

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Confidential.

O.S.B.46.

Geneva, August 24th, 1937.

TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

International Convention for Limiting the Manufacture
and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, of
July 13th, 1931.

Supervisory Body.

ELEVENTH SESSION.

PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.

I. SUPPLEMENTARY, REVISED OR AMENDED ESTIMATES FOR 1936.

1)- Supplementary statements for 1936.

The fifth, sixth and seventh supplementary statements for 1936 were published after the tenth session of the Supervisory Body (October 1936). These three supplementary statements contain supplementary, revised or amended estimates for 22 countries and 7 territories.

2)- Late supplementary estimates, i.e., estimates received at the Secretariat after December 31st, 1936.

Supplementary estimates for 1936 for two countries and one territory were received at the Secretariat after December 31st, 1936.

One of these estimates (Cuba) has already been communicated to members of the Advisory Committee; the remaining two received recently, will be submitted at the present session.

3)- Total number of estimates for 1936 examined by the Supervisory Body.

The Supervisory Body has received and examined in all, for 1936, 111 supplementary late, revised or amended

estimates;

Of this total: 105 were inserted in the seven supplementary statements for 1936;
3 were held over;
3, received after December 31st, 1936, were not inserted in a supplementary statement for 1936.

Counting the 179 estimates published in the statement for 1936, the Supervisory Body has therefore examined 290 estimates in all for 1936.

II. ANNUAL ESTIMATES FOR 1937.

- 1)- Statement of estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs for 1937 (Documents O.S.B./Statement 1937, Confidential, and C.547.M.353.1936.XI, public edition).

By a letter of November 2nd, 1936 (C.L.200.1936.XI), the Secretary-General communicated to Governments confidentially the Statement of estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs for 1937.

In the past the Statement was made public six weeks after the date of its distribution to Governments. The German Government, by its letter of October 12th, 1936, having informed the Supervisory Body during the tenth session that in its view the publication, in the Statement, of detailed estimates concerning eucodal, dicodide, dilaudide and acedicone, which are German products with protected trademarks, was likely to injure the legitimate commerce of Germany, the Supervisory Body decided, for the statement for 1937, to publish a special public edition as well as the confidential edition. This decision was brought to the knowledge of the German Government by the Secretary's

letter of December 21st, 1936, of which the following is an extract:

To the German Consul,

"Sir,

"With reference to your letter of October 12th, 1936 I have the honour to inform you that the Supervisory Body has instructed me to bring the following to the knowledge of your Government:

"In view of the obligation to forward, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, to all Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 27 of the 1931 Convention for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs, a Statement containing the estimates for each country or territory, and having taken into consideration the wish expressed by the German Government that its estimates concerning eucodal, dilaudide, dicodide and acedicone should not be made public, the Supervisory Body has decided to issue, in respect of the year 1937, two Statements: one of a confidential character, intended for Governments and containing estimates for all drugs, including the above-mentioned four drugs, and the other intended for publication, containing no details of the estimates for the four drugs in question.

"I have the honour to be, etc.

.....".

The statement for 1937 intended for publication was communicated to Governments by a letter from the Secretary-General dated January 30th, 1937 (C.L.23.1937.IX); this statement contains no details of the estimates for the four drugs or for genomorphine (morphine-N-oxide).

The German Government, by its letter of April 9th, 1937, informed the Secretary-General that it had no objection to raise as regards the procedure adopted by the Supervisory Body. (A copy of this letter, which also contains a reference to the conditions on which the German Government is prepared to sign the Procès-Verbal to alter the date of issue of the statement, together with the Secretary-General's reply of June 29th, 1937, are reproduced in Annex I to this report).

2) - Exchange of views between the Governments and the Supervisory Body with regard to the annual estimates for 1937.

During its tenth session the Supervisory Body decided to publish in the statement for 1937 the annual estimates of (41) Costa Rica*, (44) Guatemala, (49) Panama, (82) Afghanistan, (84) China, (87) Iran, (80) French Guiana, (97) the Philippines, (100) French Indo-China, (111) Syria and the Lebanon), (124) Sierra Leone, (127) Kenya, (141) French West Africa, (144) Madagascar and Dependencies, and (145) Morocco, as supplied by the Governments in question.

These estimates were accompanied by a note stating that they are the subject of discussion between the Governments and the Supervisory Body or that the Supervisory Body had not received, before the end of the tenth session (October 16th, 1936), any reply to its request for information or any further details.

Costa Rica - By a letter of August 22nd, 1936, the Costa Rican Government's attention was directed to the fact that the figures shown under Heading III of Form B(L) (reserve stocks) represent for the most part amounts corresponding to the supplies for several years. Further, the figures shown under Heading IV(a) of the same form were apparently arrived at by deducting from the figures shown under Heading III those shown under Heading I (consumption).

* The numbers preceding the names of countries are the serial numbers under which the countries are mentioned in Table II of the statement for 1937.

In the same letter the Costa Rican Government was informed that the same misunderstanding had occurred in the presentation of the estimates for 1936 and that the Supervisory Body had directed the Government's attention to these facts by its letter of April 30th, 1936, to which no reply has been received. The Supervisory Body accordingly requested the Costa Rican Government to re-examine the estimates supplied for 1936 and 1937, in the light of the observations contained in the two above-mentioned letters.

No reply having been received to the letter of August 22nd, 1936, a reminder was addressed by telegram to the Government in question on October 6th, 1936, requesting it to reply to the said letters before the end of the tenth session of the Supervisory Body. No reply to this telegram has been received.

Guatemala - By a letter of August 24th, 1936, the Guatemalan Government was informed that the Supervisory Body had noted at its ninth session that Guatemala's estimates for 1937 for certain drugs showed, under Heading IV(a), quantities required for bringing the reserve stocks up to the desired level which exceeded the actual level shown under Heading III. The Guatemalan Government's attention was also directed to the fact that the explanation of the method accompanying the estimates is not very clear on several points.

In reply to this letter, the Guatemalan Ministry of Foreign Affairs forwarded to the Chairman of the Supervisory Body a communication dated September 25th, which was transmitted to members of the Supervisory Body in Document O.S.B./34(m), pages 31 and 32. As this reply still left some doubt as to the Guatemalan Government's intentions with regard to the reserve stocks and more particularly the quantities necessary

to bring them up to the desired level for 1937, the Secretary had recourse to the good offices of a member of the Secretariat who was on a mission to his country (Guatemala) and requested him to transmit to his Government a memorandum explaining in detail the difficulties encountered by the Supervisory Body in the examination of Guatemala's estimates for 1937 and further explaining the questions raised in the letter of the Chairman of the Supervisory Body, dated August 24th, 1936.

The Supervisory Body having decided to insert in the statement for 1937 the estimates as supplied by the Guatemalan Government and to omit the figures given under Heading IV(a) of statistical Form B(L), the Secretary asked the official in question to direct the attention of his Government to this question and to request it to frame estimates of the amounts required to bring the stocks up to the desired level, in order that the Supervisory Body might communicate them to Governments in the next supplementary statement for 1937.

In reply to this memorandum, the Guatemalan Government transmitted the revised estimates for 1937, which were received at the Secretariat on April 7th and communicated to the members of the Supervisory Body on April 17th, 1937 (Document O.S.B./S.E./1937 (8)).

After examining the revised estimