with due regard to the protection of the legitimate trade, the French Government would in the future take such action in respect of this system as it might think possible.

The system actually in force in France at the moment gave every possible guarantee. Opium could only be imported by the acquisition of an *acquit à caution*, which was only given on the production of a receipt signed by the *préfecture de police* or the *préfecture maritime*. With regard to export, the vendor had to be in possession of a customs certificate. Internal traffic was strictly controlled. Chemists who carried on a regular trade in these substances could only sell them on the production of a medical certificate. Further, these chemists were subject to inspection.

The traffic in narcotics was therefore closely supervised in France, thanks to a series of regulations regarding import, internal sale and export. Account was taken of narcotics from the moment of their entry to the moment they were consumed or exported.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that certain countries had commercial treaties with other countries which bound them not to put any barrier in the way of the commerce of those countries. This would mean that a certain country might receive narcotics from another country which was not a party to the 1912 Convention. All morphine-manufacturing countries were signatories to the Convention, with the exception of Switzerland, but he wished to know how the countries not parties to the Convention could be prevented from manufacturing morphia and selling it to countries signatories of the Convention. It would be impossible to prevent some countries not parties to the Convention from erecting new factories to manufacture morphia to compete with the morphia-producing countries parties to the Convention. When the system proposed was adopted, India would increase her production of opium, and he did not think that Turkey and Persia would decrease their production. Therefore the supply would be far in excess of the demand, with the result that the price of opium would fall. The system would therefore mean an encouragement to some non-signatory countries to erect factories for the manufacture of morphia, by taking advantage of the comparatively low-priced raw opium from Turkey and Persia, to supply the outside world, including those countries which were parties to the Convention. The League could not prevent all other countries from dealing with non-signatory countries, because the price of opium would fall very much as a result of the increased supply.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee adjourned the discussion till its next meeting.*

FOURTH MEETING

held on Tuesday, January 9th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

Present: All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

13. Resumption of the Discussion on Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly, as applied to Manufactured Drugs.

The CHAIRMAN asked Dr. Anselmino what the position of Germany was as regards the import certificate system.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that Germany had accepted the system, and a draft law had been prepared in collaboration with the vendors of drugs, who considered that the import certificate system was a protection against illicit traffic. This draft law would shortly come before the Council of the Reich.

M. BOURGOIS (France) repeated his opinion that the resolution would have the effect of erecting a barrier between the various countries and would thus prevent their nationals from benefiting by the medicines manufactured in others. They would be deprived of remedies and scientific discoveries from which all men had a right to profit.

The CHAIRMAN asked if M. Bourgois could enter more into detail. His objection would not seem to apply to the pure drugs, since these would always be obtainable. Presumably he was referring to medicines prepared with such drugs as a component. For instance, Switzerland manufactured cocaine. If she continued to remain outside the Convention the signatory States would refuse to import cocaine from Switzerland. This would not harm the nationals of those States, since there were other countries from which cocaine could be obtained. On the other hand, the importation of special preparations from Switzerland into those countries was another question, and the Committee would have to draw a distinction and decide whether the boycott should be applied to the pure drug only or whether it should also be applied in the case of other preparations.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked M. Bourgois to give a practical illustration. In theory the system did undoubtedly entail the inconveniences which M. Bourgois had mentioned, but the question was whether these inconveniences really existed in practice.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that Turkey, for example, which had not adopted the Import Certificate System, would be unable to obtain morphia or cocaine.

The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared to be a misunderstanding. The proposal under discussion was that drugs *manufactured* by a country which had not adhered to the Convention or adopted the Import Certificate System should not be *imported* by the countries which had done so. M. Bourgois' objection referred to the system of Import Certificates itself. The resolution at present being discussed by the Committee would prevent the import of drugs by countries adhering to the Convention and adopting the Import Certificate System from countries which had not adhered to the Convention or adopted the Import Certificate System.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, in effect, commerce between countries accepting the System and adhering to the Convention would not be interrupted, and the same would be true of countries not adhering to the Convention and not adopting the System. The only dislocation that would occur would be between a country which had accepted the System and the Convention and a country which had not. England, for example, would be unable to import raw opium from Turkey, and Luxemburg would be unable to import cocaine from Switzerland.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that commerce was not the right word. The problem was not simply a commercial one. It was humanitarian in scope and concerned not an ordinary commercial necessity but remedies for human life. To take a concrete example: France manufactured many preparations which came within the scope of the Hague Convention, but if she did not accept the Import Certificate System, were nationals of certain countries to be deprived of these preparations as a result? Pressure or retaliation, which were serious enough when applied to trade, could not be allowed if they prevented certain countries from obtaining certain medicines. Mankind could not be prevented from benefiting from scientific discoveries, especially in the field of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN asked Surgeon-General Blue for an expression of opinion.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) replied that he would, speaking generally, say that the United States of America was in favour of any reasonable measure that would limit the production of both the raw material and the manufactured article to strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. If the system proposed would produce these results, it merited the respectful consideration of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether it was not true that the only products which could be imported into the United States were raw opium and coca leaves. If this were so, the United States would not appear to have any apprehension as to the effect of being cut off from medical preparations made in other countries, but it evidently deemed its own supply to be sufficient for the needs of the 120 millions of its population.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) agreed that this was the case.

M. BOURGOIS (France) laid stress on the principle which should guide the Committee in its work. It should confine itself to considering measures for the suppression of illicit traffic, and should carefully avoid proposing any which might prove excessive and harmful to the legitimate trade. This should be left free in order that the illicit traffic might not be allowed to increase.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked M. Bourgois to give specific instances of preparations affected by the resolution.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he could not at the moment produce accurate statistics. But the amount exported from France of certain preparations was very large. He took an entirely humanitarian point of view and had no wish to enter into the commercial aspects of the question.

M. BRENIER took cocaine as an example. Despite abuse, cocaine had a legitimate use, but under the proposed system coca leaves grown in Peru, for instance, could no longer be imported by the countries adhering to the Convention and adopting the system. Nevertheless, the coca leaves would still remain in Peru and cocaine would be manufactured in greater quantity in that country if this were not already the case, or else the manufacture would be started. There would be no decrease in production and Peru would find a market in those countries which had not adhered to the Convention.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the resolution would have the effect of separating countries into two groups, each of which would only be able to trade with its own group. Each group would develop its own production and manufacture.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) enquired whether the countries signatory to the Convention would be permitted to sell drugs to the countries non-signatory.

The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative. The resolution did not refer to the exports from signatory countries to non-signatory countries, but to the imports by signatory countries from non-signatory countries.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that the market would thus be limited and that the morphia factories would be moved from the signatory countries to the non-signatory countries. England, America and Germany were at present the chief manufacturing countries. If the resolution were adopted the manufacture of morphia would be transferred to non-signatory countries. The non-signatory countries would set up morphia factories, because they would be able, if the resolution were passed, to obtain cheaper opium from countries outside the Convention, or from their own fields, and also a market for their goods.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he had demonstrated the difficulties to which this resolution would give rise, since it would separate countries into groups and would cut off one group from the benefits of the medical discoveries made in the other. The measure, which raised many difficulties, would not reduce the evil by a single pipe of opium, a single injection of morphine or a single pinch of cocaine.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he had three objections to the resolution: first, it would interfere with the free trade in drugs; secondly, it would create a monopoly; thirdly, it would increase the illicit trade.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to sum up his opinions. With regard to raw opium, he had no desire to press the resolution, but he earnestly asked every member of the Committee to realise the grave difficulties in which the Committee was placed by the position of Persia and Turkey. The Committee was at the present moment sailing in a boat one-third of which was whole, while

two-thirds of it were holes. It was impossible to continue in this position. He appealed to members to find some practical measure which would give the Committee control over the opium situation.

Regarding drugs, Mr. Campbell fully appreciated the objections which had been raised. He had no considerations to urge on behalf of his Government, since India did not manufacture drugs, or only manufactured them to a negligible extent. He desired, however, to remind the Committee that the Hague Convention placed drugs on a very different plane to that of raw opium. The Convention enjoined a much stricter control of drugs and the closest co-operation between Governments. The signatories of the Convention had undertaken definite obligations and it was the duty of the League of Nations to see that those obligations were put into effect.

Unless the Committee could devise some method whereby this could be accomplished, the signatory Governments would in their turn be unable to carry out their obligations. They had bound themselves to co-operate with each other very closely and to restrict the use of drugs entirely to medical and scientific purposes. Unless the Committee could find a method of effecting this, the Convention would break down. So far, a deadlock had, apparently, been reached.

He desired to propose that the discussion on the resolution should be adjourned until the next session in April, in the hope that, between the present session and that date, some practical solution would be found. The immediate advantage of his proposal would be that the Committee would not take any decision regarding the position of Turkey and would therefore not prejudice the possibility of Turkey's adhesion to the Convention.

M. BRENIER enquired whether the Committee could not find a formula expressing the hope that Turkey would adhere to the Convention as soon as possible. This would encourage Turkey to come into line with the other States.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could certainly make a recommendation to that effect to the Council. He thought the best plan would be to consult the Secretary-General and obtain his opinion.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed with the Chairman.

The Committee decided to request the Chairman to consult the Secretary-General regarding M. Brenier's proposal.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, it was decided that the decision on the resolution of the Assembly should be postponed until the next meeting.

FIFTH MEETING

held on Wednesday, January 10th, 1923, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

14. *Minutes.*

(a) *Minutes of the First Meeting.*

The Minutes of the First Meeting were adopted with some drafting amendments.

(b) *Minutes of the Second Meeting.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT and M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) proposed certain amendments to their remarks

The Committee adopted the Minutes of the Second Meeting with the amendments proposed by Mrs. Hamilton Wright and M. Chao-Hsin Chu, together with certain drafting amendments.

15. *Resolution regarding the Adhesion of Turkey to the Opium Convention.*

The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the Secretary-General about the proposal made by M. Brenier at the previous meeting, and the Secretary-General had informed him that he possessed information to the effect that the Turkish Delegation at Lausanne had stated that Turkey was ready to co-operate in the humanitarian work of the League, including the work in connection with the opium traffic, and that he thought a resolution of the Committee expressing satisfaction at the information might be useful. He accordingly proposed that the Committee should pass such a resolution expressing its satisfaction at this information.

Sir John JORDAN, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) and M. BRENIER proposed slight amendments to the resolution, *which was finally unanimously adopted in the following form:*

“That this Committee learns with the greatest satisfaction of the Turkish declaration of readiness to give effect to the International Opium Convention of 1912, since the full co-operation of Turkey in the supervision of the Traffic in Opium will greatly facilitate the difficult task of the Committee. The Committee desires to express its lively appreciation of the decision of the Turkish Government and its hope that the necessary formal steps to give effect to that decision may shortly be taken.”

16. *Resolution No. 2 of the Assembly regarding Opium (continued).*

The CHAIRMAN said that there had been a very full and frank discussion in this Committee on the Assembly's resolution, during the course of which every argument for and against it had been stated and several misunderstandings had been removed. It was now quite clear that the resolution had nothing to do with the export of drugs to countries not parties to the Convention,

but with exports from those countries to countries parties to the Convention. The resolution meant, in effect, that countries which were parties to the Convention would, if they adopted it, exclude from their markets the products of countries which were not parties.

M. Van Wettum, M. Bourgois, Sir John Jordan and M. Brenier had stated the arguments against the proposal. M. Van Wettum had put forward three objections: that it hampered free trade, that it created monopolies, and that it increased illicit traffic.

M. Bourgois had two objections: first, that the resolution would divide the world into two groups of countries which could only trade among themselves; secondly, it would prevent those countries which adopted the resolution from importing from the boycotted countries certain medical preparations unobtainable elsewhere, and, in consequence, humanitarian work in general would be impeded.

Sir John Jordan had thought that it would mean an increase in the production of opium and consequently an increase in consumption.

M. Brenier had raised a similar objection regarding cocaine.

Those members of the Committee who had supported the proposal had thought that, although these objections were certainly of substance, they were neither decisive nor insuperable. It was true that the resolution would hamper free trade, but the precise object of the Opium Convention was to hamper free trade in drugs. In Chapter III of the Convention trade in harmful drugs was restricted to certain purposes, and the Assembly resolution should not be rejected merely on the ground that it would hamper free trade in drugs. Regarding the objection raised on the ground of monopolies, the resolution would certainly place India in a very advantageous position, but it would not give her an entire monopoly, because there was a considerable production of very high-grade opium in the former European-Turkish provinces. It must not be forgotten that the world's production of raw opium was very much in excess of legitimate requirements. He himself had no doubt that, while India might be placed in an advantageous position for a time, countries like the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes would soon enter into the market and compete with Indian opium on equal terms.

The objection had been raised that the adoption of the resolution would mean the increase of smuggling, especially in raw opium. This was true, but the same thing had occurred as a result of the efforts already made to deal with the problem of opium and other dangerous drugs. The illicit traffic in cocaine, for instance, was at the moment very large, precisely because chemists were now prevented, by law, from selling cocaine on demand. This objection would therefore held good against all the work performed by the Advisory Committee. The restriction of trade always meant increase in illicit traffic, because the profits accruing tempted persons to enter the illicit trade. The remedy was to take energetic measures to combat illicit traffic.

M. Bourgois had objected that the world would be divided into two groups of countries by the resolution. If that were the effect of the proposal, he did not think the Assembly would ever have adopted it. The Assembly had made the proposal contained in the resolution because it had considered that the great majority of countries in the world intended to enforce the Convention, and the proposal had accordingly only been made to meet the case of the small minority of countries who might desire to remain outside.

M. Bourgois had also said that the resolution would hinder supplies of medicinal specialities. M. Bourgois had not given any specific instances of such specialities. It was true this was possible, but the resolution could perhaps be modified in such a way as to allow exceptions to be made in favour of these preparations.

Sir John Jordan and M. Brenier had objected to the resolution because it would mean the increased production of opium. This might be its immediate effect, but when the legitimate markets were closed to the boycotted countries, their production would undoubtedly fall.

In summing up the arguments in favour of the proposal, the Chairman said that the Committee was faced with a very serious situation. There was a large traffic in opium and dangerous drugs from countries not parties to the Convention. He instanced the trade in the Persian Gulf. It was vitally important to find a remedy, otherwise the work of the Committee would be useless.

The resolution would have to be judged according to its effectiveness. It might not be the only effective means to deal with the situation, but no other had been suggested during the present session. He, personally, thought that the proposal, if carried, would probably be effective; it would very seriously affect the markets in Turkey and Persia for raw opium. Production of a staple article on a large scale required for its success a regular and stable market.

In conclusion, the Chairman was inclined to think that the Committee's decision regarding the Assembly resolution should be postponed until the next session. The situation was still transitional.

Turkey had promised to give effect to the Convention. Persia might do so, and so might Switzerland. Further, a number of those Members of the League who had not yet adopted the Import Certificate System might do so in the immediate future. It was therefore better to postpone the decision, and present a report to the Council which should contain a review of the situation. Further, the Council should be requested to publish the Committee's report, since it might have an effect on those Governments which were hesitating whether or not to adopt the Convention and the Import Certificate System.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) had nothing to add to the objections which he had already raised. He emphasised the great difference between the restrictions applied to cocaine and the restrictions applied to opium in the Convention. The Committee would have to act in accordance with the terms of Article 6 of the Convention. The smuggling of opium was one of the worst evils, and to put a stop to this was the Committee's chief task. Unless smuggling was stopped, the

Dutch Government would be unable to fulfil its obligations under the International Opium Convention. He had no objection to postponing the final decision until the next session.

Sir John JORDAN did not agree that no alternative solution had been proposed. It had, for instance, been suggested that persuasive rather than coercive methods should, in the first instance, be employed towards Turkey. It was certainly not an opportune moment to press the proposal before the Committee. He thought there was something incongruous in discussing a proposal of this nature, which was directed against Turkey, after the Committee had just passed a resolution congratulating Turkey on her decision to adhere to the Convention. He had felt throughout that the Committee was trying to force a door which was already open, and that the situation had greatly changed now that Turkey was willing to come into line with other countries.

The CHAIRMAN said that members would have a full opportunity of seeing that their views were correctly stated in the report to be submitted to the Council. If his proposal were accepted, members would have time to put forward alternative solutions between the present and the next session.

The Committee unanimously decided to postpone the taking of the final decision regarding the Assembly's Resolution No. 2 and to submit a report containing its views to the Council, with a request that the Council should publish it.

SIXTH MEETING

held on Wednesday, January 10th, 1923, at 3 p.m.

Present: All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

17. Departure of Prince Charoon.

The CHAIRMAN communicated to the Committee a letter from Prince Charoon (Siam) stating that he had been unavoidably called to Paris, and appointing M. C. CHARUVASTRA, Secretary to the Siamese-German Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, as the Siamese representative on the Advisory Committee until the end of the present session.

18. Progress Report by the Secretariat (Annexes 2, 3 and 4).

(a) Signature and Ratification of the International Opium Convention.

The SECRETARY communicated to the Committee an addition to the report concerning the ratification of the Convention by Persia. The Secretary stated that a letter, dated January 4th, 1923, had been received from Prince Arfa-ed-Dowleh, stating that the question of the ratification, without reservation, of the Opium Convention had been submitted to the Persian Parliament, but that no decisive answer would be given before March 1923.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were a number of countries which had not yet ratified the Convention, among them Switzerland, Argentine, Persia, Peru and Chile. At each session the Committee had represented to the Council the importance of obtaining the universal ratification of the Convention. He suggested that it should once more make a recommendation to the Council in this sense, especially with regard to Persia.

Sir John JORDAN said that Persia, Turkey and Switzerland were the most important countries from which the ratification of the Convention should be secured.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that Argentine and Chile were also important with reference to the drug traffic. Chile had apparently ratified, but the ratification had not yet reached the Secretariat. He noticed that there was a large number of South American Republics which had not adhered to the Convention, and there appeared to be no known reason for this abstention. Perhaps, however, there was some common reason, and he suggested that the Committee might enquire whether this was so from the Pan-American Bureau attached to the Secretariat.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked whether the Committee would like enquiries made of the United States Government regarding its views on the South American Republics which had not yet ratified.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a special paragraph should be inserted in the report referring to the abstention of certain South American Republics, and that the Council should be asked to take what special measures it could.

These proposals were adopted.

(b) Import Certificates.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in addition to the section of the Progress Report on Import Certificates, there was also a special report and a further reference to them in Annex 4.

The SECRETARY laid before the Committee information concerning the Netherlands, to the effect that the Netherlands Minister at Berne had notified the Secretariat on January 8th, 1923, on behalf of the Netherlands and the Dutch East Indies, of the acceptance in principle by the Netherlands Government of the Import Certificate System. The actual date for the bringing into force of the system in the Netherlands depended on an alteration in the existing legislation. It might also be necessary to modify the form of certificate, but the Netherlands Government would inform the Secretariat whether the form of certificate could be accepted without modification. As regards the Dutch East Indies, an Import Certificate System had been in force since January 1st, 1913, and an Ordinance of July 14th, 1922, had been passed in order to bring the existing system into conformity with the system proposed by the League. This Ordinance had come into force on October 1st, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN said that Belgium and Canada possessed an Import Certificate System independent of the League's recommendations. They apparently intended to continue to use their own systems rather than adopt the system recommended by the League.

In reply to a question by Mr. CAMPBELL (India), the SECRETARY said that the United States had never replied direct to the League, but had sent information to the Netherlands Government.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether Surgeon-General Blue could give the Committee any information regarding the attitude of the United States.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) replied that he was under the impression that letters on the subject had been sent to the Netherlands Government, together with the annual reports containing the imports to and exports from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN said that, so far as the United States was concerned, he understood that the Import Certificate System would only apply, by reason of the late legislation regarding the import of narcotics, to raw opium and coca leaves. Perhaps Surgeon-General Blue would inform the United States Government of the importance which the Committee attached to the acceptance of the Import Certificate System. The United States had already put into force a similar system with regard to Great Britain.

He called attention to the fact that, according to the Secretary's report, the Import Certificate System had only been put into force by 12 States on January 1st, 1923, and had been accepted in principle by 15 others. A large number had not yet adopted the system or replied to the letter from the Council, including such important countries as Brazil, Argentine and Spain. The situation with regard to Switzerland, France, Germany and Portugal was still in doubt. It was very nearly two years since the Committee had recommended this system, and the Assembly and the Council had twice unanimously approved it, in 1921 and 1922. The last Assembly had adopted an urgent resolution regarding the system. He felt somewhat discouraged at the failure to obtain a more universal adoption of the system, which had always been approved by the Assembly and the Council without a dissentient vote. The non-adoption of the system was a great inconvenience to those Governments which had adopted it and were trying to enforce it, and was doing an injury to their traders. The Committee could do no more than repeat its sense of the importance of the system and send a further strong resolution on the subject to the Council.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that, with regard to Portugal, the Portuguese Government had informed him in September that a draft Bill had been submitted to Parliament, but he had had no further information since then. He would ask the Portuguese Government once more what had been done.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the resolution should bring out the fact that the Committee considered that the adoption of the Import Certificate System was a direct corollary to the Hague Convention. The resolution should not be in a form likely to antagonise Governments, and the Committee should bear in mind the difficulty of altering internal legislation in a hurry. Further, in order to give practical effect to the system, the countries must have a list of the authorities in each country authorised to sign the certificate. Had the Secretariat sent out this list?

The SECRETARY replied that the Secretariat was waiting for a larger number of adhesions before sending out such a list.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that the certificate in Japan was issued by the Home Office.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the resolution should also mention that the adoption of the system was not only necessary for a country itself, but was also necessary to enable other States to fulfil their obligations under the Opium Convention.

In reply to a question by Sir John Jordan, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) analysed the Opium Convention and showed that the obligations which it imposed undoubtedly contained the implication that some kind of Import Certificate System must be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN enquired what procedure Governments which had adopted the system should follow when asked by a dealer for permission to export drugs to a country which had not adopted the system.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, if an application was received to export a consignment of opium to a country which had not adopted the Import Certificate System, the Indian Government

would, he thought, apply to the Government of that country asking if the consignment were for legitimate purposes. If the reply was in the affirmative, the consignment would be despatched; if not, the Indian Government would, he thought, refuse to despatch it. He pointed out, however, that no *obligation* of a legal character rested on an exporting Government in such a case.

The CHAIRMAN said that this procedure had been followed in Great Britain. Great Britain had, for instance, greatly restricted her export of drugs to Switzerland. The result of a refusal was, however, that the country applying, and being refused, obtained its drugs elsewhere.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether any check on the imports of a country were kept, or whether it could, by certificate, import all the drugs it wished

The CHAIRMAN said that the exporting country could always refuse or grant its export licence at its own discretion. The import certificate from the Government of the importing country would, of course, be strong evidence that the consignment asked for was required for legitimate purposes. It was impossible to know how large a quantity an importing country possessed of a certain drug. The exporting country only knew the amount which it itself exported.

Sir John JORDAN said that the proper working of the system therefore depended entirely on the honesty of the importing Governments.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that in India, as far as raw opium was concerned, a close watch was kept on the opium situation in general, and the Government knew approximately what the requirements of the importing countries were over a certain period of years. A certificate issued by a responsible Government, however, was, and necessarily must be, accepted unless there were very grave reasons to believe it to be fraudulent. To his knowledge, cases had arisen in India where demands for opium had not been met. Once the Import Certificate System was in proper working order, the fact that a certain country was importing more than it required would gradually be discovered and the other countries would gradually come to regard its certificate with suspicion.

Sir John JORDAN said that Mr. Campbell's statement confirmed his view of the system, and that he was glad to know that in certain cases India had refused to allow the export of opium.

The CHAIRMAN enquired what was the procedure in Germany when an application was received to export a consignment of drugs to a country which did not adhere to the Import Certificate System. For instance, what would the German Government do if it received a request to allow the export of a consignment of narcotics to Switzerland ?

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that Germany would not, in view of the fact that Switzerland had not yet adopted the Import Certificate System, prevent the consignment from being sent to Switzerland. Germany could have no control over Swiss imports, and could not be responsible for the amount asked for, however large it might be. She could not put a limit to her exports.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) did not know what procedure was followed by his Government in these cases, but it was quite certain that his Government considered that it had a free hand in this matter.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the whole Import Certificate System raised the principle of not creating a barrier between States. Statistics showed that perhaps one person in 100,000 took morphia unlawfully. In order to save that one person, the Committee must not run the risk of penalising the other 99,999. The objections already raised against the second resolution of the Assembly therefore reappeared in all their strength. The Committee was actuated by humanitarian motives, but the actual work it contemplated doing would be the reverse of humanitarian. The only formality required in France regarding export was the statement of the vendor checked by the authorities. It lay solely with the government of the purchasing country to provide the necessary guarantees regarding import into its territory. This was the principle. In practice, commonsense and honesty were used in its application. A country might, for instance, conclude a purchase in France in conditions sufficiently abnormal to arouse suspicions.

There was no question that France would always combat illicit traffic, in whatever form it appeared, and she might be left to take freely and spontaneously what measures she considered adequate.

The CHAIRMAN said that the effect of complete freedom in this matter was to allow a country which was a centre of a traffic in drugs to obtain any amount which it desired without control. This would mean, in practice, that the control of exports would cease to exist.

M. BRENIER enquired how an exporting country could know the legitimate requirements of an importing country.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the exporting country could know this within certain wide limits. Great Britain applied a rough standard to all requests for the export of drugs, but it did not, of course, know what applications the same importing country made elsewhere at the same time.

He suggested that the Committee should discuss the Extension of the Import and Export Certificate System (Annex 5).

19. *Discussion on the Extension of the Import and Export Certificate System* (Annex 5).

The CHAIRMAN said that the first part of the Memorandum contained a summary of the system and the second part contained considerations laid before the Committee by the Secretariat. He quoted the first consideration as follows:

"The present system offers no guarantee that drugs exported from country A to country B, on the strength of an import certificate issued by B, ever reached country B."

He thought this criticism of the system a just one. The remedy would be either that suggested by the Secretariat or that a receipt should be given by the importing country verifying the import. This receipt should be despatched to the exporting country.

M. BRENIER said that the Committee had now passed to the discussion of the deficiencies of the system; but the system had not yet been universally adopted. Would it not be better to discuss measures which, if taken, might tend to make the system more acceptable rather than measures which would make it more severe or difficult to apply?

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed with M. Brenier. The measures now before the Committee would complicate the system and make it more difficult to apply. The imposition of new restrictions should depend upon observed results, especially as these restrictions would probably give a good deal of trouble to the Governments. The Committee should wait until experience had demonstrated the defects of the present system before amending it, all the more so as any amendments thus made would have the force of experience behind them. Some of the proposed modifications went too far.

M. BRENIER said that the more complicated the system was the less chance was there of it being adopted.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with the previous speakers, but said that several of the points in the memorandum of the Secretariat were already in force in certain countries. The first, fourth and seventh suggestions appeared to him to be important.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that so far there had not been a single case of more than one authority being appointed in any country with power to issue a certificate. The fourth suggestion was therefore purely theoretical. The Committee ought not to suggest difficulties which had not in fact arisen. It should postpone consideration of the memorandum until it was ascertained what supplementary measures were in fact required.

The CHAIRMAN recognised the force of M. Brenier's and Mr. Campbell's arguments. Some difficulties had already arisen in Great Britain on the lines suggested in considerations one and three. There was at present no guarantee that an export was carried out *bona fide*, and the possibility of diversion by transshipment, or by other means, was always present. These difficulties were bound to arise so long as illicit traffic existed, and if the system was to prevent this traffic, he thought they were real points which, sooner or later, would have to be met. The seventh consideration — "the system does not provide for the prohibition of re-export" — seemed to him to rest on a misunderstanding. The present Import Certificate System applied equally to exports and re-exports.

M. BRENIER said that it was inadmissible that a country should be prevented from re-exporting drugs which it had purchased abroad, provided always that it did so under the Import Certificate System.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she thought that the seventh suggestion was to be found in the system in force between the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the author of the memorandum was wrong in assuming that a drug could be re-exported without an import certificate from the importing country.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that the suggestion under discussion appeared to him to provide an efficient check on the drug traffic and that the principle which it contained was embodied in the Law of the United States. He had not studied it very carefully, but it seemed to him to be a proposal well worthy of the Committee's consideration.

M. BRENIER said that, if the principle contained in the seventh suggestion and as it appeared in the French text were introduced into the system, countries which did not produce or manufacture drugs would be excluded from the legitimate trade. For instance, if a French merchant desired to re-export morphia purchased in England to Hong-Kong, he would be unable to do so, since it would be formally laid down that the import certificate furnished by the importing country would not be delivered unless re-export were forbidden. The case would be different if the suggestion meant that re-export would only take place on production of a certificate from countries requiring re-exported opium. This, however, was another question. A merchant should always be permitted to do so provided that he did so under the Import Certificate System.

Sir John JORDAN said that re-exportation was the basis of illicit trade.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that exports and re-exports were in reality the same thing as far as drugs were concerned.

The CHAIRMAN, in summing up the discussion, said that the Import Certificate System was interpreted to mean that a certificate was required equally in cases of the export of drugs produced in the country and of the re-export of drugs imported into it. The suggestion that re-exportation should be prohibited had not found favour with the Committee.

He proposed that the Committee should postpone the further discussion of the memorandum before it until some future date.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

SEVENTH MEETING

held on Thursday, January 11th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

20. Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings.

The Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings were approved with certain modifications and additions.

21. Traffic in Turkish and Persian Opium (Annex 1).

Sir John JORDAN desired to know what use was made of the Turkish and Persian opium imported into Great Britain. There was a very large import of this opium and he wished to know whether it was all used for the manufacture of morphia for legitimate purposes. The figure given in the table was 333,090 lbs. for 1921.

The CHAIRMAN replied that, as Great Britain was a centre of the opium trade, much of the opium imported was re-exported. The trade had diminished since the restrictions had been put into force. The actual amount used for manufacture of drugs in 1921 was 65,477 lbs., of which 62,199 was Turkish opium, 1,924 lbs. European and 728 lbs. Persian. Persian opium had lately become so unmarketable that the great firms which had imported it into England had been compelled to return large quantities of it to Persia because they had been unable to dispose of it.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the United States of America had always imported Persian opium, but that, according to statistics, she had apparently not imported any in 1920 or 1921.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the reason was probably because Persian opium was far more expensive than Turkish.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mrs. Hamilton Wright to circulate statistics with regard to the import of opium into the United States.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT promised to do so. She said that the total import of opium into the United States in 1920 had been in the neighbourhood of 211,000 and in 1921 101,000 lbs.

The CHAIRMAN said that Table 1 of Annex 1 showed that the total import into the United States in 1919 of opium from European Turkey was 322,469 lbs. Some of this, no doubt, came from Asiatic Turkey through the port of Constantinople.

22. Progress Report (continued). Reports by Governments (Annex 3).

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, at the beginning of 1923, the Committee had in its possession only five reports from countries adhering to the Opium Convention for the year 1921. There was a very large list of countries which had sent no reports. It was impossible for the Committee to work without statistics. He thought attention should be called to this in its report to the Council and that the Council should be requested to bring pressure to bear on Governments to complete the reports. No reports, for instance, had been received from the Governments of China, Germany, the Netherlands, Siam and Japan, which were all represented on the Advisory Committee.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the report from the Dutch East Indies was on the way.

M. CHARUVAstra (Siam) said that the Siamese Government had informed the Siamese Minister in Paris that the report was on its way and would reach the Secretariat by the end of January.

M. BRENIER enquired whether the Secretariat could not confine itself to asking the Governments of the more important producing and manufacturing countries to send their reports.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was important to have reports from all countries in order that the Committee could estimate the total amount of consumption and production.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that there were laws and regulations in the United States by which the amounts of import, export, manufacture and consumption could be determined. The only ports where import was allowed were Philadelphia, New York, St. Louis and San Francisco. The reports prepared in accordance with these laws would be ready in a few months and would be communicated to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that these statistics would be of the greatest importance.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that the annual report from Japan was on the way.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the German Government was preparing the report, but the smallness of the staff in the Ministry of Finance rendered the preparation of it somewhat slow, as there was a great number of figures to be collected and co-ordinated. It would be sent as soon as it was ready.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might ask the Council to request the Governments to send in preliminary figures for 1922 concerning production and manufacture, for the consideration of the Committee at its April session.

M. BRENIER suggested that the attention of the Governments should be drawn to Article 21 of the Opium Convention, by the terms of which the signatory Governments were bound to furnish statistics.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that Mrs. Hamilton Wright would shortly communicate to the Committee statistics relating to imports and manufacture in the United States.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether the figures for the colonies of Colonial Powers would be required by April. Owing to difficulties of communication and the numerous kinds of patent medicines this might be difficult. The Dutch colonies had only import, no export.

The CHAIRMAN said that it would not be necessary to give details of all medicines containing narcotic drugs. All that was required for the purposes of the Committee was the total morphine content of all preparations exported and imported. British statistics were compiled on the principle of giving one figure for the total morphine content of all medicines containing narcotics.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that it would be difficult for the Netherlands Government to give this figure as it did not know the morphine contents of all drugs imported.

The CHAIRMAN said that the practice in Great Britain was that exporters and importers had to state the amount of morphine, cocaine, etc., contained in each preparation they desired to export or to import. Unless they did so, licences for export or import were refused.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that, under the Pure Food Laws of America, every preparation containing narcotics must show the quantity and the quality of the narcotic on the label of the bottle.

The CHAIRMAN said that Great Britain had similar laws. It was important to obtain statistics of the amount of narcotics contained in medicinal preparations.

M. BRENIER said that, in order to get these figures, it might be necessary for several Governments to change their existing legislation.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that Article 26 of the Law of September 14th, 1916, contained provisions whereby all wrappings and bottles containing medicines prepared with narcotics must possess a label showing the name and the quantity of the substances contained in one hundred grammes of the preparation.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the laws of the Netherlands went further than the provisions of the International Opium Convention, but that it would be impossible to furnish statistics of this nature. He enquired what article of the Convention made the furnishing of such statistics obligatory.

The CHAIRMAN replied that Article 14 (b) and Article 21 (b) of the Convention contained stipulations which made it quite clear that the signatory Governments were bound to furnish such information. Article 14 stated that the laws and regulations respecting the manufacture, import, sale or export of morphine, etc., should be applied to all preparations containing more than 0.2 %

of morphine or more than 0.1 % of cocaine. Article 21 bound the signatories to communicate to one another statistical information regarding the trade in raw opium, prepared opium, etc., *as well as in other drugs, or their salts or preparations* referred to in the Convention. Apart from the obligations imposed by the Convention, the work of the Committee would be hampered if it did not possess these statistics.

M. BRENIER said that it would be difficult to calculate the retail quantity of medicines sold.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee was not so much concerned with the internal sale of medicines as with their export and import. There should be no difficulty in obtaining the figure of the amount of morphine contained in consignments of medicines. In the United Kingdom this figure was required in the case of export at the time of export, and in the case of import shortly afterwards, though new measures, which had been taken since the adoption of the Import Certificate System, would require the import figures to be furnished at the same time.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) did not see how it would be possible to keep account of the amounts of narcotics consumed or exported unless laws similar to those in force in Great Britain and the United States were adopted. In the United States, preparations containing a very small amount of narcotics were not taxed but were controlled. Preparations containing a larger amount were taxed and stamped in accordance with the law.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that theoretically the Convention imposed the obligation on States to communicate statistics regarding certain medicines, but in many cases the total import of such medicines was negligible. With the sole object of finding a practical solution of a real difficulty, he suggested that the Committee might perhaps fix a limit regarding the medicines referred to in Article 14 of the Convention: he suggested the figure of 100 ounces of morphia, heroin, codeine, etc. Many countries would thus not be affected by the request to furnish statistics of this nature, since they only imported a small quantity of such medicines. The table of exports of cocaine from Great Britain, for instance, contained figures which were of interest to the Committee only in the case of six or eight countries.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that it would be a waste of time to collect statistics regarding these medicines, as the quantity of narcotics contained therein was negligible.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that many countries, such as America and India, for example, had no legislation regarding preparations which contained only a very small quantity of narcotics. Theoretically, therefore, it might be possible for the total amount of morphia or cocaine contained in these medicines to exceed the total quantity contained in the medicines which were controlled by law. He did not think that this held good in practice.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French experts considered the quantity of narcotics contained in uncontrolled medicines to be so small as to be negligible for the purposes of statistics.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed with Mr. Campbell. Preparations which contained only a very small proportion of narcotics were not dangerous and therefore could not be abused. They might be said to lie outside the scope of the Committee.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he would like to explain the law of the United States on this subject more clearly at a future meeting.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Campbell should draft a resolution on the terms of his proposal and submit it to the Committee at its next meeting.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether the reports, the summary of which was before the Committee, were sent, in the case of the colonies, direct by the colony or whether the mother country reported for the colonies as well as for herself. Did Great Britain, for instance, furnish reports for the British Isles only? Did the Secretariat apply to Great Britain for the reports concerning the Crown Colonies?

The SECRETARY said that all requests for reports for the British Crown Colonies were transmitted to the British Foreign Office.

The CHAIRMAN said that the report for Great Britain related only to the United Kingdom and that the Crown Colonies were instructed by the Home Government to furnish separate reports.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had seen very few replies of any importance from any of the colonies. Those that had been brought to his notice appeared very scanty, yet this was a very important question.

The CHAIRMAN replied that, as far as Great Britain was concerned, the Colonial Office had instructed all the Crown Colonies to make an annual report, and that some of these had already been transmitted to the Secretariat.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the absence of any reports from European possessions in the Far East was a very serious omission. It was one of the principal duties of the Committee to suppress the consumption of opium in those colonies. Speaking generally and subject to correction, he thought that there was no report of any large colony belonging to any European Power before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that the reports were doubtless in preparation or on the way.

Sir John JORDAN said that neither Great Britain nor France, as far as he was able to judge from the documents which he had received, had sent reports concerning their Eastern possessions, where the amount of opium consumed was very great.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that there were great difficulties in collecting information in Eastern countries, notably in India, owing to the difficulty of communications.

Sir John JORDAN said that this might be the case in India, but he was not referring to India. He desired specially to mention Hong-Kong and Singapore; the report for Hong-Kong could have been made in twenty-four hours if necessary. There was no reason for delaying these reports, the absence of which greatly hampered the work of the Committee.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said the French Colonial Ministry had not yet sent in the report because a long time was required to prepare it; in Indo-China, for instance, the financial year ended in March and it took about three months for statistics from all the provinces to reach Saigon; another month and a half was then consumed by sending the documents to Paris, where they had to await the documents from other colonies. The preparation of the report required about two months. A year's delay was therefore inevitable before it reached the League.

Sir John JORDAN recognised the difficulty with regard to Indo-China, but said that it did not apply in other cases.

The CHAIRMAN said he was informed by the Secretariat that the reports for Ceylon and Fiji had been received. He had no wish to defend any delay in the sending in of these reports; he would do his best on his return to England to expedite the transmission of the report from Hong-Kong. He wished, however, to make it quite clear that all the Crown Colonies of Great Britain were bound to furnish these reports and had received explicit instructions to this effect. He reminded Sir John Jordan that they had all replied most fully to the Secretariat's questionnaire. The request for these reports had only been sent out by the Council in May last, that is to say about seven months previously. He did not think, in view of the difficulties of communication with the East, that there was any grave default on the part of the Crown Colonies.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had no desire to single out Great Britain for attack. He merely wished to emphasise the extreme importance of obtaining these reports.

M. BOURGOIS (France) added that not infrequently when the reports arrived certain passages had to be elucidated. This entailed further correspondence. This meant still further delay.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) mentioned that the Statistical Abstract for India, which contained statistics down to March 31st, 1920, had only just been published—nearly two years after the latest statistics which it contained. This would give some idea as to how long it took to collect statistics.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee adjourned the discussion until its next meeting.*

EIGHTH MEETING

held on Thursday, January 11th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

Present : All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

23. *Proposal regarding Statistics of Medical Preparations.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) made the following proposal:

"That, in the case of preparations of the drugs mentioned in Article 14 of the Convention, a limit should be fixed below which, for the purposes of the statistical returns, import and exports might be disregarded if desired; and that, for the preparations of each of the drugs morphine, heroin, cocaine and codeine, the limit should be 100 ounces. This resolution would not apply to the pure drugs and their salts."

M. BRENIER agreed with the proposal.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) enquired whether the limit would be applied to each preparation separately or to all preparations taken together.

The CHAIRMAN said it would be applied for each drug separately to all preparations taken together.

M. BOURGOIS (France) suggested that the Committee should approve this suggestion in principle, but leave the fixing of the figure to be discussed later.

The Committee agreed to this proposal and decided to fix the figure at a later meeting.

24. *Annual Reports, Resolution 10 (Annex 3).*

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), referring to the comments on the annual report attached to the documents, enquired whether Governments were bound to furnish statistics regarding the consumption of opium. Article 10 of the Convention, paragraph (c), stated that all persons engaged in the manufacture, import, sale, distribution or export of drugs should "enter in their books the quantities manufactured, imports, sales and other distribution and exports of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts. This rule shall not necessarily apply to medical prescriptions and to sales by duly authorised chemists."

M. BRENIER said that, the last sentence of the article referred to authorised chemists not to enter details of sales of these drugs in their books. Statistics of these sales could not therefore be asked for.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that all chemists in America were bound to enter details of such sales.

M. BRENIER said that, by Sub-Section A of Article 10 of the Convention, statistics regarding the manufacture had to be furnished, and thus control of consumption would be, in effect, secured.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that in India statistics for the sale of opium were so complete that even the quantities sold to individual persons could be traced, in a large number of cases. He thought that the last sentence of Article 10 did not really restrict the Committee, because, by the terms of the Convention, all wholesale chemists and manufacturers had to keep a record of all transactions with retail dealers. It was therefore only the statistics of individual sales which could not be obtained. These sales were, of course, controlled.

The CHAIRMAN said they were also controlled in Great Britain and retail vendors had to keep a record of their sales.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that in America all dealers, manufacturers and druggists had to keep a record of their sales.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said this was also the case in his country.

M. BOURGOIS (France) desired to correct the unfortunate impression which might have arisen regarding the passage of the annual report concerning France. The French Government had never wished to convey the impression by not having forwarded statistics that there was no manufacture of drugs in France. He would lay before the Committee, for insertion in the relevant documents, the names and addresses of firms which manufactured morphine, heroin and cocaine in France¹. The French Government would shortly ask manufacturers for the figures of the amounts they manufactured.

The absence of statistics did not authorise the insinuation that this "seems to point to a lack of adequate measures for enforcing the application of Article 10". The documents already sent in to the Secretariat, notably the Law of July 12th, 1916, and the Decree of September 14th, 1916, contained details regulating the application of that article.

The Law of July 1922 completed the preceding ones and went further than the legislation of any other country. It increased the term of imprisonment from one to five years, the amount of the fine from 3,000 to 30,000 francs; and further, by this law a penalty of *interdiction de séjour*, which could extend over a period up to ten years, was also provided. These penalties applied not only to traffickers, but also to persons found guilty of having abetted the use by someone else of these substances, either by finding them a place in which to consume them, or by any other means.

Finally, M. Bourgois was surprised at the implication contained in the statement regarding the export of morphia to Japan. The statement was to the effect that, "moreover, Japan would apparently have the same opportunities and greater advantage as far as prices are concerned for purchasing direct from the manufacturing country." The drug traffic was free, and it was most probable that the advantages in prices had caused these purchases, which had been made during the selling-off of war stocks.

As a proof that the measures taken by France to control the traffic in narcotics were effective, M. Bourgois quoted the figures for 1922: there had been 446 cases, 341 arrests, followed by the imposition of penalties which had varied from two months' to three years' imprisonment, and from 50 to 1,000 francs fine. Also 51 kgs. of opium, 24 kgs. of cocaine, and 3 kgs. of morphia had been seized. The total value of these seizures had amounted to 300,000 francs. These figures had been supplied by the Service de la Sûreté générale, and did not include the figures for the arrests, seizures, etc., made by the Préfecture de Police in Paris, which had not yet been collected.

Sir John JORDAN enquired what had become of all of the 6,868 kgs. of morphia exported to Japan in 1920.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that he had no statistics at present available, and the Committee would have to wait until the report from his Government arrived.

Sir John JORDAN said that excessive freedom of the legitimate commerce often encouraged illicit trade.

M. BRENIER pointed out that this export of morphia had taken place in 1920, before the Export Certificate System had come into force.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) enquired what action the Committee proposed to take regarding the comments which were before it.

The CHAIRMAN said that he thought the Committee should simply take note of the comments, which were of a confidential nature, and placed before it for purposes of information. He did not agree with some of the comments with regard to Great Britain, but there was no necessity for any action to be taken.

The Committee agreed with this opinion.

25. *Statistics of the Manufacture of Cocaine and other Drugs.*

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had recommended at its last session that Governments should send in as soon as possible statistics of the manufacture of drugs. M. Bourgois' communication with regard to these statistics was very satisfactory.

Japan and Switzerland had just sent in their replies, which were to be found in Annex 4 and Annex 13. In commenting upon the Swiss reply (Annex 14 and Annex 14 (a)), he expressed surprise that the Swiss Government had not written to the manufacturers in Switzerland asking

¹ The names and addresses of firms in France manufacturing morphine, heroin and cocaine, as supplied by M. Bourgois. — Cocaine: Rocques, 36, rue St-Croix de la Bretonnerie, Paris; Pointet et Giraud, 30, rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris; Buchet et C^{ie}, 21, rue des Nonnains-d'Hyères, Paris. Heroin. — Giraudeau, Lavirotte et C^{ie}, Lyons. Morphine: Société industrielle et chimique de l'ouest.

for statistics of the amount manufactured. He enquired what the position was with regard to Germany.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the position with regard to the report of the German Government on the manufacture of cocaine was the same as that with regard to the statistics of opium and morphia. The report was being prepared, but as the laws of Germany did not yet cover the case of coca leaves, it had been difficult to collect statistics. They had, however, been collected in the course of the previous fortnight and the report would be sent in as soon as it was finished.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether there would be any difficulty in getting the figures from the manufacturers.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied in the negative.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, in the present circumstances, the Netherlands Government was unable to supply the required figures concerning the production of cocaine. There was only one manufacturer in the Netherlands, and he refused to produce them for publication. The Ministry of Labour, which was the authority entrusted with the enforcement of the Opium Laws, was of opinion that, according to the provisions of these laws, the manufacturer was under the obligation to give these statistics to the health inspectors, but that the laws did not authorise the Ministry of Labour to make these figures public.

Should the Netherlands Government be the only one which did not supply the figures, and thus did not co-operate in this matter, the Minister for Foreign Affairs was willing to propose to the Minister of Labour that a Bill should be introduced authorising the Netherlands Government to publish the figures.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. van Wettum's declaration was most valuable. It was essential for the Committee to have the statistics if it was to succeed in controlling the traffic in cocaine. The information asked for was clearly covered by the terms of Article 10 of the Opium Convention. He proposed that the Committee should ask the Council once more to urge the Governments to give the necessary information.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she had in her possession statistics for the United States regarding the manufacture and import of cocaine. She would circulate these to the Committee if desired.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would be very glad to receive these statistics.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that cocaine was very little known in China, and that only a very small quantity was imported and that for use in the new hospitals. The Chinese as a people were not yet accustomed to foreign drugs.

The Committee agreed to insert a passage in its report requesting the Council to approach the Governments once more with regard to this matter.

26. *Estimates of the Total Annual Requirements of Drugs for Internal Consumption.*

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the estimates for the total annual internal consumption of drugs in countries had only been asked for by January 1st, 1923.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the statistics for the Dutch East Indies were on the way.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that the laws concerning the import and export of narcotic drugs had only been in force in America since May 1922, and that reliable data were not therefore yet available. They should, however, be available in a few months and they would then be communicated to the Secretariat. He would endeavour to obtain the information for the Committee before its April session.

27. *Observations of Governments on the List of Drugs supplied by the French Government.*

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the Health Committee of the French Government had been unable to meet for the purpose of studying the various reports circulated by the Secretariat on this question.

The Committee decided to postpone the consideration of this matter until its next session.

28. *World's Requirements of Drugs.*

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Mixed Sub-Committee of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and the Health Committee of the League had met and that its rapporteur, Dr. Anselmino, had drawn up a report which had been circulated to the members.

The Committee decided to discuss this report at its next meeting.

29. *Traffic in Free Ports and Zones.*

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Transit Committee was discussing this matter and that it suggested that a small sub-committee, composed partly of members of the Transit Committee and partly of members of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, should meet and examine the question.

The Committee decided to appoint the Chairman, Dr. Anselmino (Germany) and M. Brenier to represent it on the proposed sub-committee, and to await the sub-committee's report before discussing this item.

30. *Exchange of Information between Governments regarding Seizures.*

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the number of States which had replied to the Council's invitation to adopt the proposals made by the Committee regarding seizures was very small. Information regarding seizures was of great value. He suggested that the Committee should ask the Council to renew its request.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) laid before the Committee certain statistics regarding seizures and convictions in the United States for the year 1922. During 1922 a total of 71,151 ozs. of narcotic drugs and preparations had come into the possession of the Government through the enforcement of the anti-narcotic laws. This represented an increase of 37,082 ozs. over the previous year, during which 34,087 ozs. had been seized. In 1922 a total of 3,104 convictions had been obtained and sentences aggregating 2,814 years 3 months and 20 days had been passed. The fines imposed had amounted to \$204,059. 515 cases had been compromised for an aggregate sum of \$55,640. The total amount of fines for the year had reached the figure of \$254,644.

In reply to an explanation of the CHAIRMAN regarding the method for the mutual communication of seizures, Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he would take the matter up with the United States Government. He did not anticipate any objection to the proposed procedure.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government had received valuable information on several occasions which had enabled it to take action. It had been able to communicate information to other Governments which had been of great service to them. The information was of considerable importance with a view to the suppression of illicit traffic.

Sir John JORDAN stated that he had often seen in Chinese newspapers reports of seizures in Shanghai and other ports. How did this information reach the Secretariat ?

The CHAIRMAN replied that, according to the recommendation of the Committee, the information went direct from the Government making the seizure to the Government of the country from which the consignment of drugs had been sent. He was glad that Sir John Jordan had raised this point, as no information regarding these seizures had reached Great Britain from the Chinese authorities.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) was sure that the Chinese Customs officials would do their very best to supply the information. He would urge his Government to do so without loss of time.

M. CHARUVAstra (Siam) said that his Government had no objection to the proposed procedure, and in fact communicated such information to the Secretariat since December 28th, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was most important that there should be no delay in sending the information regarding seizures.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) enquired whether the information would state the exact origin of the drug seized.

The CHAIRMAN said that the information should give all possible particulars, especially, for example, with regard to the ship, labels, consignor, consignee, etc.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Germany would accept the method and that the German Consulate in New York had been asked to furnish information regarding illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure was already in operation between Germany and Great Britain and that Great Britain had lately notified Germany of a case of seizure which had resulted in a German trafficker in drugs being arrested in Hamburg.

NINTH MEETING

held on Friday, January 12th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors.

31. *Minutes of the Fifth and Sixth Meetings.*

The Minutes of the Fifth and Sixth Meetings were approved with certain modifications.

32. *Publicity of Meetings.*

On the discussion being opened by the President as to the holding of a public meeting, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that no meeting should be held in public. Time did not admit of a public meeting; and he did not see what subjects could usefully be discussed at such a meeting.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Committee had left over the question of holding a public meeting until there was nothing left of importance to discuss in public.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that it would be most unfortunate if the Committee did not hold a public meeting, as there had been a great demand for one.

The SECRETARY suggested that the Committee should hold a public meeting on Monday, January 13th, at which it could adopt its report.

Sir John JORDAN moved that, contrary to Mr. Campbell's proposal, the Committee should hold a public meeting.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he was in favour of Sir John Jordan's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN explained that there were two ways in which the Committee could hold a public meeting. It could either discuss its report in private first and then hold a public meeting, at which certain members could speak on the report in order that the public should have an opportunity of learning what had been done. The Committee could then formally adopt the report. The alternative was for the Committee to discuss the report in public. He thought that in any case the public meeting would have to take place on Sunday, in view of the fact that certain members had signified their desire to leave Geneva by Sunday night.

The Chairman put Sir John Jordan's proposal, that the Committee should hold a public meeting, to the vote.

On a vote being taken, the representative of China voted in favour, and the representatives of India, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal against. The representatives of France, Germany, Great Britain and Siam abstained.

The Committee adopted Mr. Campbell's proposal that a public meeting should not be held at that session of the Committee.

33. *Prepared Opium. Question of the Reports to be submitted by Governments.*

Sir John JORDAN said that the clauses of the International Opium Convention referring to prepared opium were allowed to become a dead-letter. He had no desire to make an attack on any country, but it was notorious that the European possessions in the Far East were receiving a large quantity of opium in excess of their legitimate requirements. The Committee had, in his opinion,

barely touched the fringe of the question in its two years of work. He hoped that the question of prepared opium would come before it in a more definite form.

In the course of the previous meeting, Mr. Campbell had referred to Turkey and Persia, which, he had estimated, produced two-thirds of the total world export of opium. Sir John hoped that both Turkey and Persia would be members of the Committee by its next session. He desired to suggest that India, Turkey, and Persia, which were the three great exporting countries and were sailing in the same boat at the present moment, should consent to jettison a part of the cargo of opium with which that boat was so greatly over-loaded. If those three countries would come to an understanding with regard to production, something definite would be achieved. He realised that this could not be done immediately, because the revenue derived from the opium monopolies in European possessions in the Far East constituted no small part of their total finances.

He would like to see presiding over the Committee a statesman of the same calibre as Mr. Hughes, who would treat the opium question in the way that statesman had dealt with the Disarmament question at Washington and plainly tell all concerned the sacrifices they had to make for the common good.

The ultimate object of the Committee was the extinction of the opium trade and the eventual suppression of consumption. The Convention had provided for the gradual and effective suppression of this, but the Committee had taken no practical steps to enable the Convention to be carried into effect.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) strongly endorsed Sir John Jordan's remarks regarding the gradual suppression of opium production and consumption, not only in the Far East, but also the Near East, and in the Western countries.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) admired the sincerity of purpose with which Sir John Jordan had criticised the work of the Committee. He was largely in agreement with him, but he differed as regards Sir John Jordan's interpretation of the International Opium Convention and as regards his practical policy. Sir John desired, he suggested, to push matters too far and too fast and to go beyond the provisions of the Convention. The Convention dealt with raw opium, prepared opium, and with drugs in entirely different ways. As regards raw opium, there was no suggestion in the Convention that its use should be suppressed. As regards prepared opium, the Convention provided for its gradual and ultimate suppression. As regards drugs, the Convention limited their use strictly to medical and scientific purposes.

Mr. Campbell differed from Sir John Jordan concerning the measures which should be taken to put into effect the provisions of the Convention. As far as India was concerned, the Indian Government had publicly and solemnly stated that in no circumstances would they undertake the suppression of the consumption of opium in India. It was their considered opinion, arrived at after exhaustive enquiry, that it would be sheer inhumanity to do so. The Committee should bear in mind the essential fact that, despite centuries of usage, and despite the size of the area under cultivation, the Indian Government had succeeded during thirty years in keeping the consumption of opium per head in India at a lower level than official figures he had seen of the consumption in the United States and in Switzerland.

Regarding the export of opium from India, the position of the Indian Government was perfectly clear. The Indian Government did not send one single ounce of opium out of India to any country which did not want it. From January 1st, 1923, they required a certificate from the importing Government certifying that the consignment was required for legitimate purposes. They had always followed this system in effect; and had lately done their utmost to secure that all consignments exported were used for legitimate purposes. The Indian Government could not go any further unless the Hague Convention were re-written. If it refused to accept the certificates of responsible Governments, that would be equivalent to impugning the word of those Governments. Sir John Jordan had suggested that a 20% reduction of production should be the immediate aim. The International Opium Convention had come into force two years previously. Since that date there had been a large reduction of export and of auction sales in India, and the 20 % reduction proposed by Sir John Jordan had already been attained and in some cases exceeded. The exports to Hong-Kong, for instance, which had been about 400 chests per year, had now been reduced to about 200 chests, a reduction of about 50 %. Exports to British North Borneo, which had hitherto contracted for 24 chests a month, had since January 1st, 1923, been reduced to 7 chests per month, a reduction of about 70 %. The policy of the Indian Government was, and always had been, to confine its exports to the amount required for legitimate purposes. It could go no further without stating in so many words that the certificate of the responsible Government was a fraudulent one.

In Mr. Campbell's opinion, since the enforcement of the Hague Convention a most remarkable progress had been achieved in many countries, and he considered it better to continue on these lines, which had, up to the present, given so satisfactory a result. India could not in any sense be regarded as a danger to the world so far as opium was concerned. Not an ounce went out except on the request of responsible Governments. Even before the Hague Convention had come into force, the Indian Government had attempted to restrict its exports to legitimate requirements; and they had, on occasions, refused certain demands when they had reason to believe they were too large.

Sir John JORDAN enquired how much the total export of opium from India had been reduced in the last two years.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he was unable to give any figures beyond 1920, *i.e.*, before the International Opium Convention had come into force. The figures for 1919-1920 were 10,509 chests and for 1918-1919, 14,828 chests.

M. Chao-Hsin Chu (China) said that Mr. Campbell had stated that the opium exported from India was only used for legitimate purposes. He desired to know whether the smoking of opium could be considered as legitimate or illegitimate. The Convention said that it was illegitimate, but Indian opium was exported to the Far East for smoking purposes. He desired strongly to support the views of Sir John Jordan. The quantity of opium now consumed in the Far East could easily be reduced by 20 %.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee had from the first recognised that the limitation of production was the essential step in securing the objects of the Convention.. It had emphasised this point in several passages of its last report. The Assembly had fully endorsed the report and had passed a strong resolution to the same effect.

As the Committee had decided at its last session to put the question of opium in the Far East upon its agenda for next April, he proposed that the Committee should defer further discussion on this subject until its next session.

M. BRENIER desired to reply to the representatives of China. The Convention spoke of the gradual suppression of prepared opium. It did not declare that it was illegitimate.

Mrs Hamilton WRIGHT said that if the consumption of prepared opium were not illegitimate it would not require to be suppressed.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, by the terms of the Convention, the smoking of opium had clearly not been declared illegitimate for the present. Chapter II of the Convention had declared that it should be ultimately suppressed, but recognised the use, pending ultimate suppression, as legitimate and had prescribed procedure for controlling it. The smoking of opium was legitimate so long as the restrictions laid down in the Convention were complied with.

The Committee adjourned the discussion on this item of the agenda until its next meeting.

TENTH MEETING

held on Friday, January 12th, 1923, at 3 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee and the Assessors.

34. *Resolution regarding Medical Preparations.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) submitted his resolution.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that codeine should be omitted from the resolution because it was not mentioned in Article 14 of the Hague Convention. In Great Britain codeine was not recognised as producing the same ill effects as other derivatives of morphia.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that codeine had been specially left out of the Hague Convention.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) asked what effect the resolution would have on Article 14 of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the resolution would only affect Article 21 of the Convention, which referred to the collection of statistics.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked that the limit should be expressed in the metric system. He proposed three kilogrammes.

The Committee accepted these amendments and adopted the resolution in the following form :

“The Committee proposes:

“That in the case of preparations of the drugs mentioned in Article 14 of the Convention, a limit shall be fixed below which, for the purpose of statistical returns, imports and exports might be disregarded if desired, and that for the preparation of each of the drugs morphine, heroin and cocaine, the limit shall be 3 kgs. This resolution does not apply to the pure drugs and their salts.”

35. *Prepared Opium; Reports of Governments.*

Sir John JORDAN, replying to Mr. Campbell's remarks at the previous meeting, said that he had no intention of criticising the internal administration of the opium problem in India. Mr. Campbell had assured the Committee once more that the Indian Government would never undertake the suppression of opium in India. The Assembly had sanctioned this decision, and he did not desire to question its wisdom. He only referred to India as a producing and exporting country. Turkey, Persia and India were the three principal producing and exporting countries. He hoped that both Turkey and Persia would be represented at the next session of the Committee, and he suggested that the three countries might come to an understanding to reduce proportionally their present exports of opium to the Far Eastern possessions of European Powers. His suggestion struck at the root of the whole question, *i.e.* at production. The Committee had always interpreted the Hague Convention in the sense that that instrument placed no limitation on the production of raw opium, while another of its clauses provided for the gradual and effective suppression of prepared opium. India or Persia could not, under the terms of the Convention, export prepared opium, but they could export without limit raw opium to Ceylon, Singapore or to any other place, where it was all converted into prepared opium. This was, in his opinion, an absurd

position. There seemed to be a joker in the Convention pack of cards. For this reason he had frequently impressed upon the Committee that the limitation of production was the only real solution.

Mr. Campbell had shown that there had been a reduction of exports to two out of seven or eight Far Eastern possessions. In Singapore, on the other hand, there had been an increase in the years 1918-1920. Since 1918, the consumption in the Federated Malay States had remained constant. It was the same in Siam. The reduction in Hong-Kong was more apparent than real, since Indian opium had there been supplanted to some extent by Chinese opium, and Persian opium had elsewhere taken the place of Indian.

It was quite true that the Indian Government did not export a single ounce of opium to a country which did not ask for it. The Committee, however, must remember that the Far Eastern possessions of European Powers were not in the position of self-governing countries. They were Crown colonies ruled by Governments in Europe, and the responsibility for what happened attached to those Governments. This responsibility was all the greater because the people concerned were not nationals of the countries holding Far Eastern possessions but were Chinese settlers who carried back the habit to China.

One thing was quite clear: whatever the amount of opium produced it would all be consumed. The amount produced was the amount consumed, and unless production was reduced the problem would never be solved. His opinion was based on experience. He had dealt with the problem in China for ten years from 1907-1917. In China, during that period, the question had been attacked from the standpoint of production. Consumption had been considered a secondary question. The Committee had reversed this procedure. For ten years production was gradually reduced in China, and had been, in the end, practically suppressed. Despite the present very disturbed state of China, most of the reform which had been accomplished by 1917 still remained. The International Opium Association at Peking went so far as to say nine-tenths of it. In his own opinion, at least three-quarters of it remained. The reduction, therefore, in China was far greater in proportion than the reduction in the Eastern Possessions of other Powers, and that meant that the overseas Chinese — that was, the Chinese living under Western rule — were in a far worse position as regards opium than the Chinese living in their own country. This was not to the credit of the Western countries concerned.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that public opinion did not demand the limitation or the regulation of the opium evil but its suppression. Smallpox, plague, or the white slave traffic were not limited; they were exterminated. It was in the hope of ridding the world of this evil that the first International Opium Commission had been called by the United States in 1908. The Hague Convention was either so inadequate or so narrowly interpreted that it failed to meet the situation.

Regulations were necessary, but they were of secondary importance. Production was the kernel of the matter, and it was the opinion of the disinterested part of the world that production should be reduced to medicinal and scientific needs. This principle should be accepted by the Committee and its adoption urged upon the great opium-producing countries of India, Turkey and Persia. Public opinion in the United States was demanding the restriction of cultivation to medicinal needs, and America had so recognised that the use of opium was an evil for which no financial gain could compensate that she had brought the opium trade in the Philippines to a termination at the end of five years, without financial disaster to that country.

The regulations of the Indian Government seemed to her to be made not for the protection of the people against a vice but as commercial regulations of a branch of commerce. The Convention had not intended to put its seal upon this form of traffic. This was the statement of the Philippines Opium Commission, which had made a study of the opium situation as it had existed in the Far East. It had been quoted by Lord Morley in the House of Commons in connection with his comments on the Report of the Royal Commission of 1894.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he repudiated with the utmost energy, on behalf of his Government, the concluding paragraph of the statement of Mrs. Hamilton Wright. He could assure the Committee that the insinuation was entirely incorrect. The policy of the Indian Government regarding opium had never been determined by financial considerations, and the results achieved by that Government in India were sufficient evidence of the injustice of the accusation. The proportion which the whole opium revenue bore to the revenue of India was 3.2 %. The figure regarding India's export opium trade was 1.6 %.

Mrs. Hamilton Wright had laid stress upon the action taken by the United States in the Philippines. The Government of India had, as far back as 1880, that was to say, long before the action taken by the United States, passed similar measures, far more drastic and far more complete, regarding a territory larger than the Philippines, and with, he thought, a larger population. This territory was Upper Burma. When the Indian Government had taken over Upper Burma, it had decided that the consumption of opium there was deleterious and had immediately suppressed it. From the day that that country had been taken over until the present time, there had been no opium consumed in Upper Burma and no possibility of the inhabitants getting any.

The same reason which had caused the Indian Government to prohibit the consumption of opium in Upper Burma had caused it to limit it under a specially restrictive system in Lower Burma and had led it to continue the consumption of opium in other parts of India. Its sole guiding motive had been the welfare of the Indian people. In one part it had prohibited consumption; in another part it was firmly of opinion that consumption should be permitted, and no degree of pressure would move the Indian Government from that position.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that if the consumption of opium, in the opinion of the Indian Government, was essential to the health of the population, this was a question entirely within

its own jurisdiction. That Government had a right to grow it, but only for home consumption. It could regulate this as it thought best. The Powers, however, had signed a Convention to protect the rest of the world from opium and had a right to protest against the international traffic. This could be done without injuring the necessities of the people of India. The Indian Government could do what it liked with the opium consumed in India but would have to check what went out of the country.

In reply to a question by Sir John Jordan, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Indian Government's regulations regarding the consumption of opium in Lower Burma, where there were large numbers of Chinese, were extraordinarily complete. Only registered consumers were allowed to obtain opium and these were a fixed number. No name was added to the list, and as each consumer died the list grew smaller. He believed that Siam had an exactly similar procedure.

On the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to postpone the further consideration of this subject until its next session.*

36. *List of Drugs prepared by the French Government.*

The CHAIRMAN submitted two resolutions put forward by Dr. Anselmino.

The Committee adopted the first resolution in the following form:

“The Committee recommends:

“That the Chairman should communicate with the Director of the Health Committee with a view to causing the list furnished by the French Government to be considered by the next Sub-Committee of the Health and Opium Committees, since this question appears to be primarily a medical one.”

The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to Dr. Anselmino's second proposal, to the effect that States should be asked to transmit to the Secretariat copies of any scientific publications dealing with the medical employment of narcotic drugs, he was somewhat doubtful. Governments could not well be asked to make a collection of scientific works and present them to the Secretariat of the League. They should only be asked to send in their own official publications.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) suggested that the Committee might ask for the names of these publications.

M. BRENIER suggested that the Librarian of the Secretariat might get into touch with the various scientific bodies. The Academy of Medicine in France, for instance, would, he felt sure, immediately communicate a list of publications.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed with M. Brenier.

After a short discussion, *the Committee decided, on the proposal of the Chairman, to instruct the Secretary to discuss the matter with the Librarian of the Secretariat and to report to the Committee at its next session.*

37. *World's Requirements of Drugs. Report of the Mixed Sub-Committee (Annex 6).*

The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the Sub-Committee, which had been prepared by Dr. Anselmino, had been laid before both Committees (Health and Opium) for their information.

M. BRENIER said that there were various passages in the report with which he could not agree. The passage in which it was said that the use of cocaine as a stimulant was a legitimate one was not, in his opinion, true, nor in conformity with the opinion of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this passage in the report was merely the expression of Dr. Anselmino's personal opinion and that the decision of the Sub-Committee had been entirely different.

The enquiry into the world's requirements of drugs, which the Health Committee was undertaking at the request of the Opium Committee, was still continuing, and the report in question should only be regarded as a progress report.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that it would be a mistake to place morphine and cocaine amongst stimulants. They were dangerous habit-forming drugs and should only be prescribed or dispensed under physicians' orders. He could not agree that stimulants were necessary to mankind nor that racial or climatic conditions had anything to do with the craving for stimulants and narcotics. Social conditions might have some influence, but the controlling factors were the example of habit and the medical and the non-medical use of these drugs. The production of opium referred to in the Hague Convention was understood in America to mean not only the manufacture and refining of the raw products but the growing of the poppy for the purpose of producing raw opium. The report of the Sub-Committee, therefore, seemed to limit the work

of the Committee to the correction of the abuses of opium, while many countries signatory to the Convention desired to control production with a view to confining it to medical and scientific needs.

He had followed with the keenest interest and sympathy the praiseworthy efforts of the Advisory Committee and desired to take that opportunity to express his admiration of its work.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that when the question came before the Mixed Sub-Committee, it had first to decide what was to be the base of departure. As it had been instructed to draw up its report solely from the health and medical point of view, the Committee had decided that medical use should be considered the only legitimate use, and that all non-medical should be recognised as an abuse. He had objected to this conclusion, had voted against it, and had made a formal reservation, his reasons being that this matter had been decided, first by the Hague Convention, secondly by the Advisory Committee, and lastly by the Council and the Assembly, in the opposite sense.

He entirely agreed with Surgeon-General Blue that it would be most undesirable to recognise any possible use of cocaine or morphia as a stimulant. The Sub-Committee had not, he thought, considered this question.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) expressed his concurrence with Mr. Campbell's view.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the passages in the report to which objection had been raised were merely expressions of his own personal opinion and, as such, he was perfectly willing to delete them from the report.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT stated that the U. S. A. had never accepted the resolution of the Assembly as it did not desire to export opium other than for legitimate or medicinal requirements.

The CHAIRMAN enquired what action would be taken on the report of the Mixed Sub-Committee.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that the Health Committee would doubtless continue the enquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) gave certain explanations regarding the Sub-Committee's work. Starting from the basis that opium and its derivatives must be used for medical purposes only, the Sub-Committee had determined to institute four different methods of obtaining figures of the world's requirements. When the results of each method had been collected, the Sub-Committee would then determine whether they were concordant enough to give figures likely to command general acceptance. The first method was that of taking the export and re-export figures given in the answers to the questionnaire, subtracting them from the import figures, and dividing the result by the total number of the population. This was a very approximate method, as it took no cognisance of stocks in hand. The second method, to be pursued in the case of small countries, was to make enquiries from every hospital, every druggist and every vendor, add the totals thus collected, and divide the figure by the total number of the population. An exact computation of the existing consumption per head would thus be obtained. The third method was that adopted by Dr. Lambert in America, the details of which would be evident from the paper before the members of the Committee. Briefly, that method was: The average consumption of drugs per patient was deduced from an examination of the records of all hospitals or of selected hospitals. The sickness rate of the population generally was obtained from the records of assurance companies. This sickness rate was usually given as a percentage of the total population; and, inside this sickness rate, as it were, there was a further figure available as to the percentage of sick persons ill enough to require hospital treatment. By applying this latter figure, expressed as a percentage of the total population, to the *per capita* consumption of the drugs deduced from hospital practice, one was able to arrive at an estimate of the total medical requirements of the whole population in respect of these drugs. It would be noticed that this took no account of the cocaine used in dental practice, unless special enquiries on that subject were made; and the method also omitted from consideration the veterinary requirements of the population.

The fourth method was that when the import and export certificates system was in proper working order, figures certified by Governments should be obtained, and, from the import and export figures, a figure of *per capita* consumption could be worked out.

By these means the Sub-committee had hoped that it would be possible to obtain a series of figures which might, as regards some of the methods, be reasonably concordant. Once there was some amount of certainty, a legitimate figure could perhaps be arrived at, which the world generally would accept as reasonable because it would be based upon a variety of methods and would have the weight of experience behind it.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Campbell for his explanations, and suggested that the Committee should express concurrence with the Health Committee in the suggestion that the enquiry should continue on these lines. This could be indicated in the Committee's report.

The Committee adopted this proposal and deleted the whole of Section 2 of Dr. Anselmino's report (From "What constitutes an abuse?" to "this legitimate use may become an abuse").

38. *Opium in Free Ports. Transit Sub-Committee's Report (Annex 7).*

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to take note of the Transit Sub-Committee's opinion that the regime of a free port allowed the Sovereign State, by its ordinary police and supervisory

powers, to enact any measures for the control of the opium traffic in a free port which it considered necessary for the application of the International Opium Convention. At his suggestion, the Transit Sub-Committee had altered the last line of its recommendation (a) to "the necessary guarantees provided for in pursuance of the Opium Convention".

Recommendation (a) also referred to the question of a consignment passing through a free port on its way to its ultimate destination. Recommendation (a) would not prevent the altering of the destination in the free port.

The Transit Sub-Committee had promised to consider this question.

Subject to these two points, he and his colleagues had accepted the general principles suggested in the Sub-Committee's recommendations.

The Committee approved the action taken by its representatives on the Transit Sub-Committee.

39. *Black List* (Annex 8).

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that he had originally suggested the compilation of this list in order that there might be some means whereby the different Governments might be kept informed of the movements of certain persons in European and other countries who were carrying on an international traffic in dangerous drugs. His idea had been that the police, if they knew of such people, should, on their moving to another country, communicate with the police of the country to which these people had moved the fact that they had done so, in order that they could be watched. He had no wish to press his suggestion that the Secretariat should compile such a list if the Committee did not desire it. It would be sufficient if Governments would communicate freely with each other concerning the movements of such people, and thus adopt an arrangement similar to that adopted with regard to seizures.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he did not support the drawing up of black lists. There was no advantage to be gained from them provided that the interchange of information between Governments was carried on regularly.

M. CHARUVASTRA (Siam) said that publicity, in the case of these persons, was an added penalty, being by nature an important moral sanction, indirect but effective. He had developed certain legal considerations which he would like to put before the Committee when convenient.

The CHAIRMAN said that the essence of his proposal was secrecy. The police would have to keep the information in their own possession in order to prevent criminals being placed on their guard. He suggested that M. Charuvastra should circulate his proposal in writing to be discussed at the next session.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the Chairman's suggestion was similar to his own. It was not necessary to draw up a special list, provided the Governments communicated the information confidentially regarding illicit traffic.

Sir John JORDAN said that shipping companies often required information of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the police of each country would be able to warn the shipping companies.

M. CHARUVASTRA (Siam) said that in his proposal the information communicated confidentially should in certain cases be made public. He would, however, accept the Chairman's suggestion and circulate his proposal to be discussed at the next session.

The Committee adopted the Chairman's proposal.

40. *Bonded Warehouses and Entrepôts* (Annex 9).

The CHAIRMAN said that the Netherlands Government had asked whether the question of free ports included the question of bonded warehouses. The answer was in the negative, but he thought that the Committee should examine this question at its next session. He would circulate a note, which could be considered in the interval.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

41. *Letter from the Chinese Government regarding the Manufacture of Cocaine* (Annex 10).

Sir John JORDAN asked M. Chao-Hsin Chu for further information regarding the proposed establishment of a factory in China for the manufacture of morphine, mentioned in the letter of the Chinese Government. He did not think that the erection of this factory was in accordance with the treaties between China and certain States.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that the factory would, if established, only manufacture morphia for the legitimate use of the country. Its erection had been proposed by Sir Francis Aglen, Inspector-General of Customs. He regretted to state that he had very little information on this subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the proposal contained in the letter appeared to be contrary to China's treaties with Great Britain and America. He had always understood that there was little or no legitimate consumption of morphia or cocaine in China. His Government would, he felt sure, be grateful for any information regarding the proposed factory which M. Chao-Hsin Chu could communicate.

After a short discussion with the Chairman, M. Chao-Hsin CHU promised to obtain all possible information by the next session.

42. *Opium Trade in Chinese Turkestan* (Annex 11).

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a note circulated by Sir John Jordan regarding the opium trade in Chinese Turkestan.

Sir John JORDAN said that the British Consul-General at Kashgar had given him most reliable information showing that a considerable quantity of opium was being imported into Chinese Turkestan from Afghanistan and from Semirechia in Russia. There was no opium grown in the province of Turkestan, but the opium was cultivated outside its borders and smuggled in.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that he had official information which bore out Sir John Jordan's statement.

Sir John JORDAN said that continual pressure at Peking in 1918 had stopped this trade. It all depended upon the personality of the Governor of the province.

43. *Appointment of the Commissioners to investigate the Opium Provinces in China* (Annex 12).

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it a letter to the Secretary-General giving the names of the Commissioners appointed by the Chinese Government to investigate the alleged growing of the poppy in certain provinces of China. There were no names for the important provinces of Szechuan, Yunnan and Kuei-Chow.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that the Commissioners for these provinces would not be appointed by the Chinese Government until conditions of peace and order had been properly re-established in that part of China.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was glad that the Chinese Government had recognised the condition of these provinces. They were the three worst provinces of China as far as the production of opium was concerned. He thought that the Chinese Government should have sympathy and support in dealing with these provinces, for foreign support would be a considerable help in regard to this question.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking had been invited to give its co-operation in the matter and appoint representatives to accompany the Committee.

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that he thought the co-operation of the representatives of the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking with the Chinese High Commissioners could not be refused by the Chinese Government because it had accepted the proposal of the League. He would at once make enquiries regarding the invitation to this Association.

The Committee noted M. Chao-Hsin Chu's answer.

44. *Additional Staff for the Opium Section.*

The CHAIRMAN said that he had been much impressed by the great amount of work performed by the present staff of the Opium Section. He felt sure that the members would agree that the Secretary to the Committee had not nearly enough assistance to cope with the great mass of work involved by the work of the Committee. The Secretary-General had informed him that, provided there were sufficient funds available in the budget, he would have no objection to appointing extra staff. The Chairman suggested that the Committee should pass a resolution that extra staff should be appointed if the budget permitted.

Sir John JORDAN desired to associate himself with the Chairman's proposal. He had been much impressed by the efficiency of the Secretary and her staff.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he would support the proposal provided that it should be distinctly understood that there should be no increase in the budget of the League.

The Committee unanimously adopted the Chairman's suggestion.

45. *Date of the Next Session.*

After a short discussion, the Committee *decided to meet in May 1923 and to leave the exact date to be fixed by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman.*

46. *Seizures at Shanghai.*

M. Chao-Hsin CHU (China) said that he had circulated a report of the maritime Customs at Shanghai containing particulars of seizures.

47. *Statistics for 1921.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she would send in statistics regarding the manufacture of drugs in the United States in a few days.

ELEVENTH MEETING

held on Sunday, January 14th, 1923, at 11 a.m.

48. *Absence of several Members of the Committee.*

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that M. Chao-Hsin Chu (China), M. Ariyoshi (Japan) and M. Ferreira (Portugal) had informed him that they would be unable to be present. M. Ariyoshi would be represented by M. Kusama.

49. *Minutes of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Meetings.*

The Committee approved the minutes of the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth meetings with certain modifications.

50. *Comments of the Secretariat on the Annual Reports.*

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided that the comments of the Secretariat on the annual reports contained in the Secretariat's memorandum (Doc. O. C. 73 (a) had been laid before it confidentially and should not be published.*

51. *Examination of the Committee's Report (Annex 15).*

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India), *the Committee decided to discuss the report page by page.*

Sir John JORDAN said that he would like to propose several additions of a general nature to the report after the discussion; in his opinion the report was not entirely comprehensive.

The CHAIRMAN replied that he had had to write the report very hastily through lack of time and that no doubt some points had been omitted.

M. BOURGOIS (France) made some general observations on the report. On reading it he had had the impression that it did not contain an exact account of the discussions in regard to the following matter. He had thought during the discussion that most of the members of the Committee had been opposed to the second resolution of the Assembly. The arguments in favour of that resolution, if his memory was correct, had only been put forward by the Chairman and Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Campbell himself had made certain reservations. He was of opinion that these speakers had only laid before the Committee the two sides of the question and had not shown themselves very strongly in favour of the resolution. The report, on the other hand, gave the impression that there had been as many members of the Committee for the resolution as there had been against it. As no vote had been taken, it was difficult to determine exactly who had been for and who had been against it. The report as a whole, however, gave the impression that nearly all the members had been in favour of the resolution while, from his recollection of the discussion, the majority of members had been against it, and the other members had recognised the inconveniences of the measures and had hesitated to take a decision.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was true that no vote had been taken, but, in his opinion, if there had been a vote, only M. Bourgois and M. Van Wettum would have voted against it. Mr. Campbell would have voted for it. M. Ariyoshi had made a reservation on the question of price. Prince Charoon had not expressed an opinion and M. Chao-Hsin Chu had stated that, though his Government made no objection to the resolution, he would abstain from voting. As far as Dr. Anselmino and M. Ferreira were concerned, they had also not expressed an opinion. Personally he had abstained, in the circumstances, from expressing a definite opinion, and had contented himself with summing up the arguments for and against the resolution when the discussion had been brought to an end. He did not wish the report to give the impression that the Committee had either adopted or rejected the proposal. He had confined himself in the report to expressing the arguments for and against; he should have done no more and could do no less.

Sir John JORDAN reminded the Committee that he had declared himself to be against the proposal but thought that the report was an impartial one.

M. BOURGOIS (France) laid stress on the reserve made by M. Ariyoshi. This reservation would be a serious objection since it would be very difficult to reach an understanding regarding prices.

M. CHARUVAstra (Siam) thought that, although Prince Charoon had not given his personal opinion regarding the question, he would have had something to say on the same lines as M. Ariyoshi if the Committee had not postponed this question until the next session. The question of prices could be settled by an agreement between Governments. Further, the Committee had only discussed the principle contained in the resolution and had not voted upon it. Prince Charoon had not taken part in the discussion owing to the fact that no definite proposal had been made. A reservation made by a member of the Committee did not imply that that member voted against the principle involved.

M. BOURGOIS (France) maintained that the question of price was not a secondary one, and that the question of principle was subordinate to it because a monopoly would be created were the resolution adopted. He agreed, however, with Sir John Jordan and withdrew his objection of principle.

Sir John JORDAN added that, since the Committee had postponed its decision, the Council would not in the meantime take any action with regard to the resolution, and the form in which that part of the report had been drafted which concerned the resolution raised no practical difficulties.

The Committee then proceeded to examine the report page by page.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that mention should be made in the report of the absence of the Serb-Croat-Slovene Delegate. This question had been brought before the Fifth Committee, of the Assembly and the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on that Committee had stated that his Government would send a delegate to the next meeting of the Committee. Ought not the Committee to express regret at the absence of this delegate, all the more so as his presence at its session of May 1922 had only been prevented by reasons of health?

M. BRENIER thought that it would be of use if a representative of Greece were invited to sit on the Committee since there was very important cultivation of the poppy in a certain part of Macedonia, which now belonged to Greece.

The CHAIRMAN said that he understood the largest part of the opium-producing districts of Macedonia belonged to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and that Greece itself produced very little opium.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph:*

"The Committee regrets that the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes has not yet seen its way to send a representative to the Committee in accordance with the renewed invitation of the Council and Assembly."

With regard to the following sentence: "In particular they are convinced that the import certificate system is the most effective method by which the States which are parties to the Convention", M. BOURGOIS (France) said that this phrase was a little too strongly worded, because the most efficacious method was, in his opinion, the imposition of very severe penalties on offenders. This was the method followed by the French Government, which had incurred, because of it, a certain amount of criticism from lawyers on the ground that the penalties were excessive; because, however, of the grave consequences due to the abuse of narcotics, the French Government had maintained these penalties, which were ten years' imprisonment and ten years' interdiction *de séjour*, not only for traffickers and consumers but also for all who aided and abetted others to obtain and use these drugs. This method was certainly as efficacious as the import certificate system.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) was of opinion that the system of importation certificates was the first line of defence and was of an international character, while the internal measures of which M. Bourgois had spoken were only the second line of defence.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government was in agreement with the French Government as to the necessity of heavy penalties for any infraction of the law, whether with regard to import, export or internal consumption, but the Committee was dealing with the first line of defence — that was, exports and imports. The penalties imposed on the delinquent, once he was arrested, were entirely questions of internal administration.

The Committee decided that the text in question should read as follows :

“In particular it is convinced that an import certificate system is the most effective method, so far suggested, by which the States that are parties to the Convention can be enabled to carry out their international obligations under the Convention with regard to the control of imports and exports under the Convention.”

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he was unable to accept the following sentence :

“What action should be taken with regard to exports from countries which are enforcing the Convention to countries which are not, is another and a very important question which requires consideration. But we do not deal with it now.”

Though the resolution, when adopted, would have a direct effect only upon imports, nevertheless it would have the immediate indirect effect of compelling countries to take measures regarding exports. The two questions were interdependent. The fact of having adopted one measure would mean the adoption of the other. The fact of rejecting one meant also the rejection of the other.

The CHAIRMAN did not agree with M. Bourgois. One of the great difficulties in Great Britain had been to determine what action a State which had adopted the import certificate system should take with regard to an import of a State which had not adopted the system, and which refused to give a certificate that the import was or was not approved. It was, however, possible to deal with the question of exports in a second point without in any way dealing with the question of imports. The Assembly's resolution referred only to questions of imports.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that the Committee would do well to draw attention to the fact that the adoption of the measures regarding imports meant placing the Committee very shortly in the position of having to adopt measures regarding exports.

The CHAIRMAN thought that this was not the case. Supposing, for instance, that Switzerland desired to import narcotics, the representatives of the Netherlands and of Germany stated that their Governments would export the quantity asked for. Great Britain, on the other hand, had refused to export drugs to Switzerland until it had received an assurance that the drugs for which a request had been made were for legitimate purposes. English dealers had complained that their clients in Switzerland and in other countries complained that they had great difficulty of obtaining drugs from England, while they could easily obtain drugs from Switzerland, Germany and other countries.

The Committee took note of M. Bourgois' remarks and decided to insert, after the paragraph in question, the following sentence :

“Though the opinion has been expressed in the Committee that the adoption of the one system may entail the adoption of the other.”

On the proposal of M. Van WETTUM, the Committee decided to add, after the words “to increase illicit traffic”, the following sentence :

“It would also intensify the difficulties which have to be overcome in carrying out the measures, under Article 6 of the Convention, with regard to the gradual and effective suppression of the use of prepared opium.”

M. BRENIER, in commenting on the sentence “pointed out..... that opium of high quality, and in considerable amounts, is produced by other countries”, said that the production of opium in European Turkey was not considerable.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that this production amounted to about 150 tons.

M. BRENIER was of opinion that this figure was not a high one when compared with production in India. In British India the production of opium had been, in the year 1919-1920, 849 tons, and in the native States 291 tons for their own use and 158 tons for the use of British India.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) stated that the total figure of exports of Indian opium amounted to roughly 1,400,000 lbs. The production of European Turkey was, therefore, when compared with the production of India, in the ratio of 1 to 4.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the production in what had been European Turkey was, nevertheless, considerable when the world's legitimate requirements of morphia were taken into consideration. Great Britain, a country of 40 million inhabitants, only consumed 50,000 ounces of morphia a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, if a comparison were made between the total production of India and that of what used to be European Turkey, M. Brenier was right. India produced more opium than European Turkey. If, however, the export figures of Indian opium were compared with those of European Turkey, M. Brenier's remark no longer held good.

The Committee decided to draft the sentence in question as follows:

"It was pointed out that the amount of opium required for the manufacture of drugs to meet medical and scientific needs is only a comparatively small part of the world production of opium."

TWELFTH MEETING

held on Sunday, January 14th, 1923, at 3 p.m.

52. Continuation of the Discussion on the Committee's Report to the Council (Annex 15).

In commenting on the sentence "It was noted that the United States of America, which, by its new law, prohibits entirely the importation of the manufactured drugs and preparations to which the Convention applies, has apparently not considered the risk a serious one", M. BOURGOIS (France) was of opinion that the risk run by the United States was of a different nature. A State which, in executing the Hague Convention, had to put an embargo on the imports of manufactured drugs and preparations, could only reserve its decision with great difficulty. At least a year's notice had to be given before denouncing a Convention of this kind, and, further, a State could not be sure of being able to do so, because the denouncement of the engagement depended partly on obtaining the agreement of the other countries, while the moment an embargo had been imposed, as a result of a law purely national in its scope, of the kind which had been adopted by the United States, this embargo could be very quickly removed if necessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that M. Bourgois was right but that the report was, nevertheless, correct. If the United States had considered the risk to have been a grave one, it would have not have passed such measures.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the idea which he had put forward had been lost sight of during the course of the discussions and that he thought that it should be put before the Council.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to add after the sentence in question the following sentence: "though it is true that it has not undertaken an international engagement on the point, and would be free to alter its legislation if circumstances required."*

With regard to the next paragraph, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the proposed action to be taken would render all exports from Turkey and Persia completely illegal from the international point of view, but that the volume of trade as a whole would not necessarily increase. Only the illicit portion of the traffic would grow larger. A part of the trade which was actually legitimate at the moment from the legal point of view, but illicit from the moral point of view, would become illicit from both the moral and international points of view.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that, from the national standpoint, that was to say from the standpoint of Turkey and Persia, the trade would remain legally legitimate.

M. BOURGOIS (France) objected to the following phrase: "The situation must be dealt with, and no alternative method, which was immediately practicable, of dealing with it had been suggested."

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Bourgois' objection applied only to the Assembly's proposal concerning boycotting. The point the Committee was dealing with at the moment was the situation created by the abstention of certain countries from adhering to the Convention and accepting the import certificate system. It had been decided to postpone consideration of this for the moment. No other proposal had been laid before it.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Committee had not been qualified or called upon to make other proposals. It had simply given its opinion on the proposal which had been submitted to it.

The Committee decided to alter the last line of the sentence in question in the following manner: Instead of "had been suggested", the words "was before the Committee" were substituted.

Commenting on the sentence "Since the work of supervising this traffic and the execution of the Convention were entrusted to the League, great strides have been taken by many countries towards bringing the traffic under effective control", Sir John JORDAN asked which were the countries in question. The world production of opium had not decreased since the Committee had begun its work, and no real progress could be made until production was reduced. The Committee and the Secretariat had, indeed, done excellent work, but while the production of opium in the world remained at the same figure, real and lasting progress was impossible. The Committee should remember that every ounce of opium produced was consumed.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was referring to the work accomplished by individual countries and he thought it was no more than the truth to state that countries had been bringing the Convention into force and the traffic under control. The United States, for example, had, in the course of the last twelve months, passed very severe legislation. Great Britain had done the same, and the production of morphine in that country had fallen. The same was the case in France. Japan had passed similar legislation, and the Japanese Government had given a formal assurance that it would be strictly applied. The effects of these laws were only just beginning to be apparent, because in a matter of this kind results could not be felt immediately. The quantity of opium produced in Persia and Turkey was also unknown to the Committee. It seemed probable that the production in those countries had decreased.

Sir John JORDAN assured the Committee that the production of opium in the world in general had not decreased since the Committee had begun its work, and he asked what became of this opium. It was all consumed in one form or another.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that, as far as China was concerned, the production of opium had, indeed, increased.

Sir John JORDAN said that, until the Committee tried to find a means of reducing the production of opium, it would never touch the root of the evil.

M. BRENIER said that the anticipated adhesion of Turkey and Persia to the Convention justified the hope that satisfactory results would be attained. While he quite agreed with Sir John Jordan that the production of opium had not decreased, he was of opinion that the report should not give the impression that the Committee had been pursuing a vain task. He added that at Shanghai, for instance, the consumption of opium had diminished.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) did not agree with Sir John Jordan. The production of opium had apparently decreased. The last poppy crop in India had been the smallest that had ever been recorded. There had been a steady decrease from year to year. More than 10,000 lbs. of opium had, he noticed, been re-exported from Great Britain to Turkey because no buyers had been found in the former country. If Turkey was unable to sell her opium, she would not continue to cultivate the poppy. In certain districts of Persia it was said that the poppy had not even been gathered, because it had not been found possible to sell the crop. America's statistics showed that the import of opium into the United States had fallen from 700,000 lbs. to 100,000 lbs. in the last three years for which the Committee had statistics. Imports into Hong-Kong had decreased by 50 % and imports into North Borneo by 70 %.

Sir John JORDAN replied that the information in regard to Persia could hardly be accepted as authentic and that the decrease in Hong-Kong was due to the introduction of Chinese opium, the production of which had increased.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had done its best to combat this increase in China.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) showed that the production of morphine and cocaine in Germany had considerably decreased. The decrease was at least 25-30 %. This result had been due to the application of the Hague Convention.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to replace the first part of the sentence in question by the following phrase: "Since the Convention came into force"*.

Commenting on the sentence "the ultimate aim of restricting the production and use of opium and the other drugs to which the Convention applies to medical and other legitimate purposes", Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he did not understand the meaning of the word "legitimate". In reading Dr. Anselmino's report on the work of the Mixed Sub-Committee, he had been unable to understand the exact sense in which certain legal terms had been used. Did the word "legitimate" apply only to medical and scientific needs? He understood that the Committee desired to limit its activities, for the moment, to certain definite classes of problems. He thought, however, that the question of the interpretation to be given to the word "legitimate" should be raised at another session.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that it would be well not to raise a point which had already been the object of numerous discussions.

The CHAIRMAN desired to point out that the report as it was drafted followed the terms of the Assembly's resolution.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the opinion of the representative of the United States, who was sitting for the first time as a member of the Committee, should be mentioned in the report, all the more so because it was not entirely in accordance with the decisions already taken by the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) feared that if this opinion were recorded in the report, it would be bound to give rise to controversy. As far as this question was concerned, he himself was bound by the instructions of his Government. The statement of Surgeon-General Blue should only appear in the minutes.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that Sir John Jordan desired to inform the Council that Surgeon-General Blue's opinion was shared by him and by Mrs. Hamilton Wright. She thought it very important that the Council should be informed of the opinion of Surgeon-General Blue, which represented, as well, the opinion of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN asked if Surgeon-General Blue desired that the text of the report should be modified in accordance with the statement which he had just made.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that he had not wished to make a formal statement but simply to express his opinion. If the sentence meant that the consumption of opium and other drugs could be sanctioned by law for needs other than medical and scientific, he thought that this was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were three kinds of drugs in question: raw opium, prepared opium, and drugs manufactured from opium and its derivatives and the coca leaf. By the terms of the Hague Convention, the use of the manufactured drugs had to be limited to medical and scientific requirements. With regard to the use of prepared opium, the Convention laid down the principle that it should be suppressed, but allowed the suppression to be effected gradually in certain countries. Raw opium was used in three ways: (1) It was manufactured into drugs; (2) it was smoked; (3) it was used semi-medicinally in India and other tropical countries. The Council, the Assembly and the Advisory Committee had each in turn decided not to raise the question of the use of opium for semi-medicinal needs in such countries. They had never approved the uses of raw opium, which went beyond the Hague Convention.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that, while he could not accept the interpretations as stated, he did not wish to press the matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed, in order to meet Surgeon-General Blue, that the sentence should read as follows: "that a great advance will be possible towards securing the realisation of the objects of the Convention."

M. BRENIER supported Mr. Campbell's proposal. The sentence showed that the United States did not wish to go beyond the Hague Convention.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) asked if the Committee desired to adopt as its own the opinion expressed by the Mixed Sub-Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) and M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that it should not do so.

The former reminded the Committee that he had made a formal reservation in the Mixed Sub-Committee. During the course of the discussion on this subject, he had made the same reservation and had been supported by M. Van Wettum.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) asked if the Committee had formally adopted the report of the Mixed Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee had only to decide whether it agreed to the four methods of enquiry submitted by the Mixed Sub-Committee.

Sir John JORDAN asked what account the Committee should take of the statement contained in the report of the Mixed Sub-Committee that only the medical use of opium should be considered as legitimate.

The CHAIRMAN replied that it was only for the Committee to concur with the proposals regarding the methods of enquiry proposed by the Mixed Sub-Committee for determining the world's legitimate requirements.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the decision of the Mixed Sub-Committee concerning the legitimate use of opium was against the terms of the Hague Convention and against the previous decisions of the Council, the Assembly and the Advisory Committee. However, the Mixed Sub-Committee had only been considering what methods of enquiry should be adopted to determine the quantities of narcotics necessary for the legitimate requirements of the whole world, and they had clearly to adopt some base. He did not think that the base actually adopted—though, in his view, wrong—would occasion any serious difficulties in actual practice, at any rate, as regarded European countries and America.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) asked if the report of the Sub-Committee would be published as an annex.

The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative. The question of the legitimate use of opium had not been mentioned in the Committee's report as that question had not been discussed by the Committee. If the Committee had been of opinion that the legitimate use of opium ought to be confined to medical and scientific needs it would be going beyond the terms of the Hague Convention. The question thus raised was a very important one and would have to be very carefully examined. It would be best for the Committee to keep to the actual text.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) proposed that the question of the definition of "legitimate needs" should be placed on the agenda of the next session, together with the conclusions of the Mixed Sub-Committee regarding the medical and non-medical use of opium (see the Sub-Committee's report).

The Committee adopted this proposal.

53. *The Question of the Publicity of Meetings.*

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the proposal which he had made, and which had been supported by Surgeon-General Blue, M. Chao-Hsin Chu and Mrs. Hamilton Wright, to the effect that the last meeting of the Committee should be open to the public, should be mentioned in the report as having been rejected. He thought that the Council should be informed that the proposal had been put forward in order that it might express an opinion on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was not in the least opposed to the holding of public meetings, but that it would be regrettable if the question were raised in the report. It was merely special circumstances, which had affected only the present session, which had prevented the Committee from holding a public meeting during that session. As the report would be published, the proposal of Sir John Jordan would do more harm than good to the cause of publicity.

Sir John JORDAN reminded the Committee that he had frequently asked during the course of the last two years that the meetings of the Committee should be open to the public, and that for two years he had been unable to carry his point. It was now time that the Council and the public should be informed of this.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as a result of the conversation which he had had with the Secretary-General, greater publicity had been given to the work of the Committee. More comprehensive communiqués had been given to the Press. He was ready to discuss the question whether it was possible to hold public meetings during the next session. Sir John Jordan could submit a formal proposal on this question at the next session.

The CHAIRMAN declared the session to be at an end.

M. CHARUVASTRA (Siam) proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman for the manner in which he had directed the work of the Committee during the session.

The Committee unanimously adopted this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Charuvastra and the Committee

ANNEX 1.

ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF ANNUAL TRAFFIC IN PERSIAN AND TURKISH OPIUM.

The absence of any report from either the Turkish or Persian Governments makes it practically impossible to arrive at any reliable figures representing the total volume of opium export from those countries. Any attempt to arrive at such figures by the indirect method of summarising the imports of Turkish and Persian opium recorded in the statistics of various countries would very possibly lead to the same opium being counted several times. Few, if any, of the available statistics show the net imports per annum after deduction of the re-exports. No summary so compiled can be accepted as accurate, but figures of imports into any given country for the last 11 years give an indication of the volume of the export trade in opium from Turkey and Persia. From the statistics furnished by the United Kingdom in reply to the questionnaire, it would appear that the import into the United Kingdom of opium from Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia for the last 11 years amounted to no less than 2,727,005 lbs.

The imports from Persia for the corresponding period amounted to 1,932,148 lbs., showing an average annual import into the United Kingdom of 247,909 lbs. of Turkish and 175,641 lbs. of Persian opium, or a total annual average import of some 189 tons of Turkish and Persian combined.

During the war years 1916, 1917 and 1918, the recorded imports dropped to only a small fraction of the average annual figures.

The imports into the United Kingdom for the years 1910 to 1920 were:

	Lbs.		Lbs.
From Turkey during 1910	439,740	From Persia during 1910	166,820
1911	299,950	1911	136,591
1912	234,976	1912	254,178
1913	362,593	1913	136,464
1914	453,853	1914	260,999
1915	214,289	1915	492,894
1916	29,411	1916	193,283
1917	21,420	1917	207,802
1918	560	1918	48,649
1919	337,123	1919	30,558
1920	333,090	1920	3,910
Total for 11 years	2,727,005 lbs.	Total for 11 years	1,932,148 lbs.

The various consular reports available throw no light on the total production of Turkey. These reports deal with separate districts and not with Turkey as a whole, which makes it difficult to arrive at comprehensive figures. However, in the general report on the trade and economic conditions of Turkey issued by the British Department of Overseas Trade in 1921, some light is thrown on the direction which the export trade from Turkey is taking. In that report it is stated that restrictions imposed in England and in the United States of America and the difficulty of obtaining a Government licence is causing shipments to be diverted to other countries. A certain quantity is going to South America. "Other European countries where export restrictions are more elastic are now developing into distributing centres and are importing quantities far in excess of anything they did previously."

From the replies to the Questionnaire C. 171 (1) it will be seen that the amount of Turkish and Persian opium transhipped at Bombay *en route* mainly for Singapore, Hong-Kong and Formosa was:

		Lbs.			Lbs.
Turkish opium	1911	88,000	Persian opium	1911	283,800
	1912	61,600		1912	132,000
	1913	165,000		1913	380,600
	1914	57,200		1914	228,800
	1915	2,376		1915	418,000
	1916	—		1916	286,000
	1917	—		1917	424,600
	1918	286		1918	325,600
	1919	17,600		1919	149,600
	1920	561		1920	160,600

These figures show that during the period 1914 to 1919 the total amount of Turkish opium transhipped at Bombay was 77,462 lbs. and Persian 1,832,600 lbs. or a total of 1,910,062 lbs. When this amount is added to the total imports into the United Kingdom and the United States of America for the same period, the total obtained is 5,889,675 lbs. or an average of some 981,612 lbs. per annum.

As the imports into the United States of America (see Table I) make no distinction between Turkish and Persian opium, it is not possible to accurately apportion the amount of each in the annual total. If, however, the amount imported into the United States is reckoned at 50 % Turkish and 50 % Persian, the following figures are arrived at:

Persian Opium.

Years 1914-1919	Lbs.
Net imports into the United Kingdom	1,234,185
Imports into the U. S. A.	1,030,402
Transhipped at Bombay	1,832,600
	<hr/>
	4,097,187 lbs.

Turkish Opium.

Years 1914-1919	Lbs.
Net imports into the United Kingdom	684,625
Imports into the U. S. A.	1,030,401
Transhipped at Bombay	77,462
	<hr/>
	1,792,488 lbs.

These figures indicate that the combined Turkish and Persian opium traffic cannot be less than some 1,000,000 lbs. per annum.

TABLE I.

Statistics compiled from information contained in publications issued by the United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

*Import into U. S. A.
Opium containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia.*

From	1914 lbs.	1915 lbs.	1916 lbs.	1917 lbs.	1918 lbs.	1919 lbs.
France	—	—	1,711	—	1	2,577
Germany	32,339	32	—	—	—	—
Greece	—	2,940	46,367	6,138	27,087	45 521
Italy	—	2,268	2,291	4,285	815	—
Portugal	—	—	4,500	—	—	—
Turkey in Europe . . .	160,514	228,162	13,644	599	—	322,469
England	39,372	38,258	62,665	65,356	126,173	40,207
Canada	—	—	—	177	—	—
Cuba	—	—	25	—	—	—
Persia	—	—	1,216	10,257	3,758	780
Turkey in Asia	222,975	212,367	14,239	—	—	318,718
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	455,200	484,027	146,658	86,812	157,834	730,272

TABLE I — *continued.*

Turkish Opium	1914 lbs.	1915 lbs.	1916 lbs.	1917 lbs.	1918 lbs.	1919 lbs.
English imports	453,853	214,289	29,411	21,420	560	337,123
English re-export to United States of Amer.	39,372	38,258	62,665	65,356	126,173	40,207
United States of America imports, Turkish and Persian.	455,200	484,027	146,658	86,812	157,834	730,272

*Imports into the United Kingdom and the United States of America
during the years 1914-1919.*

	Lbs.
Total imports of Turkish opium into United Kingdom	1,056,656
Total re-exports of Turkish opium into United States of America	372,031
Net imports of Turkish opium into United Kingdom	684,625
Total imports, Turkish and Persian, into United States of America.	2,060,803
Total imports of Persian opium into United Kingdom	1,234,185
Total imports United Kingdom and United States of America, Turkish and Persian.	3,979,613 lbs.

ANNEX 2.

TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.

I. SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF OPIUM CONVENTION.

Resolution 1.

1. That the Council of the League should be requested to urge on all States which have not yet done so, and in particular on Switzerland, Persia and Turkey, the desirability of bringing the Opium Convention of 1912 into force in its entirety without delay.

At the request of the Council of the League, a letter was despatched by the Secretary-General on May 30th, 1922, to all Governments which had not signed nor ratified the International Opium Convention of 1912.

As a result of this letter the following Governments have either signed or ratified:

LUXEMBURG (ratified),

MONACO (signed),

VENEZUELA (signed Protocol bringing Convention into force).

ALBANIA.

As will be seen by the attached table of signatures and ratifications, Albania is the only State Member of the League which has not signed the Opium Convention. A letter was received from the Government of Albania on February 20th, 1922, stating that this Government was willing to adhere to any convention tending to suppress the use of dangerous drugs. The Secretary-General replied calling the attention of the Albanian Government to the International Opium Convention and requesting it to give its early consideration to the signature of this Convention. The letter of May 30th was also despatched to Albania. Further steps with regard to the signature by Albania were taken in December 1922 when the Secretary-General despatched a letter to the Government of Albania quoting his two letters above mentioned and stating that, in view of the fact that the signature and ratification of the Opium Convention would be discussed at the next meeting of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium in January, he hoped that the Albanian Government would see its way to signing the Convention as soon as possible. No further reply has as yet been received.

CHILE.

The Government of Chile has signed the Convention but has not yet ratified it. On September 11th, 1922, however, the delegate of Chile made a statement to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly stating that his Government was on the point of ratifying. A letter was despatched to the Government of Chile on December referring to this statement and asking if any steps had yet been taken.

COLOMBIA.

A letter was received from the Government of Colombia dated March 18th, 1922, stating that the ratification of the Opium Convention was to be submitted to the National Congress at its next session in July 1922. It was also stated in this letter that the Government of Colombia hoped to be able to provide their delegate at the Third Assembly of the League of Nations with the necessary powers to deposit the instrument of ratification. This ratification, however, was not deposited, and a letter was therefore sent to that Government on October 31st, 1922, asking what decisions had been taken by the National Congress in July on this subject.

PERSIA.

The delegate of Persia made a statement on September 16th to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly to the effect that the Persian delegation hoped soon to be in a position to announce to the Assembly that this Government would ratify the Opium Convention without reservation. This announcement was, however, not made to the Assembly, and a letter was despatched to Prince Arfa-ed-Dowleh on November 22nd asking him if any decision had been reached on this subject. A reply has been received from His Highness stating that he was in communication with the Persian Government on this matter.

SWITZERLAND.

The delegate of Switzerland made a statement on September 9th to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly to the effect that Switzerland hoped to ratify the Convention during the month of December 1922.

ARGENTINE, COSTA RICA, ESTHONIA, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, PARAGUAY.

These Governments have signed the Convention but have not ratified it. A letter was despatched to them on December 13th, 1922, requesting them once more to consider the early ratification of the Convention.

ABYSSINIA, AFGHANISTAN, LICHTENSTEIN.

A further letter was despatched to these Governments on December 13th bringing this matter again to their attention.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

A letter was received from the Government of the Republic of Dominica dated September 23rd, 1922, through the Netherlands Government stating that, as Parliament was not meeting at the moment, the Government of the Republic of Dominica thought it wiser to refrain from taking any action in the matter at present.

MEXICO AND ECUADOR.

The Netherlands Government has also been requested to communicate again with the Governments of Mexico and Ecuador with reference to the ratification and bringing into force of the Convention by those countries.

Statement as to Signatures and Ratifications of the Opium Convention of 1912.

PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION (SIGNED AND RATIFIED)		MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				NON-MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				
		Parties to the Convention	States which have signed and ratified but not signed the Protocol putting Convention into force	States which have signed but not ratified	Non-parties to the Convention	States Parties to the Convention	States which have signed and ratified but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force	States which have not ratified	Non-Parties	
1. Africa, South. 2. America, U.S. of. 3. Australia. 4. Austria. 5. Belgium. 6. Bolivia. 7. Brazil. 8. Bulgaria. 9. Canada. 10. China. 11. Cuba. 12. Czecho-slovakia. 13. Danzig. 14. Denmark. 15. Ecuador. 16. Finland. 17. France. 18. Germany. 19. Great Britain. 20. Greece. 21. Guatemala. 22. Haiti. 23. Honduras.	24. Hungary. 25. India. 26. Italy. 27. Japan. 28. Liberia. 29. Luxemburg 30. Nether-lands. 31. New Zealand. 32. Nicaragua. 33. Norway. 34. Panama. 35. Peru. 36. Poland. 37. Portugal. 38. Roumania. 39. Salvador. 40. Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. 41. Siam. 42. Spain. 43. Sweden. 44. Uruguay. 45. Venezuela.	1. Africa, South. 2. Australia. 3. Austria. 4. Belgium. 5. Bolivia. 6. Brazil. 7. Bulgaria. 8. Canada. 9. China. 10. Cuba. 11. Czecho-slovakia. 12. Denmark. 13. Finland. 14. France. 15. Great Britain. 16. Greece. 17. Guatemala 18. Haiti. 19. Honduras. 20. Hungary. 21. India.	22. Italy. 23. Japan. 24. Liberia. 25. Luxemburg 26. Nether-lands. 27. New Zealand. 28. Nicaragua. 29. Norway. 30. Panama. 31. Peru. 32. Poland. 33. Portugal. 34. Roumania. 35. Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. 36. Siam. 37. Spain. 38. Sweden. 39. Uruguay. 40. Venezuela.	1. Salvador.	1. Argentine. 2. Chile. 3. Colombia. 4. Costa Rica 5. Esthonia. 6. Latvia. 7. Lithuania. 8. Paraguay. 9. Persia. 10. Switzer-land.	1. Albania.	1. America, U. S. of. 2. Danzig. 3. Germany.	1. Ecuador.	1. Dominican Republic. 2. Mexico. 3. Monaco. 4. Russia.	1. Abyssinia. 2. Afghani- stan. 3. Lichten- stein. 4. Turkey.

— 19 —

II. IMPORTATION CERTIFICATES.

Resolution 2.

2. That it is most desirable that the system of importation certificates unanimously adopted by the Council and the Assembly of the Leagues should be brought into force by countries in Europe, America, Africa and Australia not later than September 1st, 1922, and by other countries not later than January 1st, 1923; and that the Governments should be asked to adopt the form of importation certificate proposed by the Advisory Committee”.

On May 30th, 1922, a letter was sent to all Governments quoting the resolution adopted by the Council in May 1922 and urging the acceptance of the import certificate system on all Governments whether or not they had adhered to the Opium Convention of 1912. A copy of the form of the certificate recommended by the Advisory Committee was enclosed.

As a result of this letter the following Governments have agreed to put this system into force either on or before January 1st, 1923:

Albania	Esthonia	Italy
Austria	Great Britain	Japan
Czechoslovakia	Greece	New Zealand
Denmark	India	Poland

The following countries intimated their adherence to the principle of the system but gave no date as to when the system would be brought into force. A letter was therefore written to these countries in December 1922, with a request that they would inform the Secretariat as to the date on which this system would be put into force in their country.

Australia	Haiti	Peru
Bulgaria	Latvia	Siam
China	Lithuania	South Africa
Cuba	Luxemburg	Sweden
Germany	Norway	Switzerland

SWITZERLAND.

Owing to the fact that the Swiss Government has announced its intention of putting the system into force as soon as the Convention of 1912 is ratified, no further correspondence has as yet taken place with this Government.

PANAMA.

By a decree dated March 1922, supplied to the Secretariat under Article 21 of the Opium Convention (Appendix 1), the Government of Panama would seem to have adopted this system. As, however, no official intimation on this subject has yet reached the Secretariat, a letter was forwarded to the Government of Panama on December 1st, 1922, with a request that the Secretariat might be informed if this were the case.

MEXICO.

According to an extract from the *Times Trade Supplement* of November 12th (Appendix 2), the Mexican Government would also appear to have adopted this system. As in the case of Panama, however, no official acceptance has been received. The Netherlands Government was therefore asked on November 27th, 1922, to ascertain the position in Mexico.

FRANCE.

On December 8th, a letter was written to M. Jean Gout, Directeur du Service français de la Société des Nations, asking him if the French Government could see its way to adopting this system before January 1st, 1923. No reply has yet been received.

GERMANY, PORTUGAL, NETHERLANDS.

These three Governments have again been approached through the representatives on the Advisory Committee. No replies have yet been received.

Up to the present no replies have been received from the following countries:

Afghanistan	Ecuador	Persia
Argentine	Guatemala	Roumania
Abyssinia	Honduras	Salvador
Bolivia	Hungary	Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Brazil	Iceland	Spain
Chile	Liberia	Turkey
Colombia	Lichtenstein	Uruguay
Costa Rica	Monaco	Venezuela
Danzig	Nicaragua	
Dominican Republic	Paraguay	

A further letter was sent to these countries on November 4th, 1922, but no replies have yet been received.

A list of departments issuing the certificate in the following countries is appended:

Albania	Direction générale de la Santé.	
Australia	Collector of Customs in each State.	
Belgium	Ministère de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène.	
Bulgaria	Direction de la Santé publique près du Ministère de l'intérieur du Royaume.	
Canada	Department of Health, Ottawa.	
Denmark	Direction de la Santé publique, Ministère de la Justice.	
Great Britain	Home Office, London.	
India:		
1. Madras	Board of Revenue, Separate Revenue, Madras.	
	Officer	Area
2. Bombay	Commissioner in Sind	Province of Sind
	Political Resident	Aden
	Collector of Bombay	Bombay Town and Island
	Commissioner of Customs, Salt and Excise	Rest of the Presidency.
3. Bengal	Excise Commissioner, Bengal.	
4. Burma	Excise Commissioner, Burma.	
5. Bihar and Orissa	Commissioner of Excise, Bihar and Orissa.	
6. United Provinces	Excise Commissioner, United Provinces.	
7. Punjab	Secretary to the Financial Commissioners, Punjab.	
8. Central Provinces	Excise Commissioner, Central Provinces.	
9. Assam	Excise Commissioner, Assam.	
10. North-West Fron- tier Province	Revenue Commissioner, North-West Frontier Province.	
11. Delhi	Chief Commissioner, Delhi.	
12. Ajmer-Merwara	Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara.	
13. Coorg	Commissioner, Coorg.	
14. Baluchistan	The Revenue Commission, Baluchistan, Quetta.	
Latvia	Pharmaceutical Section of Health Department.	
Luxemburg	Service sanitaire.	
New Zealand	Comptroller of Customs, Wellington.	
Poland	Ministère de l'Hygiène publique.	

Appendix I.

DECREE No. 25 OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE OF PANAMA OF MARCH 27th, 1922,

Regulating the importation of opium, its salts and derivatives, in conformity with the Hague Convention dated January 23, 1912, adopted by Panama in accordance with Article 295 of the Treaty of Versailles, of which she was a Signatory.

Whereas the Republic of Panama, as a Signatory of the Treaty of Versailles, has adopted the Hague Convention, dated January 23, 1912, concerning the Traffic in Opium, in accordance with the provisions of Article 295 of the Treaty;

And whereas, under Article 89 of the Fiscal Code of the Republic, it is forbidden to import opium other than that employed for medical purposes, and it is provided that this product may be imported only with the permission of the Minister of Finance;

And whereas neither Law No. 46 of December 20, 1912, nor Law No. 19 of December 22, 1916, passed by the National Assembly, nor Decree No. 65 of June 5, 1920, published by the Ministry of Finance contain such special provisions as are necessary for the strict execution of the obligations contracted by the Republic with regard to the traffic in opium:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC,

in exercise of his legal authority,

HEREBY DECREES:

Article 1. — As from the date of the promulgation of the present decree, all hospitals and druggists established within the Republic, desiring to acquire abroad opium, morphine, codeine, cocaine, heroin, dionin, marcein, (?) their salts, their derivatives of every kind, or similar substances shall make a declaration on oath to the Ministry of Finance to the effect that the drugs which they propose to import are exclusively intended for medical or scientific purposes.

The Ministry of Finance shall send a certificate to the importer which the latter shall deliver to the foreign exporter in order that the respective authorities may authorise the exportation.

Article 2. — Since the importation into the country of opium and the other drugs referred to in the preceding article (except such as are intended exclusively for medical and scientific purposes) is prohibited under Law No. 46 of 1912 and Law No. 19 of 1906, their exportation shall also be prohibited, as their exportation or re-exportation constitutes a purely commercial and separate act, for which no authorisation exists.

Article 3. — The traffic in the drugs in question shall be regulated concurrently by Law No. 46 of December 20th, 1912, and Law No. 19 of December 22nd, 1916; by the provisions contained in this decree and, in other cases where no special regulations exist, by the general regulations contained in the Hague Convention of January 23rd, 1912, adopted by Panama in accordance with Article 295 of the Treaty of Versailles, of which she was a Signatory.

Article 4. — The Ministry of Finance and the port authorities of the Republic shall transmit to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs a detailed monthly report concerning the importation of opium, cocaine, morphine and its derivatives and similar substances through the various ports of the Republic, for use within the Republic in order that the Ministry may forward this report to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The report shall state the nature of the drug, the quantity imported, the name of the importer, the date of importation, the name of the country and the authority granting the importation permit, the port of lading, the place of the substance's destination and any other remarks it may seem fit to communicate with a view to improving the control of the traffic in these drugs.

Article 5. — The Government of the Republic shall confiscate all opium, cocaine, morphine, codein, heroin, dionin, marcein, their salts, their derivatives and similar substances if these arrive clandestinely at Panama ports, or if any clandestine attempt is made to export them, in contravention of the laws and decrees permitting their importation for medicinal or scientific purposes only.

Article 6. — Decree No. 65, of June 5th, 1920, published by the Department in this connection shall be annulled, together with all other provisions which may conflict with those contained in the present decree.

The above shall be communicated and published.

Given in Panama this twenty-seventh day of March in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

(Signed) BELISARIO PORRAS,
EUSEBIUS A. MORALES,
Minister of Finance.

Appendix 2.

EXTRACT FROM "THE TIMES TRADE SUPPLEMENT", NOVEMBER 18th, 1922.

Drug Imports into Mexico. Official Prohibitions.

The Mexican Consul-General in London announces that his Government, with a view to restricting the importation into the Mexican Republic of all such drugs, narcotics, etc., as are injurious to public health, has issued instructions to all its Consulates abroad to acquaint exporters of these goods that no consular invoices covering the said drugs may be legalised hereafter, and that the introduction of such goods into Mexico is strictly prohibited unless a special permit is obtained beforehand from the Department of Health (Departamento de Salubridad) at Mexico City, which permit must be presented at the Consulate at which the respective invoices are legalised.

The drugs that are included in the above regulation are the following:

Opium, raw, in powder, and extract of;
Morphine, its salts, and products of;
Heroin (diacetylmorphine and its salts);
Thebaine (alkaloid of opium);
Papaverine (alkaloid of opium);
Laudanine (alkaloid of opium);
Nareine (alkaloid of opium);
Cocaine and its salts;
Dionine (chlorhydrate of ethylmorphine);
Peronine (chlorhydrate of benzylmorphine);
Stovaine (chlorhydrate of amylene);
Marihuana, papaver somniferum;
Eucaine.

III. ANNUAL REPORT.

See separate document O. G. 73 (a).

IV. TRAFFIC IN COCAINE.

Resolution 8.

8. That, in order to facilitate the general control of the traffic in dangerous drugs, the Committee recommends:

(a) That the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible;

(b) That the Council of the League should invite the Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries;

(c) That the Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police authorities;

(d) That the Governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs;

(e) That, as experience shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent, the Governments should consider the question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty.

Summary of Replies from Governments to Enquiries into the Manufacture and Total Requirements of Cocaine in their Countries, etc.

On June 1st, 1922, a letter was despatched to all Governments, requesting information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine, estimate of total annual requirements, etc.

Replies have been received from:

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. South Africa | 5. Finland | 9. Luxemburg |
| 2. Belgium | 6. Great Britain | 10. New Zealand |
| 3. Canada | 7. India | 11. Norway |
| 4. China | 8. Italy | 12. Czechoslovakia |

Countries from whom no reply has been received are as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Abyssinia | 19. Spain | 37. Panama |
| 2. Afghanistan | 20. Esthonia | 38. Paraguay |
| 3. Albania | 21. United States of America | 39. Netherlands |
| 4. Germany | 22. France | 40. Persia |
| 5. Argentine | 23. Greece | 41. Peru |
| 6. Australia | 24. Guatemala | 42. Poland |
| 7. Austria | 25. Haiti | 43. Portugal |
| 8. Bolivia | 26. Honduras | 44. Roumania |
| 9. Brazil | 27. Hungary | 45. Salvador |
| 10. Bulgaria | 28. Iceland | 46. Kingdom of the Serbs,
Croats and Slovenes |
| 11. Cuba | 29. Japan | 47. Siam |
| 12. Chile | 30. Latvia | 48. Sweden |
| 13. Colombia | 31. Liberia | 49. Switzerland |
| 14. Costa Rica | 32. Lichtenstein | 50. Uruguay |
| 15. Danzig | 33. Lithuania | 51. Venezuela |
| 16. Denmark | 34. Mexico | |
| 17. Dominican Republic | 35. Monaco | |
| 18. Ecuador | 36. Nicaragua | |

(a) *Summary of statistics of manufacture of cocaine.*

Resolution 8 (a).

8. The Committee recommends:

(a) That the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible.

South Africa	}	No manufacture of cocaine.
Belgium		
Canada		
China		
Great Britain		
India		
New Zealand		
Norway		
Czechoslovakia		

Finland	}	No manufacture. Necessary quantities for internal consumption imported.
Luxemburg		
Italy	}	Measures have been taken to collect information and it is hoped that statistics will be forwarded to Secretariat before January 1st, 1923.

(b) *Replies concerning statistics of estimated annual requirements of cocaine for internal consumption.*

Resolution 8 (b).

8. The Committee recommends:

(b) That the Council of the League should invite the Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries.

I. SOUTH AFRICA.

"...is not at present in a position to furnish an estimate of the annual requirements of cocaine in the Union of South Africa."

2. BELGIUM.

"...that the Ministry of the Interior and of Health is conducting an enquiry with a view to determining the legitimate requirements of the country in respect of narcotics."

3. CANADA.

Submits the following figures:

Cocaine hydrochloride	3,000 ozs.
» muriate.	200 »
» alkaloid	100 »
» chlorhydrate	10 »
Coca leaves	200 lbs.
Soft extract of coca leaves	100 »

4. CHINA.

"What little cocaine the medical doctors use has been imported from abroad. But it is impossible to find a basis for the statistics of annual consumption without concentrating the power of control over smuggling and without a central organ for the manufacture of drugs. For these purposes the Chinese Government is planning to establish a bureau for the control and supervision of all the illicit drugs, which will keep a close watch on the different seaports so that no smuggling will be allowed and accurate statistics of the importation of drugs for legitimate use will soon become available."

5. FINLAND.

"The contents of the note will be submitted to the competent authorities for examination."

6. GREAT BRITAIN.

"As regards the resolutions (b) and (d), a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General in due course."

7. INDIA.

"The various Provincial Governments in India have been asked to furnish the Government of India with an estimate showing, as nearly as possible, the total annual requirements of cocaine in their respective provinces, and the information, when received, will be consolidated and supplied to the India Office for the use of the League."

8. ITALY.

"His Majesty's Government has taken measures to collect the information called for, which it hopes to be in a position to transmit before January 1st, 1923."

9. LUXEMBURG.

"The quantity of cocaine considered necessary for the requirements of the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg is estimated at 5 kilogrammes per annum. "

10. NORWAY.

"It is impossible to furnish exact data in regard to the annual consumption of cocaine; it depends on various circumstances and varies from one year to another; it may, however, be assumed that it is about 18 kgs. per annum."

11. NEW ZEALAND.

"Estimate for year 1922: 15 kgs. of cocaine."

12. CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"Information relative to the consumption of cocaine will be communicated to the Secretariat as soon as the enquiries on this subject now proceeding have been brought to a conclusion."

(c) Summary of replies concerning mutual exchange of full information concerning seizures made.

Resolution 8 (c).

8. The Committee recommends:

(c) That the Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police authorities.

Belgium	}	Agree to the exchange.
China		
Czechoslovakia		
Great Britain		
India		
Italy		
Luxemburg		
New Zealand		

Note: India states that this information will be supplied by asking Provincial Governments to include in their excise memoranda details of all seizures.

Italy states that the resolutions on this subject will receive a full measure of consideration in the provisions now in course of preparation for giving effect to the Hague Convention, in execution of Order in Council No. 335 of February 9th, 1922.

Finland	}	Matter submitted to competent authorities.
Canada		Future annual reports to League will contain all information with regard to seizures.
South Africa		

Note: The attention of the Governments of South Africa and Canada has been drawn to the fact that information with regard to seizures should be supplied direct to the Governments concerned as well as notified to the Secretariat of the League.

Norway	The matter is receiving the attention of the Government.
--------	--

- (d) *Summary of replies concerning advisability of undertaking educational work as to dangers of indulgence in the drugs.*

Resolution 8 (d).

8. The Committee recommends:

(d) That the Governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs.

I. SOUTH AFRICA.

"Through the medium of the medical councils, pharmacy boards and other organisations and the public Press, steps are being taken to educate public opinion as to the dangers of indulgence in habit-forming drugs."

2. BELGIUM.

"The Ministry of Health will carefully consider the advisability of educating the people in regard to the dangers involved in the use of narcotics."

3. CANADA.

"An educational campaign, with a view to warning the general public of the dangers of indulgence in narcotics, is being carried on in this Dominion."

4. CHINA.

"The Government will put into execution without delay the resolution providing for undertaking educational work as to indulgence in the drugs."

5. FINLAND.

"The contents of the note will be submitted to the competent authorities for examination."

6. GREAT BRITAIN.

"As regards the resolutions (b) and (d) a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General in due course."

7. INDIA.

"The drug habit in India not being widely prevalent, an educational campaign does not appear to be called for at the present time."

8. ITALY.

"His Majesty's Government agrees as to the expediency of the resolutions adopted by the League of Nations at its April session relating to the general control of the traffic in stupefying drugs dealt with under paragraph (d). They will receive a full measure of consideration in the provisions now in course of preparation for giving effect to the Hague Convention, in execution of Order in Council No. 335 of February 9th, 1922."

9. LUXEMBURG.

"The Grand-Ducal Government considers that education of this character is necessary, and it will be entrusted to the Luxemburg Red Cross Society and other competent organisations."

10. NORWAY.

"The Norwegian Government will give careful attention to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium as reproduced in paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of your letter."

11. NEW ZEALAND.

Question under consideration.

12. CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"The Czechoslovak Government regards it as advisable, and indeed as a duty, to instruct the people in regard to the dangers involved in the use of noxious drugs if the enquiry shows it to be necessary."

(e) *Summary of replies concerning question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment on illicit traffickers as an alternative to pecuniary penalties.*

Resolution 8 (e).

8. The Committee recommends:

(e) That, as experience shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent, the Governments should consider the question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty.

I. SOUTH AFRICA.

"It will be noted from the Draft Proclamation (Clause 17) that the penalties provided for contravention are a fine of up to £100 or imprisonment without the option of a fine for not exceeding six months, or both such fine and imprisonment."

2. BELGIUM.

"By a law of February 24th, 1921, the Belgian Government has anticipated the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium regarding the suppression of the clandestine traffic in narcotics. It should be added that the fines provided by this law have been increased by 2,000 % by the law of July 24th, 1921."

3. CANADA.

"The Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, Chapter 36 of the Statutes of 1920, as amended, 1922, establishes a minimum penalty, in case of persons found guilty of trafficking in narcotics, of a term of six months' imprisonment with a fine of two hundred dollars and costs, and a maximum penalty of seven years' imprisonment.

"In case of sale to a minor, the Court has the power to order the lash."

4. CHINA.

"It has attached severe penalty to any illicit traffic in morphine and cocaine."

5. FINLAND.

"The contents of the note will be submitted to the competent authorities for examination "

6. GREAT BRITAIN.

"His Majesty's Government have under consideration the introduction of legislation to increase the penalties imposed by the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1920."

7. INDIA.

"Provision already exists in India for the infliction of a penalty of fine or imprisonment or both in cases of unlawful import, export, transport, manufacture, possession, etc., of excise articles, including cocaine."

8. ITALY.

"His Majesty's Government has taken measures to collate the information called for, which it hopes to be in a position to transmit before January 1st, 1923."

9. LUXEMBURG.

"The law of April 29th, 1922, regarding the preparation and sale of medicaments and poisonous substances provides for sentences of imprisonment of from eight days to three months, and for fines of from 100 to 2,000 francs. In the case of a second offence within a period of two years these penalties may be increased to double the maximum."

10. NORWAY.

"The Norwegian Government will give careful attention to the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium, as reproduced in paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of your letter."

11. NEW ZEALAND.

Question under consideration.

12. CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"In the Czechoslovak Republic the traffic in these drugs is subject from now onwards to provisions which make it possible to punish contraventions by fines and imprisonment."

V. TOTAL REQUIREMENTS OF OPIUM AND ITS DERIVATIVES FOR INTERNAL CONSUMPTION.

Resolution 4.

That the Council should invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912, and other States Members of the League, to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption *per annum* of opium and its derivatives, indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required, and in the case of opium derivatives the amounts should be given in terms of morphine content.

The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far-Eastern countries, where the Chinese are the principal consumers, should be available by that date.

Summary of replies to enquiries made into the total requirements for internal consumption of opium and its derivatives per annum and per country.

On May 30th, 1922, a letter was despatched to all Governments requesting that an estimate as to the total requirements of opium and its derivatives for internal consumption in each country might be supplied to the Secretariat.

Replies have been received from the following Governments:

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------|
| 1. South Africa | 4. Finland | 7. Luxemburg |
| 2. Canada | 5. India | 8. Norway |
| 3. China | 6. Italy | 9. Czechoslovakia |

No replies have so far been received from the following countries:

- | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Abyssinia | 20. Spain | 39. Nicaragua |
| 2. Afghanistan | 21. Esthonia | 40. Panama |
| 3. Albania | 22. United States of America | 41. Paraguay |
| 4. Germany | 23. France | 42. Netherlands |
| 5. Argentine | 24. Great Britain | 43. Persia |
| 6. Australia | 25. Greece | 44. Peru |
| 7. Austria | 26. Guatemala | 45. Poland |
| 8. Belgium | 27. Haiti | 46. Portugal |
| 9. Bolivia | 28. Honduras | 47. Roumania |
| 10. Brazil | 29. Hungary | 48. Salvador |
| 11. Bulgaria | 30. Iceland | 49. Kingdom of the Serbs,
Croats and Slovenes |
| 12. Cuba | 31. Japan | 50. Siam |
| 13. Chile | 32. Latvia | 51. Sweden |
| 14. Colombia | 33. Liberia | 52. Switzerland |
| 15. Costa Rica | 34. Lichtenstein | 53. Uruguay |
| 16. Danzig | 35. Lithuania | 54. Venezuela |
| 17. Denmark | 36. Mexico | |
| 18. Dominican Republic | 37. Monaco | |
| 19. Ecuador | 38. New Zealand | |

Of the replies received only two contain a statement of estimated requirements. These estimates, from Canada and Luxemburg, are reproduced on separate tables. Attention is drawn to the absence of any information relative to the method adopted to arrive at the estimate for Canada. Enquiries have been made but no reply has so far been received.

It will be seen that less than 4 per cent. of the Governments written to have sent in any estimate of their total requirements for internal consumption.

Summary of information contained in replies received.

SOUTH AFRICA.

The Government is not in a position to furnish detailed estimates of annual requirements of the different kinds of opium in the Union further than can be gathered from the importations of opium during recent years.

The summary of importation of opium into the Union of South Africa is not accompanied by any summary of re-exports from the Union into neighbouring South African territories, although such re-exports are admitted to exist to a limited extent. The absence of data of re-exports makes the summary incomplete. It is claimed, however, that "the average imports of the past few years may be taken as substantially representing the approximate annual requirements of the Union under present conditions."

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

CANADA.

The Government furnishes a statement of the requirements of Canada, and, whilst no details are given of the system adopted for arriving at the figures furnished, the following information was supplied by the Government of Canada: "Based on the 1921 census of the population of Canada, which was 8,769,489, 93,870 grains of morphine were consumed per 100,000, or an annual *per capita* consumption of 0.9387 grains".

In connection with the above statement, attention is drawn to the disparity between the morphine *per capita* consumption as given by the Canadian Government and that given by Dr. Madsen in his estimates of consumption in Sweden (C. 223. 1922. XI, page 22).

The figures submitted as being a statement of requirements appear to be based upon previous importation rather than a scientifically established estimate of requirements from hospital data.

CHINA.

"Although opium and its derivatives have been dealt with severely in China, it is impossible to find a basis for statistics of annual consumption without concentrating the power of control and without a central organ for the manufacture of drugs. For these purposes, the Chinese Government is planning to establish a bureau to keep a close watch on all illicit drugs, and also a factory for manufacturing drugs for legitimate use. As soon as these two institutions come into existence, the Chinese Government will give accurate statistics regarding the information under consideration."

FINLAND.

This Government acknowledges receipt of letter C. L. 48 and states: "I shall not fail to inform the competent authorities of this letter and to draw their serious attention to its contents."

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

INDIA.

The India Office states that a copy of C. L. 48 has been communicated to the Government of India.

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

ITALY.

The Government acknowledges receipt of letter C. L. 48 and states that it hopes to be able to send the desired information before January 1st, 1923.

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

LUXEMBURG.

The Government has not forwarded a statement of estimated requirements but has sent a statement of the amount of cocaine, heroin, morphia and opium consumed during the years 1913, 1919 and 1920 according to information collected by the College of Medicine from chemists in Luxemburg. The absence of customs control on the German frontier makes it impossible to obtain information as to the place of origin of the drugs. Luxemburg has no manufactories of narcotics, and relies for her supplies upon imports. Figures representing consumption per 100,000 inhabitants are given in a separate table. For purposes of this return, the population of the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg was taken in round figures at 265,000 inhabitants. Whilst the return sent is not a statement of estimated requirements, it has evidently been drawn up to take the place of such an estimate.

NORWAY.

The Government states that it is unable to furnish information other than that supplied in answer to the questionnaire, and that reply is to the effect that "it has, unfortunately, not been possible to obtain detailed information as to the quantities consumed in different years."

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"There are no statistics for the manufacture and consumption of opium derivatives. In regard to the proposal to determine the stocks of opium and similar drugs, enquiries are being made, the results of which will be communicated as soon as possible. The same will be done in regard to the returns to be supplied in respect of the annual consumption of opium and its derivatives, as required by the letter C. L. 48."

No statement of estimated requirements was furnished.

Statistics furnished in reply to enquiries for estimated requirements

CANADA.

Estimates of amounts required:

Morphine Sulphate Crystals.	6,500	ozs.
» » Powder	2,000	»
» Muriate	200	»
Ethyl Morphine	500	»
Morphine Hydrochloride	100	»
» Acetate	100	»
Acetomorphine	50	»
Apomorphine	50	»
Diacetyl Morphine (Heroin)	1,500	»
Dionine	100	»
Codeine Phosphate.	4,100	»
» Sulphate	800	»
» Alkaloid	100	»
Opium (Gum)	1,500	lbs.
» (Powder	200	»
» (Extract).	25	»
Poppy Heads	250	»

GRAND-DUCHY OF LUXEMBURG.

Amounts of narcotics consumed within the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg during the years 1913, 1919 and 1920:

1. Cocaine. . .	1913	3,007 grammes	3. Morphine .	1913	5,156 grammes
	1919	4,607 »		1919	7,373 »
	1920	4,998 »		1920	7,936 »
2. Heroine . .	1913	260 grammes	4. Opium . .	1913	23,615 grammes
	1919	411 »		1919	31,134 »
	1920	533 »		1920	33,098 »

VI. SUMMARY OF REPLIES CONCERNING LIST OF DRUGS SUPPLIED BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

Resolution 8(f).

8. The Committee recommends:

(f) That the list of drugs not covered by the Convention of 1912 communicated by the French Government should be referred to the interested Governments for their observations; and that, pending the receipt of such information, the question of holding a further international conference should be postponed

On May 30th, 1922, a list, furnished by the French Government, of various chemical products which give rise to effects similar to those of morphine and cocaine was circulated to the various Governments, together with a copy of the Advisory Committee's recommendation which had been adopted by the Council of the League of Nations regarding this list.

The recommendation in question read:

"That the list of drugs not covered by the Convention of 1912 communicated by the French Government should be referred to the interested Governments for their observations, and that, pending the receipt of such information, the question of holding a further international conference should be postponed."

The final paragraph of the circular letter in question read as follows:

"I shall be happy to receive any observations which the Health Department of your Government may wish to make with regard to the subject of this letter, in order that the matter may be considered later by the Advisory Committee in the light of such additional information or comments as may be furnished by interested Governments."

Replies have been received from the following Governments:

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. South Africa | 5. Great Britain | 9. Roumania |
| 2. Canada | 6. India | 10. Siam |
| 3. Esthonia | 7. Italy | 11. Sweden |
| 4. Finland | 8. Norway | 12. Czechoslovakia |

No replies have so far been received from the following Governments:

- | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Abyssinia | 19. Dominican Republic | 37. Monaco |
| 2. Afghanistan | 20. Ecuador | 38. New Zealand |
| 3. Albania | 21. Spain | 39. Nicaragua |
| 4. Germany | 22. United States of America | 40. Panama |
| 5. Argentine | 23. France | 41. Paraguay |
| 6. Australia | 24. Greece | 42. Netherlands |
| 7. Austria | 25. Guatemala | 43. Persia |
| 8. Belgium | 26. Haiti | 44. Peru |
| 9. Bolivia | 27. Honduras | 45. Poland |
| 10. Brazil | 28. Hungary | 46. Portugal |
| 11. Bulgaria | 29. Iceland | 47. Salvador |
| 12. Chile | 30. Japan | 48. Kingdom of the Serbs,
Croats and Slovenes |
| 13. China | 31. Latvia | 49. Switzerland |
| 14. Colombia | 32. Liberia | 50. Uruguay |
| 15. Costa Rica | 33. Lichenstein | 51. Venezuela |
| 16. Cuba | 34. Lithuania | |
| 17. Danzig | 35. Luxemburg | |
| 18. Denmark | 36. Mexico | |

Summary of replies.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Forwards a draft Proclamation on habit-forming drugs to be made under Section 10 of Act No. 35 of 1922 and states that: "It is expected that this Proclamation will be promulgated within the next month or so, to be in force throughout the Union of South Africa. The law empowers His Royal Highness the Governor-General to proclaim any substance a habit-forming drug and to add it to Annex A of the Schedule. In the conditions now obtaining in South Africa it is not considered necessary to make any addition to Annex A of the Draft Proclamation at present."

CANADA.

Forwards an extract from a letter from the Deputy Minister of the Health Department on the matter, which reads as follows: "A number of the preparations mentioned in the list are already covered by the laws of the Dominion of Canada, *i.e.*, dionine, peronine, apomorphine, eupomorphine and eucaïne.

"The balance of the drugs mentioned are mostly synthetic products, and from our experience in Canada there is no abuse in any of these drugs; in actual fact, they are used to a limited extent. Novocaine and similar preparations are employed fairly extensively as local anæsthetics by the dentists.

"In the circumstances, the Department is of the impression that, in so far as Canada is concerned, the time is not opportune to add to the list of drugs already covered by the International Opium Convention."

ESTHONIA.

"The list presented by the French Government of the various chemical products the effect of which is similar to that of morphine and cocaine has been submitted for examination to the Esthonian Health Council, and it has been decided to control the following products: dionine, peronine, apomorphine, holocaine, eucaïne, euphtalmine, novocaine, alypine, stovaine, narcophine, pantopon and paverone."

FINLAND.

"Some of the drugs mentioned in the list in question are derivatives of morphine and already come within the scope of the Convention, which specifies: 'All new derivatives of morphine, of cocaine, or of their respective salts, and every other alkaloid of opium which may be shown by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill effects.' For this reason the Finnish medical authorities are of opinion that the drugs mentioned below may be excluded from the list, viz:

"1. Direct or quasi-direct derivatives of morphine; dionine or chlorohydrate of ethylmorphine and peronine or chlorohydrate of benzylmorphine, as well as direct or quasi-direct derivatives of cocaine: ethylbenzylecgonine or cocaethylic, propylbenzylecgonine, butylbenzylecgonine and cinnamylecocaine, as these are already covered by Article 12 of the Convention.

"2. The substances mentioned in the list which have neither euphoric nor narcotic effects, viz: apomorphine, eucaine A, eucaine B, euphtalmin or phenylglycolylmethylvinylidiacetone alkamine, novocaine or chlorohydrate of paraamidobenzoate of ethyl, subcutine or paraphenolsulfonate of anesthesine, antihesine, alypine or chlorohydrate of benzyltetramethyldiaminopentonal, stovaine or chlorohydrate of adimethylamine benzylpentonal.

"On the other hand, in respect of helocaine or paradiethylethenyldephenylamidine, tropacocaine and antiron, the medical authorities are of opinion that there is good reason to include them in the list of drugs not covered by the 1912 Convention."

GREAT BRITAIN.

Forwards the observations of H. M. Ministry of Health on the list of drugs communicated by the French Government, which, after dealing with the derivation and action of these drugs, states:

"Summing up, it will be seen that on consideration of their nature and effects there would be no case for the restriction of any of the drugs above-mentioned, with the possible exceptions of artificial cocaine, holocaine, alypine, and tropacocaine, and even in these cases, there is no evidence of addiction in this country. Moreover, power for dealing with abuse is already afforded by the Dangerous Drugs Act.

"It is important to note that some of the drugs mentioned—notably eucaine, novocaine, alypine and stovaine—are used in medical practice as substitutes, for necessary purposes, for cocaine, in the belief that they are less liable to abuse. Until that belief is clearly shown to be erroneous, it is undesirable to place obstacles in the way of their use. Attention is drawn to this point also in the communication from the Secretary-General of the League of Nations dated May 30th.

"It is, perhaps, desirable that attention should be drawn to two points which will doubtless be taken into consideration in connection with proposals for widening the scope of restrictive legislation. The first is that the difficulty of effective control, and, consequently, the danger of leakage, increases in perhaps more than direct ratio with the number of substances, control of which is attempted. Secondly, that the publicity inseparable from legislation may have an effect the contrary of that which is desired, by advertising the names of substances previously unknown, and thus creating a tendency to abuse, which was previously non-existent. Both these considerations point to the desirability of conservatism in the development of restriction, and basing it not upon theoretical possibilities of abuse of drugs but upon definite evidence of existence of such abuse."

INDIA.

This Government states:

"So far as the Government of India is aware, there is no abuse in India of the various chemical products detailed in the list drawn up by the French Government. They agree with the view of the Advisory Committee that it is not desirable to institute control over the use of any one particular drug unless the necessity for such action is clearly established."

ITALY.

Transmits a memorandum containing the observations of the Health Department of the Ministry of the Interior, passages from which read as follows:

"The Ministry of the Interior has examined the recommendation made by the Council of the League of Nations in regard to substances which are not referred to in the Hague Convention of 1912.

"The Ministry feels bound to recognise, in principle, the advisability of the extension of the provisions of the Opium Convention of 1912 to substances not covered by that Convention, but which produce the same effects as those expressly referred to in the Convention; this had been borne in mind in drawing up the regulations which are now under examination for the execution of the Opium Convention in Italy and the Italian Colonies in application of the Royal Decree of February 1922, No. 335.

"The provisions of the aforesaid Convention are not, indeed, intended to constitute a hindrance to the legitimate use of the substances to which it refers, but only to establish an effective control to prevent their misuse, and there appears therefore to be complete justification for extending this control to all drugs of whatever origin or nature which are found by research to produce effects analogous to those of the substances covered by the Convention. There can be no logical difference of opinion on the part of the States signatories to the Convention and of the States Members of the League.

"This principle being granted, it only remains for the specialists to determine what substances can rightly be regarded as giving rise to the narcotic effects of the substances referred to in the Convention.

"This Ministry agrees that the list of the drugs to which the Convention should be extended should be determined by a special international agreement. But it has no hesitation in expressing its own view that it would be more advisable, instead of convening a special international conference, to adopt some simpler and more rapid system, such, for example, as the exchange of Notes adhering to the conclusions which may be adopted by the Opium Committee of the League of Nations as a result of the investigation and examination which it may be able to carry out and co-ordinate, on the basis of the data furnished by the Governments interested, in the same way as is being done in regard to the problem of standardisation of sera and vaccines."

NORWAY.

"In the experience of the Public Health Service, there is no abuse of dangerous and narcotic drugs in Norway. The Norwegian Government, however, is prepared to collaborate in the conclusion of a convention with a view to preventing the abuse of all drugs which have effects similar to those of opium."

ROUMANIA.

States that the Royal Department of Public Health declares that the derivatives in question are subject in Roumania to the provisions of the new regulations for the importation, exportation, manufacture and sale of opium.

SIAM.

This Government states:

"The Department of Public Health is of opinion that it will not be useful to extend the provisions of the Opium Convention (1912) to include all the chemical products mentioned in the list supplied by the French Government.

"Nevertheless it is believed it would be both useful and helpful if, without necessarily calling a new conference, it were possible to bring within the scope of the Convention any drug 'which may be shown by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill effects', such as morphine, cocaine, etc."

SWEDEN.

Transmits a memorandum from the Director-General of the Swedish Medical Services in which it is stated that: "In this connection, we support the opinion expressed by the Special Commission that there are no grounds for restricting the use of these drugs until the necessity for control has been fully justified; there does not appear to be such justification in regard to these particular substances."

The memorandum concludes with a suggestion to the effect that: "If a conference were to decide to draw up a list of drugs which are not included in the Opium Convention, but which would be subject, by reason of their effects, to the provisions of that Act, we consider that it would be highly desirable to entrust to some permanent institution the duty of undertaking a periodic revision of the list in order to avoid the necessity of convening a conference for every revision."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"In the Czechoslovak Republic there is no widespread abuse of the drugs which figure in the 1912 Convention; there is also no general abuse of the drugs not covered by that Convention which call for measures similar to those of the Convention. The importation of, and the traffic in, these drugs are, moreover, restricted, according to the legal regulations in force, to persons holding special licences."

VII. WORK OF THE HEALTH AND OPIUM SUB-COMMITTEE WITH REGARD TO THE WORLD'S REQUIREMENTS OF DRUGS.

A meeting of this Committee is to be held on January 4th, 1923, and a report will be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium.

VIII. TRAFFIC IN FREE PORTS AND ZONES.

Arising out of the discussion on this subject at the April meeting of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, the following action has been taken:

After consultation with the Transit Section of the League, a letter was forwarded to all Governments on August 14th, 1922, enquiring as to the position at any free ports or zones in their territories as regards the imports and exports of dangerous drugs, and enquiring if, in the event of no control being at present enforced, Governments would feel it possible to take such steps as might be necessary in order to assume full control over these imports and exports.

As the measures to be taken involved a technical enquiry into the regime of free ports, the Advisory Committee for Communications and Transit was approached. A letter was sent to the Secretary of this Committee on July 8th, 1922, asking him to present this question to the Committee at its next meeting in order that the Opium Committee might be advised as to what practical measures could be taken in free ports or zones to prevent illicit drug traffic, and, if possible, what kind of technical proposals could be made to Governments to that effect. In September, at the third meeting of the Advisory Committee for Communications and Transit, a resolution was adopted (see page 79) appointing a special Sub-Committee to deal with this subject. On November 21st a letter was sent to the Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Communications and Transit, enquiring the probable date of the meeting of this Sub-Committee. A reply has been received stating that it was hoped that a meeting would be held on January 10th, 1923.

Answers to the letter from the Secretary-General despatched on August 14th have been received from the following countries:

CHINA.

The matter is in the hands of the Customs Bureau. As soon as this office has decided upon the measures to be taken to suppress any illicit traffic in free ports or zones, they will be communicated to the Secretariat of the League.

FINLAND.

No free ports or zones at present. Should such ports be created in the future, all steps necessary to ensure control over the traffic within these ports will be taken.

HONDURAS.

The matter has been referred to the Secretary of State and the Board of Trade. The reply of these Departments will be communicated to the Secretariat as soon as it is received.

NETHERLANDS.

There are no free ports or zones within the territory of the Dutch Government, unless the word "entrepôt" comes under the heading.

SOUTH AFRICA, NORWAY, SIAM.

No free ports or zones exist in these countries.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

The free zones established in the ports of Hamburg and Stettin remain German territory, Germany is therefore responsible for the control of traffic in these ports.

Resolution adopted by the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit at its Third Session.

The Committee for Communications and Transit, having been informed by the Opium Committee regarding the question of the control of the opium traffic in free ports, points out, in the first place, in order to avoid possible misunderstanding, that the regime of free ports—which is essentially and exclusively a customs regime — would not form an obstacle to the application of special police measures, particularly as regards the supervision of harmful and narcotic substances, provided that such measures do not cause any hindrance to the regime of commercial and industrial freedom which it is the object of the free ports to develop.

In bringing these observations to the notice of the Opium Committee, the Committee for Communications and Transit informs it that it is considering what police measures might be taken for the above-mentioned purpose.

Further, with a view to entering upon the study of this question, the Committee for Communications and Transit, acting in co-operation with the Opium Committee, has decided to appoint a special Sub-Committee composed of M. de Aguëro y Bethancourt (Chairman), M. Chargueraud, M. Holck-Colding, M. Montarroyos, M. Stievenard and M. Tcheou-Wei.

IX. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING SEIZURES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS.

On the instructions of the Advisory Committee at its meeting in September 1922, a letter was despatched to all Governments on October 22nd, 1922 (C. L. 120), asking if they would agree to the mutual exchange of information with regard to seizures of drugs, and a further letter was despatched on November 15th, 1922 (C. L. 129), asking that the name of the department authorised to receive information on this subject might be supplied to the Secretariat.

The following replies have been received:

FINLAND.

Agrees. For the time being the Department authorised to receive information is "Bureau de la Société des Nations du Ministère finlandais des Affaires étrangères."

GREAT BRITAIN.

Agrees to the exchange. Department: Under Secretary of State, Home Office, London.

INDIA.

The Secretary of State for India has informed the Secretariat that he is in communication with the Government of India on this subject.

ITALY.

Agrees to the Exchange. Department: Ministerio degli Interni-Direzione Generale di Sanita

LITHUANIA.

Agrees.

LUXEMBURG.

Agrees.

ROUMANIA.

Agrees. Department: "Direction générale du Service sanitaire au Ministère royal du Travail et de la Santé publique."

KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES.

Agrees. Department: Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Section pour la Société des Nations

SPAIN.

Agrees. Department: "Ministerio de Estado Oficina Española de la Sociedad de las Naciones."

Article IX of the Convention.

A letter was sent to all Governments on November 10th, 1922 (C. L. 127), asking for information as to what measures had been taken to carry out the provisions of Article IX of the Convention, *i.e.*, the limiting to legitimate purposes of the manufacture of morphine, etc.

Up to the present time only the following replies have been received:

CANADA.

States the restrictions imposed for the control of imports and exports of drugs. There is no manufacture in Canada.

FINLAND.

Sends a copy of a decree promulgated on November 27th, 1922, controlling all imports and exports. There is no manufacture in Finland.

INDIA.

Refers to paragraphs 19 and 20 of Despatch No. 14 of March 24th, 1921.

LUXEMBURG.

States that the article does not apply to the Grand-Duchy as there is no manufacture of drugs in that country.

Article XIV of the Convention.

On November 9th, 1922, a letter was sent to all Governments (C. L. 128) asking that a list of preparations considered to come under Article XIV in each country should be supplied to the Secretariat.

A reply has been received from the Government of India, through the India Office, giving a list of those drugs which are exempt from control referring to paragraph 24 (b) of Despatch No. 14 of March 24th, 1921.

ANNEX 3.

ANNUAL REPORT.

Resolution 10.

That the Council should invite the Governments, in making their annual report to the League on opium and other dangerous drugs, to adopt the form prepared by the Advisory Committee, to furnish the report not later than July 1st (in the case of Western countries) and October 1st (in the case of Eastern countries), and to make the report in one or other of the official languages of the League.

Summary of Replies received on Traffic in Opium and Drugs.

The Advisory Committee, which met at Geneva on May 2nd to 5th, 1921, made a recommendation to the Council to the effect that:

“A report should be made annually to the League by each country which is a party to the Convention, on the execution in its territory of the provisions of the Convention, with statistics of production, manufacture and trade.”

The Council endorsed the recommendation, which, under its instruction, was sent on July 6th, 1921, to the Governments of the States parties to the Convention for their favourable consideration. In May 1922 the annual report form drawn up by the Advisory Committee and adopted by the Council was sent to the same Governments, with a request that the returns for the year 1921 might be made as soon as possible in order to facilitate the work of the Advisory Committee.

Replies have been received from the following Governments:

Australia	France	Norway
Austria	Great Britain	Poland
Bulgaria	Italy	Siam
Canada	Japan	South Africa
Czechoslovakia	Netherlands	United States of America
Denmark	New Zealand	Venezuela
Finland		

but of these only five, viz., Canada, France, Great Britain, New Zealand and Poland, have sent reports.

Further letters were sent in December 1922 to all Governments which had not replied or which had not supplied reports.

No replies have been received from the following Governments:

Abyssinia	Germany	Monaco
Afghanistan	Greece	Nicaragua
Albania	Guatemala	Panama
Argentina	Haiti	Paraguay
Bolivia	Honduras	Persia
Brazil	Hungary	Peru
Belgium	Iceland	Portugal
Chile	India	Roumania
China	Latvia	Salvador
Colombia	Liberia	Kingdom of the Serbs,
Costa Rica	Lichtenstein	Croats and Slovenes
Cuba	Lithuania	Spain
Dominican Republic	Luxemburg	Switzerland
Ecuador	Mexico	Uruguay
Esthonia		

Copies of the actual replies received have been circulated to all members of the Advisory Committee and the present summary only reproduces those parts of the replies which require special consideration by the Advisory Committee. Attention is similarly drawn to the absence of replies to questions.

SOUTH AFRICA.

(October 9th, 1922.) Annual reports in respect of opium and habit-forming drugs will be furnished as far as practicable in the form shown in the annexes to letter No. G. L. 45.

AUSTRALIA.

(October 9th, 1922.) "Steps have now been taken whereby ordinances will be made to fully meet the requirements of the International Opium Convention and to ensure the carrying out of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee concerning the issue of certificates and the rendering of an annual report on the execution of the provisions of the Convention."

AUSTRIA.

(October 10th, 1922.) An annual report for the year ending September 1922 will be forwarded in due course. This report will contain particulars of the manufacture, distribution and consumption of cocaine called for in C. L. 52. No report for 1921 has been submitted.

BULGARIA.

(April 17th, 1922.) "The Bulgarian Government accepts the principle of the various resolutions on the opium traffic, but, for reasons of a technical nature resulting from the fact that a draft of a new Public Health Bill containing special provisions on the traffic in opium and its derivatives is under consideration and will shortly be submitted for approval by the Sobranje, the information asked for in letter 12(a) 18499/1917 can only be supplied later."

CANADA.

Forwarded on June 21st, 1922, the annual report for the year ended March 31st, 1922, prepared by the Department of Health, on the import, export, manufacture, sale and distribution of opium and narcotic drugs.

DENMARK.

(July 3rd, 1922.) "The Royal Government is prepared to furnish you with a report on the measures to be taken in Denmark to ensure the carrying out of the Opium Convention. You will also be supplied as far as possible with statistical data concerning the production, manufacture and traffic in opium, and, in general, with all information on this question which might be of use to the League of Nations."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(Forwarded by the Minister of the Netherlands June 12th, 1922.) The Government of the United States is prepared to forward, through the Netherlands Government, to the Powers signatory of the International Opium Convention, an annual report on the statistics of the production, manufacture and sale of narcotics in the United States, and information concerning the illicit traffic in these drugs, since, in the opinion of the said Government, this measure would be of great service in the campaign against the opium scourge.

FINLAND.

(July 31st, 1922.) "I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your Note of May 30th last, G. L. 45, referring, among other matters, to the drawing-up of an annual report to the League of Nations on opium and other dangerous drugs; I shall not fail to communicate this letter to the competent authorities and to recommend it to their careful attention."

FRANCE.

Forwarded on September 8th, 1922, a report on the traffic in opium and other drugs in respect of France for 1921.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Forwarded on August 18th, 1922, a report on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs in respect of the United Kingdom for 1921.

ITALY.

(August 16th, 1922.) The Italian Government is ready to adopt the plan drawn up by the Advisory Committee in so far as it provides for an annual report on opium and other dangerous drugs.

No separate report was received from the Italian Government, which forwarded instead a Note to the following effect: "The *de facto* and *de jure* situation as regards the traffic in opium and other drugs for the year 1921 is made clear by the replies to the questionnaire prepared in 1921 by the Advisory Committee. The Committee took note of these replies during its second session in April last. No further information bearing on the year 1921 is available."

JAPAN.

(January 14th, 1922.) With regard to the resolution concerning the transmission of an annual report, the Japanese Government has decided to conform to this resolution, but no annual report has been received.

NORWAY.

(April 4th, 1922.) "The Norwegian Government is prepared to furnish to the League of Nations, in addition to the annual report, information concerning the manufacture of and traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs."

NEW ZEALAND.

(February 10th, 1922.) "The New Zealand Government will annually make a report to the League on the execution in this Dominion of the provisions of the Opium Convention, with statistics of production, manufacture and trade." A report with statistics for the year 1921 has been received by the Secretariat.

NETHERLANDS.

(February 20th, 1922.) Accepts the principle of supplying the League of Nations with an annual report on the application of the provisions of the Convention, but has sent no report for 1921.

POLAND.

"It has not been possible to calculate with absolute accuracy the figures for 1921 which are given in this reply in regard to the statistics of the drugs specified in the Hague Convention, because the frontiers of Poland were not yet at that time finally fixed, and because the customs regulations had not yet in 1921 been applied in a uniform manner throughout Poland.

"The lack of general regulations concerning the importation and exportation and traffic in dangerous drugs also seriously impeded the obtaining of exact data on this subject. On September 21st last the Council of Ministers laid before the Diet a draft Bill concerning the traffic in narcotics in Poland, so that this important lacuna in the Polish legislation will soon be remedied."

SIAM.

(February 3rd, 1922.) "The resolution adopted by the Council and approved by the Second Assembly advocating the despatch of such report will have only just reached H. M.'s Government, so that the matter is now under consideration."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

(November 30th, 1922). "The Czechoslovak Government regrets that it is not, at the moment, in a position to furnish the League of Nations with the annual report on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs."

VENEZUELA.

(December 29th, 1921). Owing to the fact that, in the regulations concerning imports, opium was classed as "Other drugs" for the purpose of consular declaration, it has been impossible to draw up statistics concerning the opium traffic during the years 1910-1920. The only statistics received, compiled according to a system of import certificate recently enforced, have been summarised under the answers to the questionnaire.

A. GENERAL.

(1) Please mention any new legislation and important regulations and orders affecting the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs that have been issued during the year..... and any important changes in the administrative arrangements.

Please state particulars of any publication issued likely to be of interest to the Opium Advisory Committee.

CANADA.

No information supplied.

FRANCE.

Laws and Regulations in force in France. The legal provisions and regulations in force as regards opium (raw, prepared or medicinal), and also morphine, cocaine and other poisonous substances, were stated in the Note from the French Government dated November 9th, 1921. They are as follows:

Law of July 19th, 1845.
The Law of July 12th, 1916.
The Decree of September 14th, 1916.

These various provisions were strengthened by a fresh law dated July 14th, 1922, with the purpose of amending Articles 2 and 4 of the Law of July 19th, 1845, on the sale of poisonous substances, amended by the Law of July 12th, 1916, concerning the importation and use of poisonous substances.

Article 2 is now drafted as follows:

“The tribunals shall pronounce a sentence of prohibition from residence, for a period of not less than five and not more than ten years, against individuals found guilty of having facilitated the use of the said substances for the general public, either by acquiring premises for the purpose or by other means.”

Article 4 is now drafted as follows:

“By virtue of Article 10 of the Decree of July 1922, 1,791 premises in which narcotics are used in the company of others are on the same footing as premises known to be used as gambling-houses or for immoral purposes.”

NEW ZEALAND.

The legislation controlling the importation and distribution of these drugs is set forth in the Acts and Regulations which have been forwarded to the League of Nations for transmission to the other Governments which are parties to the Opium Convention.

The Acts and Regulations controlling the importation and distribution of opium, morphine, heroin and cocaine during the year 1921 were as follows:

	<i>Date of coming into force.</i>
The Opium Act, 1908	August 4th, 1908
The Opium Amendment Act, 1910	November 21st, 1910
The Treaties of Peace Act, 1919	October 29th, 1919
The Treaties of Peace Extension Act, 1921	October 28th, 1921
The Poisons Act, 1908	August 4th, 1908
Order in Council of the January 18th, 1921, published in the <i>New Zealand Gazette</i> on January 27th, 1921, making regulations under the Opium Act, 1908, and the Treaties of Peace Act, 1919	January, 27th, 1921

GREAT BRITAIN.

No new legislation was passed in 1921, but important Regulations and Orders were issued under the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1920. These are referred to in the reply of the British Government to the League of Nations questionnaire.

No alterations of importance were made in the administrative arrangements as described in the reply to the questionnaire.

POLAND.

The system of licences for the import of opium and other drugs issued by the Import and Export Office has been modified in consequence of the abolition of that office; in the second half of 1921 the Finance Ministry issued licences to import these articles, after consultation with the Ministry of Public Health.

(2) *Regulations of Imports and Exports.*

Please give a full account of the working of the import certificate system, mentioning any difficulties which have arisen in carrying it out in regard both to:

- (a) Export of the drugs from the country;
- (b) Import of the drugs into the country.

What is the practice with regard to countries which have not yet adopted the system ?

CANADA.

Before a licence to export narcotics is granted by the Department to a Canadian exporter, he must obtain from his customer in the foreign country a certificate from the proper authorities of the Government of the importing country allowing the importation of the drugs in question, and such certificate must state that the drugs being imported are required for medicinal or scientific purposes.

FRANCE.

The French Government has not yet taken a decision on the system of importation certificates recommended by the Advisory Committee on Opium of the League of Nations and now being submitted for consideration to the Governments concerned. The system at present in force in France has given excellent results and has led to the prevention of numerous frauds.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Owing to the fact that a number of countries have not signified their acceptance of the system of importation certificates, His Majesty's Government has not been able to bring that system into full operation. His Majesty's Government had already, before receiving this recommendation from the League of Nations, entered into arrangements on similar lines with Japan, France, Canada, United States of America, Spain and some other countries, and, pending the general adoption by the League of Nations recommendation, has endeavoured by negotiations to extend these arrangements to other countries. In the case of a number of countries, therefore, Great Britain is already requiring the production of an import certificate from the Government of the importing country before sanctioning exports of the drugs to that country, but the fact that the system is not in general operation is causing serious difficulties. Representations have been received from British merchants that their clients abroad complain that they have to comply with troublesome formalities in order to obtain the drugs from Great Britain, while they can get them without formalities at all from other countries.

In the case of countries which have not yet adopted the system of importation certificates, a careful watch is kept on the quantities proposed to be exported to the different countries, and licences are refused for quantities greatly in excess of what would appear to be the legitimate. There is no definite guide at present as to what are the legitimate requirements of any country for the drugs (this is a matter which is now being investigated by the League of Nations); nor is it known, of course, what quantities are being imported from other countries besides Great Britain, and His Majesty's Government has only adopted this method provisionally, pending the completion by the League of the arrangements for the general adoption of the importation certificate system.

NEW ZEALAND.

No remarks.

POLAND.

The system of import certificates was introduced in Poland in 1922; in 1921 the import and export of opium, etc., were regulated by the Import and Export Office, and, if necessary, by the Finance Ministry, after consultation with the Ministry of Public Health; these articles can only be imported by persons who possess a licence for the sale or conversion of opium, etc.; the substances imported which are set forth in Article 3 of the Convention can only be employed for medicinal or scientific purposes.

(3) *Internal Regulation of the Manufacture, Sale, Distribution, Use, etc., of the Drugs.*

Please give particulars regarding any new points of interest or importance relating to the administration of the laws in force, and especially as to the prevalence of the drug habit; difficulties in the application of the laws to particular cases; difficulties in the enforcement of the laws, and particulars available of the illicit traffic carried on, and the channels by and the sources from which this traffic is fed.

Please give such information as is possible regarding prosecutions and penalties imposed.

CANADA.

Report contains no new points of interest.

FRANCE.

The Customs Administration has been instructed to apply the provisions relating to the import and export of poisonous substances. On the one hand, as regards import, it must control the passage through the Customs and superintend the carrying-out of all formalities with regard to wrappers and containers; moreover, as regards export, it must verify the description and quantity of the goods. It is, moreover, instructed to record consignment abroad and to grant certificates of export.

Inspection departments are entrusted with the application of the other provisions concerning the purchase, sale and surrender of narcotics.

In the first place, chemists' shops *trading regularly* in these substances are under the supervision of an inspection department; in cases of proved infringements, proceedings are taken by the Public Prosecutor. This supervision is very effectual. As a result of the enquiries and investigations carried out in the course of the year 1921, twenty-one prosecutions resulting from infringements of the Law and Decree of 1916 were recorded by this Department and communicated to the Office of the Public Prosecutor.

In the second place, places where *clandestine traffic* is suspected of being carried on are subjected to constant supervision. The police keep under strict observation premises suspected of carrying on traffic in narcotics, and carry out frequent investigations in those establishments where traffickers are likely to be found (café concerts, bars, tobacco shops and places where liquor is sold, etc.), but, although the interviews between sellers and buyers nearly always take place in the establishments mentioned above, the delivery of the drugs is carried out in the streets with the help of intermediaries. The supervision, therefore, has been extended to the former.

In the course of the year 1921, 576 persons were arrested or prosecuted directly before the courts on charges of infringements of the Law and Decree of 1916 on Poisonous Substances.

One hundred and fifty persons also who were indicated as likely to take part in the clandestine traffic in or illicit consumption of narcotics were subjected to enquiries and supervision and were identified through the police.

The sentences passed remain practically the same; six months' to two years' imprisonment, and fines varying from Fcs. 1,000 to 10,000.

The great activity shown in the course of the last years by the departments entrusted with the suppression of this traffic has therefore given very satisfactory results, which are summarised in the following table.

Statement giving number of offences during the year 1921 and the first four months of the current year in respect of the smuggling of opium and other narcotics, the quantity of the products confiscated and the nationality of offenders.

Products	Number of offences	Amount of products confiscated	Nationality of offenders
Cocaine	—	7 k. 500	Dutch, Luxemburg, French, Spanish, Swiss, German
Adrenaline	1	750 phials	French.
Novocaine	1	0 k. 030 and 180 phials	
Morphine	5	0 k. 950 and 8 phials	French-Greek.
Opium	23	396 k. 182	Chinese, Greek, Russian, French, English
Hashish	2	3 k. 700	Chinese.

Opium-smoking dens are prohibited by law; they can only be carried on clandestinely and are always liable to visitation by the police. A number have been discovered, and the tenants of these opiums dens, with the smokers of the drug, have been duly prosecuted.

Much benefit is expected from the new law just passed, which very considerably increases the penalties applied hitherto, as it adds to them the penalty of *prohibition of residence* for a period of from five to ten years for all those convicted of having aided and abetted others in the use of narcotics; this law applies also to premises on which these substances are used in the company of others, or premises used as gaming-houses or brothels.

In spite, however, of the strict supervision exercised in conformity with the provisions of the Law and Decree of 1916, and in spite of the increasingly strict punishments inflicted by the judicial authorities, the secret traffic in narcotic drugs undoubtedly still exists. In particular, a traffic which is difficult of detection is carried on by air mail or by foreign parcels post, described either as "samples without value" or under a false declaration, or without any actual description of the contents.

GREAT BRITAIN.

One or two new points of interest have arisen in connection with the administration of the law, of which a full account was given in the reply to the questionnaire.

The question has been raised of the sufficiency of the penalties provided under the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1920, and a demand has been made in Parliament and in the Press for much heavier penalties. This matter is now under the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

Difficulty has occurred in connection with the provision for the imposition of a pecuniary penalty in lieu of or in addition to the penalty of imprisonment in the case of smugglers and illicit traffickers. The provision was designed to make it unprofitable for persons to engage in the trade, but most of the persons arrested for smuggling or illicit trafficking of the drugs are found to be persons of no substance and appear to be merely agents of others.

The chief difficulties in the enforcement of the law arise from the ease with which the drugs can be smuggled. Though a large number of arrests have been made, it is seldom possible to ascertain

the sources from which the drugs are obtained or the channels by which the traffic is fed. In a number of cases the cocaine smuggled into this country has been found to be of German manufacture, and particulars of several cases have been communicated to the German representative on the Opium Advisory Committee for investigation.

A number of cases have occurred in which qualified medical practitioners, who were themselves addicted to the drugs, have been found obtaining supplies of the drugs by means of prescriptions made out in their own name. The Home Office is considering the question of making it illegal for medical practitioners to prescribe the drugs for their own use.

A table of prosecutions taken and penalties imposed in 1921 follows:

DANGEROUS DRUGS.

Abstract of the Returns of Persons proceeded against during year ended December 31st, 1921.

Opium.

Persons proceeded against, 184 (London, 69; Liverpool, 72; Cardiff, 26; six other places, 17).
Males, 184 (28 aged 21-30; 93 aged 30-40; 47 aged 40-50; 16 aged over 50. — Seamen 92; cooks, 24; laundrymen, 24; firemen, 19; shopkeepers, 13; others 12).
Females *nil*.

Offence	Persons proceeded against	Acquitted or charge withdrawn	Imprisoned (14 days or 1 month)	Fined			Recommended for deportation
				£1-£5	£10-£25	£25-£100	
Importing (or concealing) opium .	14	—	—	3	7	4	—
Permitting premises to be used for opium smoking	12	—	2	1	9	—	5
Concerned in management of such premises	3	—	—	—	3	—	1
Possessing opium and (or) utensils.	122	1	9	61	45	3	18
Found smoking opium	13	3	—	9	1	—	—
Frequenting premises used for opium smoking	20	9	—	7	4	—	1
Totals	184	13	11	81	69	7	25

Cocaine.

Persons proceeded against 58 (London, 53; four other places, 5).
Males, 39 (4 aged under 21; 26 aged 21-30; 5 aged 30-40; 4 over 40).
Females, 19 (4 aged under 21; 13 aged 21-30; 2 aged 30-40). — over 30 occupations represented).

Offence	Persons proceeded against	Acquitted or charge withdrawn	Imprisoned		Fined		Additional recommendation of deportation
			3 months or under	4-6 months	£5-£10	£20-£50	
Importing or possessing cocaine .	39	3(a)	13	20(c)	1	2	2
Selling or supplying cocaine . . .	17(b)	4	5	5	1	1	—
Supplying and failing to enter in register	2	1	—	—	1	—	—
Totals	58	8	18	25	3	3	2

(a) 1 case committed to Central Criminal Court (not yet decided).
(b) In 1 case, to pay costs.
(c) In 1 case, additional £200 fine or 3 months' further imprisonment.

Morphine.

Persons proceeded against 9 (London 2; six other places, 7).
Males, 7 (1 aged under 21; 2 aged 30-40; 4 aged 40-50.—3 chemists; 4 various occupations).
Females, 2 (1 aged 30-40; 1 over 50.—servants).
Possessing or concealing morphine, 5 cases — 2 imprisoned (14 days; 6 months); 3 fined (£5; £10; £10).
Obtaining morphine by forged medical prescription, 1 case — imprisoned (6 months 2nd Division).
Supply morphine and failing to enter in register, 2 cases — charges withdrawn; defendant to pay costs.
Receiving morphine and failing to enter in register, 1 case — offender cautioned by Chief Constable (Manchester).

¹ Additional to fine or imprisonment in all but three cases.

NEW ZEALAND

No remarks.

POLAND.

The enforcement of uniform regulations for the conversion and sale of opium has been hindered by the fact that the Polish State in 1921 was passing through a period of formation; the undefined character of the frontiers made supervision very difficult, and it was absolutely necessary to exercise supervision in order to obtain information as to the illicit introduction of these substances into Poland. The consolidation of the Polish State will make it possible to enforce uniform regulations with regard to the production, import, traffic in and use of drugs and their derivatives; such action will be of great assistance in the campaign against illicit traffic in these articles.

B. PARTICULAR DRUGS.

(4) *Raw Opium.*

- (a) If country is a producing country, please state acreage under cultivation, amount produced and average morphine content.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

France does not produce raw opium.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Great Britain does not produce raw opium

NEW ZEALAND.

No cultivation.

POLAND.

Poland does not produce raw opium

(b) Imports.

Please state names of ports approved during the year and amount of each kind of opium (*i e* European, Turkish, Persian, Indian and other) imported.

CANADA.

No names of approved ports given.

Details covering the importation of raw opium into Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922 :

From the United Kingdom	1,300 pounds
From the United States.	10 »
From other countries not enumerated. . .	390 »
Total	<hr/> 1,700 pounds

The total importations for the year 1921 were 2,953 lbs. Kind of opium imported (European, Turkish, Persian, Indian, other) not stated.

FRANCE.

STATEMENT OF OPIUM IMPORTS WITH RECEIVING CENTRES FOR THE YEAR 1921.

(General and special commerce.)

Quantities given in kilogrammes (net weight).

The statistics drawn up by the Customs administration do not distinguish raw from prepared opium or medicinal opium.

General Commerce					Special Commerce			
Year	Receiving centres	Quantities	Country of origin	Quantities	Receiving centres	Quantities	Country of origin	Quantities
1921		kgs.		kgs.		kgs.		kgs.
	Marseilles . .	194	Denmark . .	3	Marseilles . .	35	Denmark . .	3
	Paris	31	Great Britain	4	Paris	32	Great Britain	4
	Havre	35	Greece . . .	111	Havre	2	Greece . . .	30
	Lyons	1	Turkey . . .	169	Lyons	1	Turkey . . .	34
	Mulhouse . .	60	Germany . .	92	Beilegarde. .	1		
	Bellegarde. .	59	Spain. . . .	1				
	Total . . .	380		380		71		71

GREAT BRITAIN.

The approved ports in 1921 were London and Liverpool. Since 1921, Southampton has also been approved.

The following quantities were imported: from Turkey, 40,244 lbs; from Greece, 16,495 lbs; from Persia, 1422 lbs.

NEW ZEALAND.

The importation or exportation of opium, morphine, heroin or cocaine is prohibited except at the following ports:

Kaipara	Gisborne	Blenheim
Tauranga	Wellington	Christchurch
Auckland	Hokitika	Timaru
New Plymouth	Greymouth	Oamaru
Patea	Westport	Dunedin
Wanganui	Nelson	Invercargill
Napier		

POLAND.

No industry for converting raw opium exists in Poland. It is not therefore imported into the country. The frontier stations at which raw opium may be imported into Poland will be named after the putting into force of the decree relating to the production, import, traffic in and use of drugs and their derivatives.

(c) Please state amount of each kind used in manufacture of:

- (i) Morphine,
- (ii) Medicinal opium,
- (iii) Other medicinal preparations.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics for the manufacture of morphine.

GREAT BRITAIN.

It is regretted that it is not possible for 1921 to distinguish the amounts of raw opium used respectively in the manufacture of morphine, medicinal opium and other preparations. The total amount used in the preparation of the drugs was 65,477 lbs., of which 62,199 lbs. were Turkish, 1,924 lbs. European, 738 lbs. Persian, 109 lbs. Indian.

NEW ZEALAND.

No remarks.

POLAND.

See (b).

(d) Other uses.

Please state particulars of nature of use, amount used, etc.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

No information that opium is used for any other purpose than for the manufacture of morphine, medicinal opium and other medicinal preparations.

NEW ZEALAND.

No remarks.

POLAND.

See (b).

(e) Exports.

Please state names of ports approved during the year... and amount of each kind exported and to what destinations.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

TABLE SHOWING QUANTITIES OF OPIUM CONSIGNED FROM EXPORTING CENTRES AND RECEIVED
IN COUNTRY OF DESTINATION DURING THE YEAR 1921.

(General and special commerce.)
(net weight)

The statistics drawn up by the customs administration do not distinguish raw from prepared or medicinal opium.

Year	General commerce				Special commerce			
	Exporting centres	Quantities	Countries of destination	Quantities	Exporting centres	Quantities	Countries of destination	Quantities
1921		kgs.		kgs.		kgs.		kgs.
	Havre . . .	25	Poland . . .	1	Havre . . .	5	Poland . . .	1
	Marseilles . .	147	England . . .	34	Boulogne . .	5	England . . .	5
	Boulogne . . .	6 (?)	Germany . . .	4	Marseilles . .	5	Germany . . .	4
	Mulhouse . . .	48	Switzerland . .	101	St-Nazaire . .	1	Switzerland . .	1
	Bellegarde . .	46	Spain . . .	45	Delle	1	Greece . . .	3
	St. Nazaire . .	1	Italy . . .	22			Turkey . . .	1
	Delle	1	Greece . . .	3			Colombia . . .	1
			Turkey . . .	2			Tunis	1
			Japan . . .	30				
			U. States . . .	30				
			Colombia . . .	1				
			Tunis	1				
	Total . . .	274		274		17		17

GREAT BRITAIN.

The ports approved in 1921 were London and Liverpool.
Since 1921, Southampton has also been approved.
The total amount exported during 1921 was 15,672 lbs., but it is regretted that it is not possible to distinguish the amounts of each kind exported. The destinations are shown in table attached.

Exports of Raw Opium during 1921.

Country	Amount	
	lbs.	ozs.
<i>Europe:</i>		
Belgium	45	—
Channel Islands	—	8
Czechoslovakia	77	2.53
France	81	12
Holland	50	11.29
Italy	429	14.34
Portugal	147	2.55
Spain	890	4.07
Turkey (Constantinople)	10,219 ¹	—
Total	12,031	6.78
<i>Asia:</i>		
China	33	—
Cyprus	—	0.27
India	33	14.5
Mesopotamia	280	—
Syria	1	1.64
Total	288	0.41

¹ Re-export of opium for which a market could not be found in the United Kingdom.

Country	Amount	
	lbs.	ozs.
<i>Africa :</i>		
Belgian Congo	32	14.14
Canary Islands	176	10.11
Egypt	578	10.45
French Congo	1	1.64
Mauritius	7	—
Rhodesia	—	4
Tripoli	—	2.24
Union of South Africa	349	10.53
Total	1,146	5.11
<i>America :</i>		
Argentina	19	13.37
Bolivia	2	3.27
Brazil	374	9.32
British West Indies	1	1.3
Canada	1,109	8
Chile	50	5.8
Costa Rica	245	0.74
Cuba	15	7
Guatemala	142	15.99
Honduras	10	—
Peru	—	3.53
Salvador	115	6.92
Total	2,086	11.24
<i>Australasia :</i>		
Fiji Islands	119	7.79
Grand total	15,671	15.33

NEW ZEALAND.

No remarks.

POLAND.

Poland does not export raw opium.

(5) *Prepared Opium.*

(a) Countries where import, manufacture and use of prepared opium is prohibited.

Please state whether it has been found possible to suppress opium smoking:

- (i) Among national population;
- (ii) Among alien population.

If not, what nationalities are addicted, what is the nature of the difficulties which have been experienced in suppressing the practice, and to what extent is opium illicitly introduced ?

What action has been taken to enforce the law ?

Please state number of prosecutions, etc.

Is the co-operation of any country necessary to effect the complete suppression, and, if so, on what lines and in what directions ?

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

See reply to question 8 of the League of Nations questionnaire. As stated there, opium smoked is almost entirely confined to persons of Chinese extraction at certain large seaports. The action taken by the police to enforce the law has been successful to a very large extent in suppressing the practice. Particulars of the prosecutions taken are given in the table.

NEW ZEALAND.

No remarks.

POLAND.

The import of prepared opium into Poland is strictly prohibited. No places where secret smoking of opium takes place have been discovered.

(b) Countries where use of prepared opium is not entirely prohibited.

Please state whether any change has been made in the system during the year and what further steps, if any, have been taken towards suppression.

Please state, if possible, total amount of prepared opium consumed, price at which re-tailed, and particulars, if not already given, of the working of the system of control.

Where smokers are required to be licensed or registered, please state number of licensed or registered smokers.

State number of Chinese resident in the country, and, if smoking is prevalent among persons of any other nationality, the number of residents of that nationality as well. State also revenue, if any, derived from the sale of prepared opium and what proportion it bears to the total revenue of the country.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Not applicable.

NEW ZEALAND.

Opium smoking prohibited.

POLAND.

No statement supplied.

(6) *Morphine.*

(a) Imports.

(1) Morphine.

(2) Salts of morphine.

(3) Preparations, admixtures, etc. containing morphine, imported from each country of supply (in case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained).

CANADA.

Details covering the importation of morphine into Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922:

From the United Kingdom	7,209 ounces
From the United States.	990 »
From other countries not enumerated.	575 »
Total	8,774 ounces

For the year ended March 31st, 1921, the total imports of morphine into Canada were 12,124 ounces.

Information for the year 1921 will be sent later.

No statement of the imports of morphine and its salts during the year 1920 was included in the Note from the French Government dated November 9th, 1921.

IMPORTATION IN 1920.

			Kilos.
Morphine and its salts	Great Britain	2,768	2,932
	Switzerland	111	
	Germany	31	
	Turkey	10	
	Other countries	12	
Acethylmorphine, ethyl-morphine and their salts	Great Britain	664	684
	Other countries	20	

GREAT BRITAIN.

Imports of morphine, none; of salts of morphine, 14 lbs. 11 ozs; of preparations containing morphine, 54 lbs. 1 oz. (— amount of morphine contained in preparations).

NEW ZEALAND.

Morphine and its preparations imported during period March 1st, 1921, to December 31st, 1921.

Kind.	Country of origin.	Weight ounces.
Codeine (methymorphine).	United Kingdom	1 1/8
Codeine phosphate	» »	1 1/4
Dionin (ethylmorphine hydrochloride).	» »	1/2
Morphine acetate.	» »	32
» hydrochloride (or muriate)	» »	355 1/4
» »	Australia	23
» sulphate	United Kingdom	136
» »	Australia	2
» tartrate	United Kingdom	28
Pills, morphine sulphate:		
4,333 containing morphine sulphate	» »	5 1/2
1,000 containing morphine sulphate	Australia	1 1/4
Suppositories, morphine hydrochloride:		
1,224 containing morphine hydrochloride	»	1
Tablets, codeine:		
1,800 containing codeine	»	1 3/4
Tablets, morphine hydrochloride and emetine :		
1,400 containing morphine hydrochloride	»	4/5
Tablets, morphine sulphate:		
63,200 containing morphine sulphate	United Kingdom	39 1/2
181,800 containing morphine sulphate.	Australia	127 1/2
Tablets, morphine sulphate and atropine :		
9,300 containing morphine sulphate.	United Kingdom	5 1/2
37,350 containing morphine sulphate.	Australia	32 1/2
Tablets, roche omnopon:		
21,000 containing morphine, tincture morphine and chloroform compound:	Switzerland	8
25 lbs. containing morphine hydrochloride.	United Kingdom	4
Total		806 3/8
		ounces avoirdupois

Note : Particulars of the importations of morphine, heroin and cocaine prior to March 1st, 1921, are not available.

POLAND.

Seeing that in 1921 the frontiers of the Polish Republic were not defined and the traffic on the frontiers of Lithuania, Danzig and Russia was not regularly established, it is impossible to give exact figures of the import and export of this drug. No special statistics have been drawn up, and the approximate figures have been based upon documents relating to the import licences issued by the Import and Export Office, after consultation with the Ministry of Public Health.

- (1) No raw morphine was imported.
 - (2) Approximately 184 kilogs. of morphine salts were imported.
 - (3) Import licences are not issued for substances containing morphine.
-

(b) Manufacture.

Please give names of owners and situation of factories; state amount of each kind of opium used, percentage (if known) of morphine in the opium, and amount of morphine or salts of morphine manufactured.

- N. B. Include morphine subsequently converted into heroin, codeine or other substances, stating amount so converted.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics for the manufacture, internal traffic in and consumption of opium, morphine and cocaine.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The names of the firms licensed by the Home Office to manufacture morphine and the addresses of the factories at which they are licensed to manufacture it are as follows:

T. & H. Smith Ltd.

Blandfield Chemical Works,
Wheatfield Road, Edinburgh,

J. F. Macfarlan & Co.

93 and 109, Abbeyhill, Edinburgh, and Northfield Chemical Works, Edinburgh.

S. H. Travis & Co.

Central Chemical Works,
King's Road, St. Pancras,
London, N.W. 1.

Whiffen & Sons, Ltd

Lombard Road,
Battersea, London, S. W.

It is regretted that it is not possible to state exactly the amount of opium used in the manufacture of morphine (see above under answer to (4) (c). The morphine content averaged from 12 to 13 %.

The amount of morphine manufactured was 39,809 ozs., and of salts of morphine 107,981 ozs., giving a total of 147,790 ozs., of which 32,056 ozs. were used in the manufacture of heroin, codeine, or other substances.

NEW ZEALAND.

No manufacture.

POLAND.

No laboratory existed in 1921 for the manufacture of morphine or for its conversion into heroin, codeine, etc.

(c) Exports.

Please state amount of:

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Salts of morphine,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing morphine, exported to each country of destination. (In the case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

Draw attention to any increases or decreases in amounts exported to any country as compared with the preceding year.

CANADA.

Morphine	Newfoundland	8,870 grs.
	South Africa	375 »
	England	151 »
	Lima, Peru	821 »
Diacetylmorphine (heroin)	Newfoundland	66½ »
	England	815 »
Codeine	Newfoundland	5,125 »
	England	1,458 »
	Lima, Peru	500 »

In connection with these statistics, it might be explained that most of the narcotics exported from Canada are either in the form of tablets, pills, etc., or the drug is included in a mixture with other ingredients.

FRANCE.

Information for the year 1921 will be sent later. Morphine was included in statistical documents among unnamed chemical products. The authorities are not yet in a position to supply information for the years 1913-1918-1919.

EXPORTATION DURING 1920.

		Kilos.	
Morphine and its salts	Japan	6,868	} 9,114
	Switzerland	740	
	Turkey	370	
	Spain	327	
	Italy	250	
	Free zones	102	
	Other countries	457	
Acetylmorphine, ethylmorphine and their salts	New Caledonia	254	} 872
	Portugal	177	
	Japan	100	
	Italy	80	
	Uruguay	80	
	Other countries	181	

GREAT BRITAIN.

The amount exported in the form of morphine, salts of morphine and preparations was 77,364 ozs. It is regretted that separate figures cannot be given for morphine, salts of morphine and preparations. The amounts exported to each country of destination are shown in the table attached.

EXPORTS OF MORPHINE DURING 1921.

Country	Amount, ozs.	Country	Amount, ozs.
<i>Europe :</i>		<i>Africa :</i>	
Austria	976	Algeria	4.52
Belgium	2,711.8	Angola43
Channel Islands	26.47	Basutoland	2.28
Czechoslovakia	2,046.12	Belgian Congo	4.71
Denmark	1,409.08	Egypt	340.34
Esthonia	1.76	Gold Coast Colony	10.92
Finland	370.34	Kenya Colony	14.91
France	36,007.33	Liberia08
Germany	3,600.39	Madagascar15
Gibraltar	4.09	Mauritius	27.88
Greece	40.64	Morocco09
Holland	1,134.58	Nigeria	19.67
Italy	6,742.19	Nyasaland43
Malta	26.41	Rhodesia	27.23
Monaco03	St. Helena08
Poland	353.06	Sierra Leone	4.76
Portugal	149.91	Sudan	48.47
Russia	4	Swaziland	1.18
Spain	4,775.19	Tanganyika Territory	18.19
Sweden76	Uganda	1.56
Switzerland	9.49	Union of South Africa	707.89
Total	60,389.64	Total	1,235.77
<i>Asia :</i>		<i>America :</i>	
Aden	1.12	Argentina	865.37
Arabia	1.84	Bolivia	1.06
British N. Borneo	21	Brazil	226.35
Ceylon	87.72	British Guiana	345.47
China	1,101.41	British West Indies	809.83
Cyprus	5.29	Canada	6,377.08
Dutch East Indies	71.34	Chile	95.06
Federated Malay States	180.73	Dutch Guiana	14.42
Goa	1.04	Falkland Islands16
Hong-Kong	60.4	Guatemala	112
India	1,319.79	Mexico	35.27
Japan (Korea)	320.07	Nicaragua16
Mesopotamia	32.22	Peru	30.86
Palestine	11.14	Salvador	15.32
Persia	117.76	Uruguay	53.48
Siam	52.56	Total	8,981.89
Siberia	388.01	<i>Australia :</i>	
Straits Settlements	27.32	Fiji Islands06
Syria	78.1	New South Wales	871.59
Turkey	1.22	New Zealand	700.96
Total	3,880.08	Queensland	58.43
		South Australia	677.24
		Tasmania	28
		Victoria	348.12
		Western Australia	192.71
		Total	2,877.1
		Grand total	77,364.48

NEW ZEALAND.

No opium, morphine, heroin or cocaine was exported during the year 1921.
With the exception of small negligible quantities of opium, morphine, heroin and cocaine which were placed on board overseas vessels as medicinal stores, the importations of these drugs during the year were for use or consumption in New Zealand for medical, dental, or veterinary purposes.

POLAND.

In 1921 the export from Poland of pharmaceutical products, and consequently of morphine, was prohibited.

-
- (d) If possible, please give statistics of home consumption of morphine for:
- (1) Medicinal purposes;
 - (2) Scientific purposes.

CANADA.

No statistics supplied.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics for the home consumption of morphine.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Accurate statistics of the home consumption of morphine are not available. The amount sold by manufacturers to dealers in this country was 58,821 ozs, and the amount imported by dealers was 872 ozs., giving a total of 96,931 ozs. The amount exported by dealers was 10,856 ozs., leaving 48,837 ozs. for consumption in this country. It is not possible to say definitely whether this represents the amount consumed in this country during 1921, as the amount of the stocks in hand at the beginning of the year and the amount in hand at the end of the year cannot be ascertained, but as it is not the practice of the wholesale dealers to carry large stocks of the drugs, there is no reason to believe that the amounts in hand at the beginning and the end of the year differed to any considerable extent.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statistics supplied.

POLAND.

The approximate annual consumption of morphine (based upon data obtained from wholesale drug stores) is 800 kilogs.

-
- (e) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

CANADA.

Wholesale druggists' and manufacturers' licences	112
Retail druggists' licences to manufacture narcotic preparations	57

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

See reply of British Government to questions 13 and 14 of the League of Nations questionnaire and the Appendix to this report.

Appendix (Great Britain.)

The following are the classes of persons authorised in the United Kingdom to use or to be in possession of the drugs to which the International Opium Convention applies.

1. *Doctors.* Duly qualified medical practitioners are authorised to be in possession of and supply all dangerous drugs, so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment.

2. *Dentists.* Registered dentists are authorised to be in possession of and to supply all dangerous drugs except raw opium, so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment.

By a special authorisation, persons who are not registered dentists but are *bona fide* engaged in practising dentistry and were so engaged on July 28th, 1916 (the date on which the restrictions on the use of cocaine were first put into force in the United Kingdom) are authorised to purchase preparations containing not more than 1 % of cocaine for use as a local anæsthetic in dentistry. In accordance with an Act which has recently been passed by Parliament, the practice of dentistry by persons who are not registered dentists will be illegal after November 30th, 1922 (though this date may be postponed), and the special authorisation regarding their use of local anæsthetics containing 1 % of cocaine will then cease to have effect.

3. *Veterinary surgeons.* Registered veterinary surgeons are authorised to be in possession of and supply all dangerous drugs so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment.

In a small number of cases unregistered veterinary surgeons who are shown to have a wide veterinary practice and to be competent persons of good character have been granted special licences to be in possession of morphine for use in the treatment of animals, and in two special cases to be in possession of cocaine as well.

An authorisation has also been given to large stock owners to purchase tincture of opium for the treatment of their animals after obtaining a special certificate from the local police.

4. *Chemists.*

(a) *Retail.* Duly qualified persons carrying on the business of a pharmacist under the Pharmacy Acts are authorised to be in possession of all dangerous drugs for the purpose of retailing, dispensing or compounding the drugs.

(b) *Wholesale.* Persons engaged in the business of wholesale chemists and druggists have been granted individual licences for the conduct of their wholesale business in dangerous drugs if it is shown that this business is of standing and good repute.

5. *Hospitals.* Duly qualified pharmacists who are employed or engaged in dispensing medicines in any public hospital or other public institution are authorised to be in possession of and supply all dangerous drugs so far as is necessary for the practice of their employment. This authority is not regarded as covering pharmacists who are employed as dispensers at "Provident Dispensaries" or "Medical Institutes" belonging to Friendly Societies, but in certain cases such pharmacists may be given special authority by licence.

6. *Laboratories for research or instruction.* Persons in charge of laboratories for research or instruction at approved universities, hospitals, or other public institutions are authorised to be in possession of dangerous drugs so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment. For the purpose of this authorisation the Secretary of State has approved all Universities and University Colleges in the United Kingdom and the Medical Schools recognised by statute, as well as certain selected public Technical and Secondary schools where training is given to pharmaceutical and chemical students.

Licences to be in possession of dangerous drugs have been granted to a few privately owned schools of pharmacy.

Licences have also been granted to one or two private persons who are engaged on chemical research.

7. *Public analysts.* Analysts whose appointments have been approved by the Minister of Health (or, in Scotland, by the Scottish Board of Health) for the purpose of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act are authorised to be in possession of dangerous drugs so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment.

8. *Factory occupiers.* Occupiers of factories and workshops are authorised to purchase a prescribed preparation, which contains not more than 1 part in 200 of cocaine, for the purpose of giving first-aid treatment in cases of eye injury.

9. *Midwives.* Certified midwives who are practising under the regulations laid down by statute are authorised to purchase preparations containing opium so far as is necessary for the practice of their profession or employment.

10. *Ships.* The masters of ships which do not carry a duly qualified medical practitioner are authorised to purchase certain preparations containing dangerous drugs which are included in the list of medicines and medical stores required by the Board of Trade to be carried on merchant vessels.

11. *Importers.* Import licences are granted to firms of good repute engaged in the wholesale import of drugs.

12. *Miscellaneous.* Certain other classes of persons not referred to above are licensed for special purposes, *e.g.* merchants engaged in exporting goods as agents for buyers abroad (the bulk of the exporters of dangerous drugs are wholesale chemists and other licensed or authorised persons referred to above); a few persons who use dangerous drugs in the manufacture of patent medicines or animal medicines (the medicines themselves almost always contain so small a percentage of dangerous drugs that they are outside the control of the Act); and a few firms engaged in the manufacture and supply of dental requisites.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

Only pharmacies and drug stores to which special licences have been granted have the right to possess and sell drugs; these products may also be brought and imported from foreign countries by pharmaceutical factories with a view to their conversion.

(7) *Heroin.*

(a) Imports.

- (1) Heroin.
- (2) Salts of heroin.
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing heroin, imported from each country of supply (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

CANADA.

No information supplied.

FRANCE.

Heroin is included in statistical documents among acetylmorphine and its salts and ethylmorphine. See statistics under (6) *Morphine*, (a) Imports.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Imports of heroin, none; salts of heroin, 17 lbs. 14 ozs; preparations, 1 oz. (amount of heroin in preparations).

NEW ZEALAND.

Heroin and its preparations imported during period March 1st, 1921, to December 31st, 1921.

Kind	Country of origin	Weight, ounces
Glycoheroin or Glykeron:		
384 lbs. containing heroin hydrochloride.	United Kingdom	7
180 lbs. containing heroin hydrochloride.	U. S. A.	3 1/4
Heroin hydrochloride.	United Kingdom	146 3/4
»	U. S. A.	772
Tablets, heroin hydrochloride:		
1,250 containing heroin hydrochloride	United Kingdom	1/2
21,675 »	Australia	7 3/4
800 »	U. S. A.	1/3
Total . .		937 1/2 ounces avoirdupois

POLAND.

See the general observations with regard to 6 *Morphine* (a).

About 2 kilogs (?) of heroin and of its salts have been imported.
Import licences are not issued for substances containing heroin.

(b) Manufacture.

Please give names of owners and situation of factories and amount of heroin or salts of heroin manufactured.

CANADA.

No information supplied.

FRANCE.

No information supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The names of the firms licensed by the Home Office to manufacture heroin and the addresses of the factories at which they are licensed to manufacture it are as follows:

T. & H. Smith Ltd.,
Blandfield Chemical Works,
Wheatfield Road, Edinburgh.

J. F. Macfarlan & Co.,
93 and 109, Abbeyhill, Edinburgh.

S. H. Travis & Co.,
Central Chemical Works,
King's Road,
St. Pancras, London, N.W. 1.

Amount of heroin manufactured, 228 ozs.; of salts of heroin, 12,157 ozs

NEW ZEALAND.

No manufacture.

POLAND.

No establishment for the manufacture of heroin existed in 1921.

(c) Exports.

Please state amount of:

- (1) Heroin,
- (2) Salts of heroin,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing heroin exported to each country of destination. (In the case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

Draw attention to any increases or decreases in amounts exported to any country as compared with the preceding year.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

Heroin is included in statistical documents among acetyl-morphine and its salts and ethyl-morphine. See statistics under (6) *Morphine*, (c) Export.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Exports of heroin and its salts amounted to 14,107 ozs. The amounts exported to each country of destination are shown in the table below.

EXPORTS OF HEROIN DURING 1921.

Country	Amount	Country	Amount
<i>Europe:</i>	ozs	<i>Africa:</i>	ozs
Belgium	481.49	Basutoland5
Channel Islands27	Egypt.	284.9
Finland.	52.78	Gold Coast Colony07
France.	4,938	Kenya Colony	1.29
Germany.	1.37	Mauritius5
Gibraltar.5	Rhodesia	1.13
Italy.	4,389.79	Sudan.02
Norway.	17.62	Tunis.	1.06
Portugal	22.93	Union of South Africa. . .	35.59
Spain.	1,358		
Switzerland.	70.86		325.06
	11,333.71		
		<i>America:</i>	
		Argentina	70.55
		Bolivia	3.12
		Brazil.	2.1
		British Guiana.	417.7
		British West Indies. . . .	7.19
		Canada	927
		Peru	3.5
		United States27
			1,431.43
<i>Asia:</i>		<i>Australasia:</i>	
British North Borneo. . . .	37.6	Christmas Island.01
Ceylon	4	New South Wales.	155.08
China	83.17	New Zealand.	66.88
Cyprus.3	South Australia	33.25
Federated Malay States. . .	224.2	Tasmania	4
Hong Kong.	7	Victoria.	86
India.	210.48	Western Australia	16
Mesopotamia	8.37		361.22
Palestine	25.92		
Persia	1.87		
Siam.	37.41		
Straits Settlements.	14.31		
Syria.	1.09		
	655.72		
		GRAND TOTAL . . .	14,107.14

NEW ZEALAND.

No opium, morphine, heroin or cocaine was exported during the year 1921.

With the exception of small negligible quantities of opium, morphine, heroin and cocaine which were placed on board overseas vessels as medical stores, the importations of these drugs during the year were for use or consumption in New Zealand for medical, dental, or veterinary purposes.

POLAND.

The export of pharmaceutical products, and consequently of heroin, was prohibited in 1921.

(d) If possible, please give statistics of home consumption for:

- (i) Medicinal purposes,
- (ii) Scientific purposes.

CANADA.

No statistics supplied.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics for the home consumption of morphine, and as heroin is included under morphine, there are no statistics for the home consumption of heroin.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Accurate statistics of the home consumption of heroin are not available. Amount of heroin sold by manufacturers to dealers in this country was 6,121 ozs.; amount imported by dealers in this country was 2 ozs., giving a total of 6,123 ozs. The amount exported by dealers was 1,504 ozs., leaving 4,619 ozs. for consumption in this country. (See remarks under (6) (d) above.)

NEW ZEALAND.

No statistics supplied.

POLAND.

The consumption of heroin amounts to about 100 kgs. annually.

(e) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

CANADA.

See under 6 (e).

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

See under 6 (e).

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied

POLAND.

See under (6).

(8) *Medicinal Opium.*

(a) Imports.

1. Medicinal opium.
2.
3. Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing medicinal opium imported from each country of supply. (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

CANADA.

Details covering the importation of powdered opium into Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922: From the United Kingdom, 141 pounds.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Imports of medicinal opium about 15 lbs.

NEW ZEALAND.

Kind of opium	Country whence imported	Quantity, lbs.
Opium in powder	United Kingdom	4
» » »	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	9
Tincture of opium	United Kingdom	863
Liquid extract of opium.	» »	8
Solid extract of opium	» »	3
Sedative liquor of opium	» »	13 1/4
Nepenthe	» »	144 1/2
Unguentum Gallae cum opio	» »	125
Pil. Saponia Co.	» »	14
Other preparations of opium.	» »	1
Total . .		1,184 3/4
		Pounds avoirdupois.

POLAND.

See the general observations with regard to morphine 6 (2). About 2,650 kilogs. of opium were imported for medicinal purposes.

Import licences are not issued for substances containing opium.

(b) Manufacture.

Please give names of owners and situation of factories; state amount of each kind of opium used; percentage (if known) of morphine in the opium; and amount of medicinal opium manufactured.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The names of the persons licensed by the Home Office to manufacture medicinal opium and the addresses of the factories at which they are licensed to manufacture it are as follows:

T. & Smith Ltd.,
Blandfield Chemical Works,
Wheatfield Road, Edinburgh.

Whiffen & Sons Ltd.,
Lombard Road,
Battersea, London, S.W.

Southall Bros. & Barclay Ltd.,
19, 20, 21, Lower Priory,
Birmingham.

Wyleys Limited,
Coventry.

J. Richardson & Son (Leicester) Ltd.,
10, Friar Lane,
Leicester.

Stafford Allen & Sons Ltd.,
Cowper Street,
Finsbury, London, E.C.

J. Wylde,
9, Coleworth Grove,
York Street,
Walworth, London, S.E.

Harker, Stagg & Morgan,
Devon Wharf,
Emmott Street,
Mile End, London, E.

R. Sumner,
40, Hanover Street,
Liverpool.

Separate statistics of the amount of raw opium used in the manufacture of medicinal opium are not available (see above under heading (4) (c)). The amount of medicinal opium manufactured in 1921 was 4,993 lbs.

NEW ZEALAND.

No manufacture.

POLAND.

Opium for medicinal purposes is not produced in Poland; factories employ opium for chemical compounds, a list of which will be found in the pharmacopœias.

(c) Exports.

Please state amount of:

- (1) Medicinal opium
- (2)
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing medicinal opium exported to each country of destination. (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

Draw attention to any increases or decreases in amounts exported to any country as compared with the preceding year.

CANADA.

Tincture of Opium, 5 lbs. (3,840 grs.)

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The amount of medicinal opium exported in 1921 was 1,777 lbs. The amount of medicinal opium exported to each country of destination is shown in the table below.

EXPORT OF MEDICINAL OPIUM DURING 1921.

Country	Amount		Country	Amount	
	lbs.	ozs.		lbs.	ozs.
<i>Europe:</i>			<i>Africa (continued):</i>		
Belgium	—	12.21	Sierra Leone	1	—
Channel Islands	—	.38	Sudan	4	7.44
Czechoslovakia	99	3.28	Swaziland	—	6.86
Denmark	50	9.78	Tanganyika Territory	2	7.19
Esthonia	9	12.8	Tripoli	—	5.85
Finland	72	11.94	Tunis	6	9.82
France	110	3.09	Union of South Africa.	78	.09
Gibraltar	—	2			
Greece	2	3.53		160	9.52
Netherlands	70	13.99			
Malta	5	5.24			
Portugal	4	7.69			
Spain	44	1.43			
Switzerland	1	3.89			
	471	11.3	GRAND TOTAL .	1,777	7.35
<i>Asia:</i>	lbs.	ozs.	<i>America:</i>	lbs.	ozs.
British North Borneo . . .	—	3	Argentine	58	11.44
Ceylon	1	14.94	Brazil	40	7.49
China	37	1.75	British Guiana	16	4.34
Cyprus	1	3.43	British West Indies . .	20	11.42
Federated Malay States . .	9	0.81	Canada	71	—
Hong-Kong	6	8.27	Chile	—	—
India	26	13.83	Costa Rica	1	—
Mesopotamia	1	14.98	Dutch Guiana	—	2.25
Palestine	10	10.54	Guatemala	10	—
Persia	—	3.4	Honduras	6	9.82
Siam	—	6.61	Mexico	1	11.51
Straits Settlements	17	2.31	Newfoundland	10	2.55
Syria	5	12.47	Salvador	31	4.8
Turkey	6	9.82	San Domingo	—	3
	125	10.16		277	1.72
<i>Africa:</i>	lbs.	ozs.	<i>Australasia:</i>	lbs.	ozs.
Basutoland	1	4.8	Gilbert and Ellis Is. .	1	8
Bechuanaland	—	2.86	New South Wales . . .	599	8.95
Belgian Congo	3	11.24	New Zealand	44	14.84
Egypt	49	1.36	Queensland	4	6.86
Gold Coast Colony	—	15.82	South Australia	14	4
Kenya Colony	2	6.08	Tasmania	15	2.4
Liberia	—	1.34	Victoria	61	9.6
Mauritius	2	.04	Western Australia . . .	1	—
Morocco	—	2.42		742	6.65
Nigeria	3	14.96			
Nyasaland	1	12.55			
Portuguese East Africa . .	—	1.37			
Rhodesia	1	9.43			

NEW ZEALAND.

No exports.

POLAND.

In 1921 the export from Poland of chemical products, and consequently of medicinal opium, was prohibited.

(d) If possible, please give statistics of home consumption of medicinal opium for:

- (1) Medicinal purposes;
- (2) Scientific purposes.

CANADA.

No statistics supplied.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics for the internal consumption of opium.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Statistics of the home consumption of medicinal opium are not available.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statistics supplied.

POLAND.

The annual consumption of opium for medicinal purposes according to figures given by wholesale drug stores amounts to about 6,000 kilogs.

(e) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

CANADA.

See under 6 (e).

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

See under 6 (e).

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

See under 6.

(9) *Cocaine.*

(a) If the coca plant is grown, please state particulars of acreage planted, situation and names of owners of plantations; exports of:

- (1) Crude cocaine,
- (2) Refined cocaine or its salts,

to each country of destination; prices of crude and refined cocaine and amount of crude cocaine and refined cocaine in stock at the end and the beginning of year.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The coca plant is not grown in the United Kingdom.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

See the general observations with regard to morphine (6) (a). Erythroxyton and other kinds of coca are not grown in Poland.

(b) Amount imported of:

- (1) Crude cocaine,
- (2) Refined cocaine or its salts,
- (3) Preparations, etc., containing cocaine. (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of weight of drug contained.)

CANADA.

According to the Trade Report of Canada, the amount of cocaine imported during the year ending March 31st, 1921, was 3,310 ozs.

FRANCE.

Importation.

Substance	Year	Country of origin	Quantity per country (in gross kgs.)	Quantity per year
Raw cocaine	1913	Germany	1,300	1,300
	1918	Peru	700	700
	1919	Great Britain	900	1,800
	"	Spain	300	
	"	Peru	600	
	1920	Great Britain	164	649
	"	United States	156	
	"	Peru	329	
Pure cocaine and its salts	1920	Netherlands	83	147
	"	Switzerland	47	
	"	Italy	5	
	"	Free zones	12	

Exportation.

Substance	Year	Country of destination	Quantity per country (in gross kgs.)	Quantity per year
Raw cocaine	1913	Italy	100	100
Pure cocaine and its salts	1920	Portugal	890	2,578
	"	Colombia	371	
	"	Turkey	304	
	"	Italy	240	
	"	Japan	140	
	"	Greece	120	
	"	Venezuela	118	
	"	Tunis	113	
	"	Spain	110	
	"	Other countries	172	

GREAT BRITAIN.

Imports of cocaine in 1921 amounted to 1,550 lbs. It is regretted that distinction cannot be made between imports of crude cocaine and imports of refined cocaine and its salts. The imports of preparations containing cocaine were 30 ozs. (—amount of cocaine contained in the preparations). The amount of cocaine exported in 1921 was 19,033 ozs. The amounts exported to each country of destination are shown in the table attached.

EXPORTS OF COCAINE DURING 1921.

Country	Amount	Country	Amount
<i>Europe</i>	<i>ozs.</i>	<i>Africa</i>	<i>ozs.</i>
Austria14	Algeria	1
Belgium	1.85	Angola28
Channel Islands	4.87	Basutoland	22.11
Czechoslovakia83	Canary Islands66
Denmark	3.59	Belgian Congo3
Finland05	Egypt	841.65
France	8,262.76	Gold Coast Colony	13.12
Germany	5.57	Kenya Colony	54.44
Gibraltar33	Madeira01
Greece	3.54	Mauritius	28.68
Holland	3,691.55	Morocco	5.36
Hungary26	Nigeria	8.87
Italy	2.18	Nyasaland58
Malta	26.45	Portuguese East Africa	2.09
Norway11	Rhodesia	53.63
Portugal	217.36	St. Helena12
Russia	4	Sierra Leone	3.38
Spain	141.42	Sudan	42.58
Sweden4	Swaziland01
Switzerland	1.24	Tanganyika Territory	6.55
Turkey (Constantinople)	13.4	Tripoli11
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	6.02	Union of South Africa	287.47
		Zanzibar	1.3
	12,387.92		1,354.3

NEW ZEALAND

Cocaine and ist preparations imported during period March 1st, 1921, to December 31st, 1921.

Country	Amount	Country	Amount
<i>Asia :</i>		<i>America :</i>	
Aden12	Argentina	69.72
British North Borneo5	Brazil.	87.41
Ceylon	28.07	Bermuda	12
China	190.71	British Guiana	25.96
Cyprus	52.77	British West Indies	191.74
Dutch East Indies47	Canada	577.09
Federated Malay States	50.45	Chile	219.95
Hong Kong	29.14	Colombia	10
India	557.62	Costa Rica.	1
Mesopotamia.	143.11	Dutch Guiana27
Palestine	117.58	Guatemala	48
Persia.	33.33	Mexico	188.79
Philippine Islands.04	Newfoundland	2.13
Siam	30.92	Peru	83.2
Siberia	39.68	San Domingo	41.14
Straits Settlements	54.72	United States46
Syria	212.87	Uruguay	31.52
Turkey in Asia	11.9		
Wei-Hai-Wei.	1		
			1,589.92
	1,545	<i>Australasia :</i>	
		Ellis Islands.	2
		Fiji Islands	6
		New South Wales.	870.76
		New Zealand.	267.59
		Queensland	148
		South Australia	61.61
		Tasmania	40
		Victoria.	720.01
		Western Australia	40.32
			2,156.29
		Grand total	19,033.43

Kind.	Country of origin.	Weight, ounces.
Cocaine (alkaloid)	France	7/8
Cocaine hydrochloride	United Kingdom	295 1/2
» »	Australia	3
» »	U. S. A.	10
Cocaine phosphate	United Kingdom	4
Extractum cocae liquidum:		
32 ozs. containing cocaine.	» »	1/6
Dental anæsthetics: "Leonard's Local", "Locesthetic", "Mylocal", "Murocain":		
780 ozs. containing cocaine hydrochloride	» »	7 3/4
5,568 ozs. containing cocaine hydrochloride	Australia	69 1/2
230 ozs. containing cocaine hydrochloride	U. S. A.	2 1/4
Pills, 1,360 containing cocaine hydrochloride	United Kingdom	3/4
Tablets, cocaine and adranalin:		
11,400 containing cocaine hydrochloride	Australia	4 1/3
1,425 containing cocaine hydrochloride	U. S. A.	1/2
Tablets, cocaine and anocaine:		
2,500 containing cocaine	United Kingdom	1 1/2
Tablets, cocaine hydrochloride:		
525 containing cocaine hydrochloride	» »	1/2
1,136 » » »	Australia	1/4
2,000 » » »	U. S. A.	1/2
Tablets, "Nasal pharyngeal":		
1,350 containing cocaine hydrochloride	Australia	1/2
	Total	401
		ounces avoirdupois

Note : Particulars of the importations of morphine, heroin and cocaine prior to March 1st, 1921, are not available

POLAND.

No raw cocaine was imported.
Approximately 84 kilogs. of cocaine and of its salts was imported.
Import licences are not issued for substances containing cocaine.

(c) Please give names of owners and situation of factories in which cocaine is extracted from the leaves or refined from crude cocaine, and output of each firm for the year.

CANADA.

No information supplied.

FRANCE.

No information supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The production of cocaine by extraction from the leaves or refining of crude cocaine is not carried on in the United Kingdom.

NEW ZEALAND.

No information supplied.

POLAND.

There is no laboratory in Poland for the manufacture of cocaine.

(d) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

CANADA.

See 6 (e).

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

See 6 (e).

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

Only wholesale pharmacies and drug stores to which licences have been granted have the right to possess and sell cocaine.

(10) *Other Drugs to which the Convention is held to apply.*

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Other drugs to which the Convention is held to apply: none.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

No statement supplied.

C. MISCELLANEOUS.

(11) *China.*

Please supply any information not hitherto submitted as to execution of treaty provisions.

CANADA.

No information supplied

FRANCE.

No information supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

There is nothing at present to add to the information communicated to the Secretariat with the Cabinet Office Note of April 7th, 1922.

NEW ZEALAND.

No information supplied.

POLAND.

No information supplied.

(12) *International Action.*

Please give references to any treaties or international arrangements made regarding opium or narcotic drugs during the year.....

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Reference has been made above under (2) to the negotiations entered into by the British Government with other Governments for the adoption of a system of importation certificates in respect of exports from the United Kingdom. As a result of these negotiations, agreements have been reached with the following States in addition to those mentioned above: Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Germany, Haiti, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Siam, Sweden, and Uruguay, that in all cases of export from Great Britain to these countries of any drugs or preparations which come within the terms of the Opium Convention, a certificate is to be produced from the responsible Government Department of the country concerned that the consignment is required for legitimate medical or scientific purposes only and will not be re-exported¹.

In the case of Siam and Sweden, the agreements have not yet come into operation pending the passing of the necessary legislation in those countries.

Similar arrangements are in force with the Dominions of Canada, South Africa and New Zealand, and with all the non-self-governing Colonies and Protectorates.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

No statement supplied.

(13) *Other Drugs.*

Please state any facts of importance with regard to the use of drugs not mentioned in the foregoing questions and any action taken during the year..... in connection therewith.

CANADA.

No statement supplied.

FRANCE.

No statement supplied.

GREAT BRITAIN.

No information of importance.

¹ The condition as to re-export is not included in some cases.

NEW ZEALAND.

No statement supplied.

POLAND.

No statement supplied.

(14) *Additional Information and Suggestions.*

.....
.....
.....
.....

In reply to questions (4) to (10), it is requested that information may be given as far as possible in the form of statistical tables. It should be stated whether or not goods in transit are included in the returns given of imports and exports.

N.B. — Countries are asked to supply corresponding information in respect of their colonies, possessions, protectorates, leased territories, mandated territories, etc.

CANADA.

The following statistics, taken from the Trade Report of Canada, shows the gradual decline in the imports of the various narcotics during the past four years, or since the licensing system in Canada has been inaugurated.

	1919*	1920*	1921*	1922*
Cocaine.	12,333 ozs.	6,968 ozs.	3,310 ozs.	2,952 ozs.
Morphine.	30,087 ozs.	28,198 ozs.	12,124 ozs.	8,774 ozs.
Crude opium	34,263 lbs.	13,626 lbs.	2,953 lbs.	1,700 lbs.

FRANCE.

There are no statistics, for the manufacture, internal traffic in and consumption of opium, morphine and cocaine.

To sum up, the search for and identification of traffickers in narcotic drugs and users of the various harmful drugs has been carried on throughout France during the past year.

The results obtained during this period are a proof that the campaign has been actively carried on, and give reason to hope that the efficiency of this campaign will be increased, thanks to the new Law of July 14th, 1922.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Note 1. The statistical information given is based on returns collected from importers, manufacturers, etc., at the end of 1921. The requirements under the Dangerous Drugs Act in regard to the keeping of records of transactions did not come into force till September 1st, 1921, and a number of firms had not, before that date, been keeping the necessary particulars. The statistical figures supplied, therefore, must be taken as approximate only, but it is believed that they are not far from the truth.

* For the fiscal year ended March 31st.

Note 2. The information given in the report refers to the United Kingdom only. Information in regard to the Colonies will be forwarded separately.

Note 3. The returns of exports do not include goods in transit.

NEW ZEALAND.

No suggestions embodied in reports.

POLAND.

The figures given under headings 6 (*a*), 7 (*a*), 8 (*a*) and 9 (*a*) do not include quantities in transit.

ANNEX 4.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRESS REPORT

GENEVA, January 6th, 1923.

I. RATIFICATION OF CONVENTION.

CHILE.

In answer to the letter despatched to the Government of Chile on December 13th, 1922, recalling the announcement made by the Chilean Delegate at the Assembly with reference to the ratification of the Convention, a letter was received from the Chilean Delegation at Berne expressing surprise that the Secretariat had not yet been notified that the deposit of ratification had been made. The delegate of Chile states in this letter that his Government informed him, on August 8th last, that the Chilean Parliament having approved the Convention, the instrument of ratification was being forwarded to The Hague at once. He has therefore written to the Chargé d'Affaires of Chile at The Hague and will communicate with the Secretariat as soon as he receives a reply.

ECUADOR.

A letter dated December 21st, 1922, was received from the Netherlands Minister at Berne, enclosing a letter from the Government of Ecuador dated October 18th, 1922, acknowledging a letter from the Netherlands Government which contained certain resolutions of the Council of the League of Nations. The Government of Ecuador stated in this letter that it had not yet ratified the Treaty of Versailles, but that the resolutions of the Council of the League had been submitted to the Health Department. The Netherlands Government replied on December 13th, 1922, informing the Government of Ecuador that, as that Government had already ratified the Opium Convention on February 25th, 1915, it only remained to sign the Protocol putting the Convention into force, which Protocol could be signed at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at The Hague.

II. IMPORT CERTIFICATES.

SWEDEN.

It is hoped that the system will be enforced in Sweden early this year

A decree has already been submitted for the approval of the Government. Should this decree be approved, the Department issuing the certificate will be the

Direction générale des Services médicaux de Suède (Kungl. Medicinalstyrelsen).

Supplementary List of Departments issuing the Certificates in Various Countries.

SIAM.

Ministry of Finance (opium for smoking).
Department of Public Health (medicinal opium).

SWEDEN.

Direction générale des Services médicaux de Suède (Kungl. Medicinalstyrelsen).

IV. TRAFFIC IN COCAINE.

The Committee recommends:

- (a) That the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible.

AUSTRALIA. SIAM.

No manufacture.

- (b) That the Council of the League should invite the Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries.

AUSTRALIA.

Estimated at 11,660 ozs.

SIAM.

Amount of cocaine used comparatively small. The quantity required would depend on the medical need, and it is not possible as yet to give any estimate of the amount required.

- (c) That the Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police Authorities.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Agrees.

AUSTRALIA.

Under consideration of Commonwealth Government.

SIAM.

Agrees. Information has been given in report now on its way.

- (d) That the Governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs.

AUSTRALIA.

Under consideration of Commonwealth Government.

SIAM.

Considers that more detailed study is necessary before any decision is taken.

- (e) That, as experience shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent, the Governments should consider the question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty.

AUSTRALIA.

Under consideration of Commonwealth Government.

SIAM.

Present Law contains provisions for alternative penalty to fines of substantial sentence of imprisonment.

See also Annexes 13, 14, and 14a.

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS AUTHORISED IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES TO RECEIVE INFORMATION
WITH REGARD TO SEIZURES OF DRUGS.

ALBANIA

Direction de la Santé publique, Tirana.

CANADA.

Deputy Minister, Department of Health, Ottawa

CHILE.

Direccion General de Sanidad, Santiago

GREAT BRITAIN.

Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, London, S. W. 1

ITALY.

Ministerio degli Interni, Direzione General di Sanita, Rome.

LATVIA.

Département de l'Hygiène publique du Ministère de l'Intérieur.

ROUMANIA.

Direction générale du Service sanitaire, Ministère royal du Travail et de la Santé publique.

KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES.

Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Section pour la Société des Nations, Belgrade.

SPAIN.

Ministerio de Estado, Oficina espanola de la Sociedad de la Naciones, Madrid.

V. TOTAL ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF DOUGS FOR INTERNAL CONSUMPTION.

BELGIUM.

The method adopted in order to arrive at the figures of the total annual requirements of drugs for internal consumption is as follows:

An enquiry by the pharmacy inspectors has been instituted by the Belgian Government. This enquiry is still proceeding, and the result will be communicated to the Secretariat as soon as possible. A statistical sheet was prepared for every wholesale chemist in the country, and on it were stated, name by name, the quantities of soporific and narcotic substances which were in stock on January 1st, 1922, or which had been bought in the country during the first half of the year in question. Under the heading "Sales", the disposal of this stock was accounted for either within the country, as it passed to wholesale dealers, chemists, doctors, veterinary surgeons and hospitals, or abroad.

Further, all changes in the substance effected by the wholesale chemists, and the quantities thus obtained, are shown in the statistical table, in order to make it possible to trace, under the nomenclature of the various products, the destination of all quantities so treated. By means of the column "Stock in hand on June 30th", it will be possible to verify with precision the date collected by the inspectors from the wholesale dealers' books.

SIAM.

Raw opium for smokers: Total required, 118,000 kilos¹. Total required per 100,000 smokers, about 33,750 kilos.

Medicinal opium: Not possible to give an actual figure. Estimated requirements for ensuing year about 120,000 grammes. This figure may, however, be modified in future years should modern method of treatment be extended.

VIII. FREE PORTS.

GERMANY.

A letter was received from the German Government dated December 16th, 1922, stating that the Opium Law of 1920 was in force in the whole country and was applicable to free ports. As, however, the supervision of imports and exports could not be exercised in the free ports, the German Government proposes to authorise special officials to supervise the traffic in these ports. The manner in which this proposal is to be carried out is still under discussion, but it is intended to put some method of supervision into practice as soon as possible.

IX. ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION.

BELGIUM.

Encloses a copy of Article 1 of the Royal Decree of September 6th, 1921, and Article 14 of the Royal Decree of April 25th, 1922.

Article 1 of the Royal Decree of September 6th, 1921, is summarised as follows:

"Coca-leaf, cocaine and its salts, officinal opium, morphine and its salts, diacetylmorphine (heroin) and its salts, officinal or non-officinal products containing more than 2% opium, 2% morphine or its salts, 0.1% of cocaine or its salts, 0.1% diacetylmorphine or its salts may not be imported or exported without special permission.

"For authorisation to import, various particulars have to be given. Imports must be verified.

"The exact address of the consignee must be given. The substances may be exported only to persons authorised to receive them.

"Imports and exports of these substances must pass through the Customs."

Article 14 of the Royal Decree of April 25th, 1922, contains, among others, the following provisions:

"No substance or preparation containing any quantity, however small, of opium, morphine, or its salts, or of cocaine or of its salts, may be dispensed without a special medical prescription in every case, nor may such be offered or exposed for sale if the substance or preparation in question is intended for children under three years of age."

CANADA.

Encloses copies of Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act and the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and draws attention to the following sections:

OPIMUM AND NARCOTIC DRUGS ACT AND AMENDMENTS TO DATE AND REGULATIONS

Liniments, ointments, and other preparations excepted.

(4) (a) The provisions of section (5) and of paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section shall not apply to the possession, sale or distribution of preparations and remedies which do not contain more than two grains of opium or more than one-fourth of a grain of morphine or more than one-eighth of a grain of heroin, or more than one grain of codeine, or any salt or derivative of any of them in one fluid ounce, or of a solid or semi-solid preparation in one avoirdupois ounce, or to

¹ This figure has been communicated from Bangkok by telegram and should be considered as provisional until letter of confirmation has been received.

liniments, ointments or other preparations which are prepared for external skin use only, which do not contain cocaine or any of its salts; but every such remedy or preparation as mentioned in this section must contain active medicinal drugs other than narcotic in sufficient proportion to confer upon the preparation or remedy valuable medicinal qualities, other than those possessed by the narcotic drugs alone; provided, however, that no person shall sell or offer for sale any remedy or preparation intended for internal use which contains opium, morphine, heroin or codeine, unless there be printed in a conspicuous place on an inseparable part of the main panel or the label and wrapper of the bottle, box or other container, and in letters of the same size and visibility as the directions for the use of the preparation or remedy, the following words:

“It is unlawful to administer this preparation to an infant under two years of age, as it contains (insert name of drug) and is dangerous to its life”.

PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE ACT.

Amended. Opium for internal use.

6. The manufacture, importation or sale of all proprietary or patent medicines containing opium or its derivatives for internal use are prohibited.

Amended. Prohibited medicines.

7. (1) No proprietary or patent medicine shall be manufactured, imported, exposed, or offered for sale or sold in Canada:

- (a) If it contains cocaine or any of its salts or preparations;
- (b) If it contains alcohol in excess of the amount required as a solvent or preservative or is not sufficiently medicated to make it unfit for use as a beverage;
- (c) If it contains any drug which is included in the Schedule to this Act the name of which and the amount per dose of which are not conspicuously printed on an inseparable part of the label and wrapper of the bottle, box or other container, or if the quantity of such drug exceeds the amount permitted by the Advisory Board.
- (d) If it contains any drug which is included in the Schedule to this Act and the name of such drug as used on the label be not the commonly employed name of such drug;
- (e) If the article be represented as a cure for any disease;
- (f) If any false, misleading or exaggerated claims be made on the wrapper or label, or in any advertisement of the article.

(2) No proprietary or patent medicine intended for administration to infants under one year of age shall contain any derivative of coal-tar, which, in the opinion of the Advisory Board, is dangerous to children under one year of age.

The Canadian Government also points out that “under the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, the percentage of narcotics allowed in preparations which, may be sold to the public other than a prescription are less than the amounts allowed under the Opium Convention, and furthermore, it is required that all such preparations be medicated and labelled so as to prevent their being purchased for the purpose of obtaining a narcotic effect or to prevent their being administered to children under two years of age.”

FINLAND.

In a letter dated December 28th, 1922, the Finnish Government draws attention to the following points in the Decree concerning the application of the Opium Convention now in force in Finland:

“Paragraph 2 of the Decree prohibits the importation and exportation without previous authorisation, from the Ministry of the Interior, of raw opium, medicinal opium, cocaine, heroin and all salts and preparations of these drugs containing more than 0.2 % morphine or more than 0.1 % of cocaine or heroin, or any new derivative of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts or any other alkaloid of opium, which could, according to any generally recognised scientific tests, be similarly misused or could produce the same harmful effects. Furthermore, there is absolute prohibition of the manufacture, importation and exportation of opium prepared in the manner defined in the Preface to Chapter II of the Opium Convention.

“Paragraph 3 of the Decree contains supplementary provisions concerning the right to possess raw opium and to sell drugs of the nature referred to in paragraph 2. Under the Decree, this right is conceded exclusively to chemists, manufacturing chemists, druggists' stores, wholesale and scientific laboratories as also to persons, institutes and firms possessing a licence from the Ministry of the Interior.”

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Refers to the reply sent by the Government of the Union of South Africa on October 7th, 1922, with regard to the list of drugs submitted by the French Government. This reply states that such products as are derivatives of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts will be covered by the proclamation in respect of habit-forming drugs which is now under consideration and which it was expected would be promulgated within a month or so. This Law empowers the Governor-General to proclaim any other substance a habit-forming drug, thus bringing it under jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX. OF THE CONVENTION.

CHILE.

In a letter dated December 23rd, the Chilian Delegation at Berne stated that the reply of the Chilian Government to the letter from the Secretary-General on the subject, dated November 8th, had not yet been received.

The Chilian Delegation forwarded a copy of the "Sanitary Code" now in force in Chile, but this Code does not appear to make any special reference to Article 9 of the Convention.

ANNEX 5.

EXTENSION OF THE IMPORT AND EXPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

GENEVA, December 21st, 1922.

MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium begs to submit the following points in connection with the extension of the import and export certificate system, as this subject figures on the agenda.

PART I.

The present system originated in the following resolution proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne at the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, held on May 4th, 1921:

“That the Council should suggest the adoption of the following procedure to the Governments which are parties to the International Opium Convention, in order to enable them to carry out their obligations under Articles 3 and 5, and under Article 13 of the Convention:

“Every application for the export to an importer of a supply of any of the substances to which the Convention applies shall be accompanied by a certificate from the Government of the importing country that the import of the consignment in question is approved by that Government and is required for legitimate purposes.”

This resolution was subsequently strengthened, on the proposal of Mr. Campbell (India), by the addition of the following sentence:

“In the case of the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies, the certificate shall state specifically that they are required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes.”

On June 28th, 1921, the Council adopted this resolution and instructed the Secretary-General to forward it to the Governments of the States parties to the Convention for their favourable consideration.

As the system was both important and complex, an explanatory statement on the procedure proposed regarding import certificates was drawn up, which the Secretary-General, after consultation with Sir Malcolm Delevingne, circulated on February 27th, 1922 (C.L. 15. 1922. IX.). It contained the following points:

“The control of the import and export trade in dangerous drugs is one of the most important parts of the system established by the International Opium Convention for the prevention of abuse of dangerous drugs. Unless an effective control of the import and export trade can be established, effective *national* control becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, and the import and export trade can only be effectively controlled if there is close co-operation between all the countries concerned. The system of import certificates was devised by the Opium Advisory Committee in order to give full effect to the provisions of the Opium Convention in regard to the control of imports and exports, and was unanimously approved by the Council and Assembly of the League. It is hoped that all countries concerned will consent to adopt it and put it into full force at the earliest possible moment. Until that is done, the efforts of the different countries and of the League itself to control the traffic are gravely impeded.

"It will be remembered that the system of import certificates recommended by the Advisory Committee provides as follows:

"Every application for the export to an importer of a supply of any of the substances to which the Convention applies shall be accompanied by a certificate from the Government of the importing country that the import of the consignment in question is approved by that Government and is required for legitimate purposes. In the case of the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies, the certificate shall state specifically that they are required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes.

"The system has a twofold aspect, thus:

"(a) If a dealer in dangerous drugs in country A desires to import a supply of drugs from country B, he must, in the first place, obtain from his own Government a certificate that the import of that particular consignment of the drugs is approved by the Government and is required for legitimate purposes (or, in the case of morphine, heroin, cocaine or medicinal opium, that it is required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes), and must forward the certificate with or in support of his order to the exporting firm in country B. The Government of country B will not issue its licence for the export of the consignment of the drugs to country A until the certificate has been produced to it by the supplier in country B from whom the drugs have been ordered.

"(b) Conversely, if a dealer in dangerous drugs in country A desires to export drugs to Country C, the Government of country A will allow the export only on the production of a similar certificate from the Government of country C that the particular consignment desired to be exported is required in country C for legitimate purposes (or for medicinal or scientific purposes, as the case may be), and that its import is approved by the Government of Country C.

"It will be seen that, by the adoption of this system, country A is protected against the export of dangerous drugs from country B for improper purposes, as the Government of country B will not allow the export to country A except with the approval of the Government of country A; and, secondly, that the Government of country A has a guarantee that the dangerous drugs are not being exported from its own territory to other countries for improper purposes, as it will only allow the export of the drugs with the approval of the Government of the importing country and on the assurance that the drugs are required for proper purposes.

"The system is based on the assumption that every Member of the League controls the export of the dangerous drugs from its own territories by prohibiting the export of the drugs except with the licence of the Government. It may be pointed out here that, in order to carry out the scheme recommended by the Opium Advisory Committee and approved by the Council and Assembly of the League, it is necessary that a separate licence should be required in respect of each consignment of the drugs exported. It is obvious that the grant by a Government of general export licences to the exporting firms which would leave the exporting firms free to export any quantities of the drugs to any persons in any country would not be sufficient to carry out the obligations which the Government has undertaken by the International Opium Convention."

This system of import and export certificates "was devised by the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium in order to give effect to the provisions of the International Opium Convention in regard to the control of imports and exports." These provisions are contained in Article 13 of the Convention.

PART II.

The method under this system of controlling the movements of the various drugs covered by these certificates is capable of improvement. The attention of the Committee is called to the following weak points:

1. The present system offers no guarantee that drugs exported from country A to country B on the strength of an import certificate issued by B ever reached country B.
2. The system does not preclude the export of unlimited quantities of drugs from A to B as long as import certificates issued by B are produced, although permission would presumably not be given for the export of such unlimited quantities from A to B without these import certificates.
3. The system does not preclude repacking or remarking *en route* of export shipments.
4. The system does not preclude the issue of import certificates by different authorities in the same country and at the same time, *i.e.*, it does not insist on the issue of these import certificates by a single office or authority in each country.

5. The system does not stipulate that the movement authorised by an import certificate shall be carried out within a fixed time.

6. The system does not provide for the despatch, under closed cover, by the authorities issuing the import certificates, of a "duplicate" copy, or notification of the issue of such certificate to the authorities of the exporting country stating the quantity authorised for import.

7. The system does not provide for the prohibition of re-exports.

The issue of these certificates might perhaps be subject to the following conditions:

1. Export certificates might be issued on deposit of cash or other guarantee which would be forfeited if the drugs exported did not reach their declared destination.

This principle is generally enforced in countries where, for some reason, the authorities desire to make sure that the movement authorised is actually carried out and that the goods have not been disposed of *en route* or at a port other than that originally declared as destination.

2. Import certificates might be issued only when such import certificates do not exceed the legitimate requirements of the issuing country.

This might be effected by each country numbering its import certificates consecutively at time of issue and showing on each certificate not only the amount authorised by it but also the total amount for which import certificates have previously been issued (during the year of issue).

3. Export certificates might be granted only conditionally on the agreement of the exporter that the shipment will neither be repacked nor remarked *en route*.

This would prevent the substitution of contents during repacking in a bonded or repacking warehouse, and the prevention of remarking would make it more difficult to evade the Customs Authorities at destination. All shipments under export certificate might be entered in a special place or on a separate sheet on the bill of lading.

4. The issue of import certificates might be restricted to one office or one authority.

This would preclude the issue of certificates for quantities in excess of the legitimate requirements of the issuing country; it is difficult to prevent this if more than one office issues import certificates.

5 (a). Export certificates might be issued conditionally on the transport being effected within a stipulated time, failing which the guarantee deposited by the exporter would be forfeited.

This would act as an additional control over the movement of the drugs covered by the export certificate.

5 (b). Export certificates might be issued conditionally upon the exporter producing, within a stipulated period of time, a receipt showing import issued by the authorities of the country of import, failing which the guarantee deposited by the exporter would be forfeited.

This would act as an additional control over the movement of the drugs covered by the export certificate and at the same time would show which guarantees are forfeited and which are returned to the guarantors.

6. A duplicate copy of the import certificate issued under separate cover by the authorities of the issuing country might be forwarded to the competent authorities in the country of export.

This measure would tend to prevent tampering with import certificates and presentation of forged import certificates. It moreover conforms to a principle hitherto applied in the control of shipments which are only permitted on a special authority.

7. Import certificates might only be issued subject to re-export being forbidden.

This would go a long way towards stopping uncontrolled traffic in drugs. If re-exports are not forbidden, it would be possible for B to re-export to C drugs imported into B from A without first obtaining an import certificate from C, although B could not *export* drugs which it had actually manufactured to C without first producing an import certificate issued by C.

ANNEX 6.

[*Translation.*]

REPORT ON THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE MIXED SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE HEALTH COMMITTEE AND OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

SUBMITTED TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BY Dr. ANSELMINO (GERMANY).

GENEVA, January 9th, 1923.

The Mixed Sub-Committee has instructed me to submit to you the report on the discussions which took place from January 4th to 6th.

The following members were present at the meetings of the Sub-Committee:

1. *For the Health Committee:*

Dr. CARRIÈRE, Director of the Federal Public Health Service at Berne, President of the Sub-Committee;

Dr. CHODZKO, Polish Minister of Health.

Professor SANTOLIVUO was absent.

2. *For the Opium Committee:*

Mr. CAMPBELL;

The RAPPORTEUR;

M. BLANCO, Secretary.

Dame Rachel CROWDY, Director of the Social Section, and Dr. RAJCHMAN, Director of the Health Committee, were also present.

At its first meeting, the Mixed Sub-Committee appointed Dr. Anselmino as Rapporteur, and requested him in the first place to submit a reply to the questions placed on the agenda:

1. An examination, in the light of previous enquiries conducted by the Health Committee, of the figures furnished in reply to a circular letter sent to all the States signatory to the Convention and to other States Members of the League of Nations, asking them to state the total quantity of opium and of its derivatives considered necessary each year for the needs of home consumption.

2. Investigations, with a view to evolving a satisfactory method of determining the quantities of opium, derivatives of opium and other noxious drugs required each year for the needs of the home consumption of the various countries.

In order to deal with this subject in all its aspects, the Rapporteur again entered into a systematic investigation of the campaign against narcotics. He formulated five questions of principle and endeavoured to reply to them:

- (1) What is the object of the work undertaken by the League of Nations ?
- (2) What constitutes an abuse ?
- (3) How do abuses occur ?
- (4) How can these abuses be ascertained ?
- (5) Can abuses be prevented ?

(1) The aim of the work of the League is to limit and finally to prevent the abuse of opium, of morphine, of diacetyl-morphine and of cocaine.

(2) What constitutes an abuse ?

After a detailed discussion, and in view of the fact that the Sub-Committee was instructed to draw up its report *solely* from the health and medical point of view, it was decided that medical use should be considered the only legitimate use and that all non-medical use should be recognised as an abuse, and also that, in the opinion of doctors, the use of opium as a stimulant could not be considered legitimate even in tropical countries.

(3) How do abuses occur ? In Europe and in countries whose customs are similar to those of Europe the abuse of drugs occurs chiefly as a consequence of their employment for medical purposes. Doctors should be made to see that morphine must only be employed in cases of absolute necessity. In all cases where it is desired to influence the respiratory system or to provide remedies for coughing, for example, morphine should invariably be replaced by codeine or dionine.

In no case should an attempt be made to cure morphino-mania by the use of cocaine. Morphino-mania is scarcely ever the result of inducement. On the other hand, cocaino-manie is nearly always intensified by this means. While the morphino-maniac conceals his practice of the vice, the cocaino-maniac will only inhale cocaine in company with others. If he has no companions he endeavours to find them and induces individuals who are not yet cocaino-maniacs, to imitate him. As a rule it is persons of weak character, youthful psycho-paths, who yield to the temptation, and cocaino-maniacs may be divided into two perfectly distinct categories: those of the demi-monde and those of the proletariat. The latter is by far the most dangerous, because in this category energies which might be of value for production are destroyed in a very short time.

No objections were raised to the Rapporteur's reply, which, however, only dealt with conditions in Europe.

4. How can abuses be ascertained? The Rapporteur began by describing the situation in Germany, and then continued:

The figures in possession of the Health Committee with regard to the annual consumption per head of the population in Canada, Denmark, Luxemburg, Sweden and Switzerland have, as regards the consumption of codeine, dionine and other drugs which are derivatives of morphine, been extended by introducing a figure equivalent to that relating to morphine (except in the case of Canada, which gave the figures for the consumption of codeine and dionine). This method can only give approximate results, and the figures are undoubtedly inaccurate, but as the same error appears in the returns for Denmark, Luxemburg, Sweden and Switzerland, the results thus arrived at enable a comparison to be made.

In the case of Canada the consumption of morphine to codeine is as 1 to 0.7

In the case of the United States the consumption of morphine to codeine is as 1 to 2.

The figures for morphine in all its forms (hydrochlorate, sulphate, nitrate) and of codeine, dionine, etc. have been reckoned as being ten times the quantity of opium. This method also is approximate and gives no exact results, for opium employed in manufactures contains more than 10 % of morphine; on the other hand, the whole of the morphine is not obtained in a pure state on manufacture and the amount of the codeine contained in opium should be added in the calculations.

Hydrochlorate of morphine contains only about 75 % of morphine, and sulphate of morphine still less, and in the same way heroin and codeine salts should not be placed side by side as regards the amount of morphine which they contain. For the object we have in view, the calculations required would prove unnecessarily difficult and at the present time would yield no useful results. In my opinion, accurate figures can be obtained if all the calculations are made using morphine as a basis.

Moreover, the figures given for consumption give no information of the extent to which morphine and raw opium are used in patent medicines, as, for example, Pavon, Pantopon, Opon, etc. Allowing for the estimates of consumption in Germany, a further amount of from a fourth to a third of the requirements in pure morphine salts must also be included in the calculations, the result being that we may estimate the consumption (the figures for morphine in Sweden are particularly low compared with those for Denmark, Luxemburg and Switzerland) at 0.9 grammes, or 15 grains of raw opium per head of the population per annum in all those countries of Northern and Central Europe for which we possess figures. The returns for Switzerland seem to be very high; they were probably reckoned on the basis of the Swiss population, whereas foreigners are the great consumers of these drugs in Switzerland.

The Sub-Committee then decided as follows:

(a) The difference between the total of the amount imported and produced and the amount exported, taking the stocks at the beginning and at the end of the year, represents the total quantity used (both legally and illegally). The Secretary will put into convenient form the information given in the summary of the replies to the questionnaire per head of population for each country and compare the figures thus obtained.

The difference between the total amount used and the quantity used for medical purposes would give an approximate idea of the amount used abusively.

(b) In what manner can the quantities necessary for medical consumption be determined?

System 1. By accurate and regular methods of supervision, such as those carried out for example, in the United States and Germany.

System 2. (applied, *e.g.*, in Switzerland). By direct enquiries made in hospitals and from chemists, dispensing physicians, dentists and veterinary surgeons. From these enquiries the quantities consumed for medical purposes will be obtained.

System 3. By determining the extend of the incidence of the disease in any given country taking as a basis the statistics of insurance companies and funds which insure against the disease. Ascertaining from enquiries addressed to a limited number of general hospitals the average consumption of narcotics per patient and per year. By multiplying the first figure by the second the average annual legitimate consumption throughout the country is obtained.

System 4. By statistics obtained through the employment of import and export certificates.

The Sub-Committee cannot see its way to propose any single method which could be employed for all countries but is of opinion that various methods should be examined in order to obtain the figures for the medical requirements of the different countries.

(5) How can abuse be prevented ? In his reply, the Rapporteur only considered the European aspect of the question ; he was of opinion that the Health Committee should purely from a medical point of view, approach doctors in the different countries in order to bring them to the view that morphine should be employed only in case of absolute necessity. In all cases, for example, in which it is desired to treat the respiratory system or in all cures employed for coughs, for example, it is essential that codein or dionin should be used instead of morphine. If morphine is absolutely necessary for the success of the treatment, the doctor should not prescribe a quantity larger than is absolutely necessary. He should never allow the patients to make injections themselves but should always perform this operation himself. If this is not possible, he should himself give instructions to and supervise the nurses.

In no case should it ever be attempted to cure morphine-mania by cocaine.

In most cases harmless drugs such as novocaine may be employed instead of cocaine.

This question did not come within the competence of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium, but the Health Committee would no doubt adopt the proposal which had been made.

ANNEX 7

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF OPIUM IN FREE PORTS

GENÈVA, January 11th, 1923.

The special Sub-Committee appointed by the Committee for Communications and Transit to consider the question of the control of the opium traffic in free ports, taking as a basis the resolution adopted by the Communications and Transit Committee on September 2nd, 1922, the International Opium Convention of January 23rd, 1912, adopted the following conclusions, without, however, taking a decision on questions of detail in connection with the procedure to be followed in the application of that Convention.

The Sub-Committee divided the question into two parts:

The import and export of opium which has not been subjected to any manufacturing process.

Legally, the régime of a free port allows the sovereign State of the port, by its ordinary policing and supervisory powers, to enact any measures for the control of the opium traffic in the free port which it considers necessary for the application of the International Opium Convention.

In practice, any such measures which could be taken would no doubt be fully adequate to control the traffic of opium which has been declared. On the other hand, in view of the small bulk of these goods, there is no doubt that the measures to prevent contraband in opium in free ports will often prove ineffective in cases in which opium is not declared.

The most practical means of surmounting these difficulties would therefore appear to be to perfect the control in the free port itself by the following general measures:

Opium should not be despatched from the country of origin to a free port except in the two following cases:

(a) If the consignment is sent with a through bill of lading made out to a final destination *via* the free port, the country of origin must not, in such a case, despatch the opium unless the country of destination shown in the through bill of lading has given the necessary guarantees mentioned in the Opium Convention.

(b) If, according to the bill of lading, the free port is the final destination of the consignment, the consignment should not be despatched by the country of origin unless the sovereign State of the port has given the same guarantees. In such a case the free port is considered, in respect of these guarantees alone, as being on exactly the same footing as any other part of the territory of that State.

Opium treated with manufacturing processes in free ports.

Legally, the sovereign State of the free port may, in accordance with its general policing powers, regulate the industries of the free port, including industries for the purpose of transforming opium.

In practice it is comparatively easy to carry out this regulation and control. If the above provisions are applied, it will not be possible for opium to reach a free port as its final destination unless the sovereign State of the port has given the necessary guarantees.

The State will therefore be able to control the transformation of raw material in the factories of the free ports, as the number of these is necessarily small, and will be able — and indeed, will be obliged, in so far as it is bound by the Opium Convention — not to allow the export of prepared products from its factories unless those prepared products can be introduced into the importing country in conformity with the Opium Convention.

The above provisions apply both to raw and to prepared opium and also to the industrial products of opium and to the similar products referred to in the Opium Convention, and are valid both as regards free ports and also as regards the free zones in ports.

ANNEX 8

REPORT ON THE DRAWING-UP OF A BLACK LIST.

GENEVA, December 22nd, 1922.

On September 1st, 1922, the Advisory Committee decided that a report, to be considered at the next session, should be drafted on the basis of the discussion on the subject of a black list. The following report has therefore been prepared:

Document O.C. 64 refers to cases which have been recently discovered of attempts to smuggle dangerous drugs from Europe to the Far East on a large scale, and it was suggested that a list of offenders should be drawn up, that their movements should be kept under observation, and that the Governments of the countries in which they take up their residence should be fully informed of their antecedents. It was further suggested that the most convenient way to do this would be through the Secretariat of the League.

From the discussion which took place, it would appear that the Committee was not unanimously agreed upon the following points:

1. Whether such a list was to be confidential or not.
2. Whether it was to be communicated to all countries or only to the countries concerned;
3. Whether the list was to contain only information relative to the illicit wholesale trader who carried on the traffic on an international scale.
4. Whether the list was to include all offenders, great and small.
5. Whether the making public of such a list was admissible, or contrary to custom and law.
6. Whether in certain cases such a list could be replaced by an exchange of confidential information between the police authorities.
7. Whether such a black list was to be prepared by the Secretariat from particulars of cases brought to its notice or not.

According to the minutes of the Third Session of the Advisory Committee, no conclusion was reached, although it appears to have been generally recognised that some means should be devised for keeping Governments informed of the offences and movements of such offenders who carried on the traffic on a large or international scale. M. Bourgois objected to the black list on the grounds that such a list was contrary to custom or even to law, as it caused suspicion to rest for an indefinite period upon traders who might only have committed a single offence, or upon offenders who had expiated their offence.

The general impression was that the various Governments should co-operate more closely in the exchange of information.

ANNEX 9

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
NETHERLANDS REGARDING FREE PORTS.

[*Translation.*]

BERNE, November 9th, 1922.

Sir,

In your letter of August 14th, 1922 (C. L. 80. 1922. XI), you were good enough to inform the Minister for Foreign Affairs at The Hague that, at the last meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium, it was decided to communicate with the Governments of all countries possessing free ports or free zones in their territories in order to ascertain the position of such free ports or free zones as regards the import or export of narcotic drugs. In reply to your letter, I am instructed by Jonkheer van Karnebeek to inform you that there are no free ports or free zones either in the Netherlands or in her colonies, unless the word "entrepôt" (warehouse) is included in the foregoing phrase.

I have the honour, etc.

(*Signed*) JAN PANHUYS.

ANNEX 10.

REPLY OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT TO LETTER OF JUNE 1st, 1922, ON
MANUFACTURE OF COCAINE, ETC.

ROME, November 6th, 1922.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your letter dated June 1st, 1922 (C.L. 52) requesting the Chinese Government to furnish the Secretary-General with all important information regarding the manufacture of cocaine, together with an estimate of its annual requirements of this harmful drug, and drawing the attention of the Chinese Government to the resolutions of the Council (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*), I have the honour to inform you that a communication has been received from my Government to the effect that, with regard to the first and second of the resolutions in question, the manufacture of cocaine and similar drugs has been strictly forbidden by authority since China began the campaign against opium. What little cocaine the medical doctors use had been imported from abroad. But it is impossible to find a basis for the statistics of annual consumption without concentrating the power of control over smuggling and without a central organ for the manufacture of drugs. For these purposes the Chinese Government is planning to establish a bureau for the control and supervision of all the illicit drugs, which will keep a close watch on the different sea-ports so that no smuggling will be allowed, and accurate statistics of the importation of drugs for legitimate use will soon become available. At the same time, the establishment of a factory for the manufacture of drugs is also in contemplation. This factory will not only manufacture drugs for ordinary use but will also produce enough cocaine and similar drugs to supply the needs of the medical world in China.

The Chinese Government wishes therefore to make reservations with regard to the resolutions in question, pending the establishment of the above-mentioned institutions, and will, as soon as these two institutions come into existence, make a careful investigation and compile statistics concerning the information under consideration, which will be sent to you as soon as available.

As for the third and the fourth resolutions, the Chinese Government will put them into execution without delay. As regards the fifth resolution, the Chinese Government begs to state that it has attached severe penalty to any illicit traffic in morphine and cocaine.

I have the honour, etc.

(Signed) TANG TSAI-FOU.

LETTER FROM THE CHINESE LEGATION IN LONDON TO THE SECRETARIAT
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OPIUM.

LONDON, November 18th, 1922.

Dear Mr. Blanco,

In further answer to your letter of the 11th inst. enquiring about the putting-up of a factory in China for morphia manufacture, according to official information, the proposal was put forward by the Inspector-General of Maritime Customs, and I can assuredly say that it will only be used to meet the requirements of legitimate and medicinal purposes. It will be carried out under the strict supervision of the Government.

I am, etc.

(Signed) CHAO-HSIN CHU.

ANNEX 11.

OPIUM TRADE IN CHINESE TURKESTAN AND CENTRAL ASIA.

NOTES BY THE BRITISH CONSUL-GENERAL AT KASHGAR IN CHINESE TURKESTAN.

The opium trade flourishes practically unchecked in Chinese Turkestan, and is not interfered with in the province of Semirechia across the frontier in Russian Turkestan.

There is no planting of the poppy in Chinese Turkestan, as the prepared article is imported from Afghanistan and its dependent province of Badakhshan, as well as from Semirechia. The persons engaged in the trade from Afghan Territory are mostly Afghans, but British subjects are occasionally involved in it.

The following table gives details of the areas of production.

District.	Quality.	Estimated yearly production.
<i>Afghanistan and Badakhshan :</i>		
Jizim	Superior to other districts.	5,800 lbs.
Chayab.	Superior.	5,300 "
Shahr-i-Buzurg	2nd quality.	2,600 "
Herat	" "	5,200 "
Jalalabad.	" "	7,000 "
<i>Semirechia, Russian Turkestan :</i>		
Tokmak and the Great Kara Kul Lake. . .	2nd quality, but said to be much improving.	44,000 "

The mode of importation from Afghanistan is as follows:

Through Wakhan and over the Russian Pamirs to the Chinese frontier, whence entry is effected by unfrequented routes, as the Chinese do not consistently maintain ports at all the points of ingress from Russian territory.

Kirghiz are employed as guides, and they also supply limited transport when required; so well organised is the system that the loads are passed through and brought to the distributing centres at Yarkand and Yango Hussar, two of the principal towns in Chinese Turkestan.

There is also the main route from Wakhan (Afghanistan) *via* the Wakhijrui Pass direct to Sarikol (Chinese Turkestan), but this was little used owing to the presence of a detachment of British levies at Payik in the valley leading to the Wakhijrui Pass. This post has recently been withdrawn, so the route in question may possibly be more utilised.

The smugglers appear to experience no difficulty in traversing Wakhan, which is administered by a Hakim or Governor appointed from Kabul.

It is estimated that, after allowing for purchase price of the drug, its transport to Chinese Turkestan, and all incidental expenses, there is a profit of Rs. 2,500 (£166 13s. 4d.) on each pony load.

The drug is openly sold in the provincial capital Urumchi, while in Kashgar I have pointed out 14 shops to the Chinese authorities, three of which were successfully raided.

Several of the Chinese officials in Turkestan are themselves interested in the trade and do not, therefore, display an active interest in its suppression.

Semirechia, Russian Turkestan.

Tokmak and the district in the neighbourhood of the Great Kara Kul Lake are the principal opium-growing centres.

The opium is imported by unfrequented routes and brought to Kulja (Ili) and to the capital at Urumchi.

The profit per pony-load is slightly higher than that accruing from the Afghan article, as the distance to be traversed is less.

In 1919 about 2,400 Chinese, Tungans (Chinese Mohammedans) and Turkis left the Urumchi and Kulja districts for Semirechia for opium planting and preparation, in addition to those from Chuguchak (Tacheng).

In 1920 about 2,800 left the same districts for Semirechia.

In 1921 approximately the same number left.

In 1918, owing to repeated pressure brought to bear from H. M. Minister, Peking, steps were taken by the provincial authorities to check the traffic, prior to which an average of 12,500 persons was engaged in the opium trade with Semirechia.

The provincial authorities issue periodical proclamations for the suppression of the traffic, but there is as yet no organised and whole-hearted attempt to cope with it.

(Signed) P. ETHERTON,

Lieut.-Colonel,

H. M. Consul-General, Kashgar, Chinese Turkestan.

December 1922.

ANNEX 12.

ENQUIRY IN CHINA CONCERNING THE CULTIVATION OF THE POPPY. CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL WITH REFERENCE TO THE APPOINTMENT OF HIGH COMMISSIONERS FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF POPPY CULTIVATION.

LETTER FROM THE CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

GENEVA, September 21st, 1922.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that I have received a telegram from the Wai-Chiao Pu, Peking, to the effect that four High Commissioners for investigating the poppy cultivation in certain provinces and special districts have been appointed by presidential mandate dated September 5th, the names of which are as follows:

M. Sa Chun-Ping, for Fukein and Anhui Provinces.
M. Lee Kai-Sen, for Shensi and Hupei Provinces.
M. Sun Tao-Jen, for Kansu and Hsinking Provinces.
M. Tseng Tao-Yuan, for Jehol and Suiyuan.

I am further directed to inform you that the above Commissioners are now making preparations for the investigation to be conducted during the forthcoming poppy-flowering season.

I have the honour etc.

(Signed) TANG TSAI-FOU.

REPLY FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

GENEVA, October 12th, 1922.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of September 21st stating that four High Commissioners for investigating the poppy cultivation in the provinces of Fukein, Anhui, Shensi, Hupei, Kansu, Hsinking, Jehol and Suiyuan have been appointed by presidential mandate dated September 5th and that these Commissioners are now making preparations for the investigation to be conducted during the forthcoming poppy season.

It would be much appreciated if the names also of those Commissioners who are appointed to inspect the provinces of Szechuan, Yunnan and Kueichow, which, it is understood, produce a very large proportion of the total opium output in China, could be sent to the Secretariat as soon as you yourself are in possession of this information.

I have the honour etc.

(Signed) ERIC DRUMMOND,

Secretary-General.

REPLY FROM THE CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL.

ROME, December 9th, 1922.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your letter of October 12th (12 A/23690/20220) asking for the names of the Commissioners who are appointed to investigate the poppy cultivation in the provinces of Szechuan, Yunnan and Kueichow, I have the honour to inform you that the Chinese Government will take up the matter as soon as the normal conditions of the above-mentioned provinces are restored and will then communicate to you the names of the Commissioners for the inspection of the provinces in question.

I have the honour etc.,

(Signed) TANG TSAI-FOU

ANNEX 13.

TRAFFIC IN COCAINE.

REPLY FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN.

PARIS, December 26th, 1922.

Sir,

In accordance with your request of June 1st, 1922 (C. L. 52), with regard to the information concerning cocaine. I have the honour to forward you the enclosed reply sent by the Government of Japan.

In this connection, I have been instructed to inform you that the replies from the territorial governments on the same enquiries will be sent to you as soon as they are obtainable.

I have the honour etc.

(Signed) S. OKUYAMA.

MANUFACTURE AND TRAFFIC OF COCAINE IN JAPAN EXCLUSIVE OF HER TERRITORIES.

September 16th, 1922.

1. Places of manufacture: Tokio and Osaka.

2. Statistics of manufacture (in kilogrammes):

1917	67,500
1918	1,017,450
1919	827,100
1920	1,799,550 ¹
1921	2,324,700

3. Channels of distribution:

Generally the manufacturers of cocaine sell with special agreement the drugs to druggists, who in turn supply the hospitals and medical practitioners through the pharmacutists in accordance with the regulations relating to the sale and handling of medicine.

4. The estimated amount needed per annum for Japan exclusive of her territories is 1,800 kilogrammes.

¹ These are correct figures for the amount manufactured in 1920, which have been entered incorrectly in the replies to the questionnaires issued by the League of Nations in 1921.

ANNEX 14.

TRAFFIC IN COCAINE.

REPLY FROM THE SWISS GOVERNMENT.

[*Translation.*]

BERNE, December 22nd, 1922.

Sir,

We have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letters dated June 1st and October 27th last, and of your telegram of the 19th instant, requesting us to furnish you with certain information concerning the traffic in cocaine in Switzerland (importation of coca leaf, whence imported, quantity of cocaine manufactured) for the use of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium.

In the first place, we would beg to remind you that Switzerland has not yet ratified the International Opium Convention, and that consequently the Federal Authorities do not supervise the import and manufacture of cocaine, as provided for under Article 10 of the Convention. Moreover, the Administrative Authorities concerned are at present engaged in examining the question of furnishing statistics to the Advisory Committee on Opium, and no definite decision has yet been reached. As, however, we are anxious to help you as far as is possible, we are requesting the competent authorities to inform us whether they would not be able to communicate to us the figures you require for 1921, as they did in 1920, in connection with the general report which we forwarded to you on March 24th last.

We have the honour, etc.,

(*Signed*) Paul DINICHERT,
for the Federal Political Department.

ANNEX 14 a.

FURTHER LETTER FROM THE SWISS GOVERNMENT CONCERNING
MANUFACTURE OF COCAINE.

[*Translation.*]

BERNE, January 3rd, 1923.

Sir,

Further to our letter dated December 22nd, 1922, respecting the enquiry undertaken by the Advisory Committee on the Opium Traffic with the regard to cocaine (countries from which the coca leaves come, quantities imported, amount of cocaine manufactured), we have the honour to send you herewith a part, at least, of the information you request.

The Swiss Customs Directorate does not classify coca leaves under a special heading in the Federal Customs Tariff. In the statistics drawn up, coca leaves appear under the general heading of "raw materials for pharmaceutical purposes". As, however, it may be said that our imports of coca leaves frequently come from *the Dutch Indies*, and as the figures which appear in the chapter of the Federal Customs Tariff dealing with the Dutch Indies under the heading "Raw material for pharmaceutical purposes" largely consist of our imports of coca leaves, we are in a position to state that the figures in question represent, approximately, the quantity of coca leaves imported into Switzerland. The figures for 1921 are:

Whole coca leaves — 146 metric quintals;
Ground coca leaves — 135 metric quintals.

As the control of the manufacture of cocaine established by the International Opium Convention is not yet in force in Switzerland, we regret that we are not in a position to supply the information asked for by the Advisory Committee on the Opium Traffic with regard to the amount of cocaine manufactured.

I have the honour etc.,

(Signed) MOTTA,
Federal Political Department.
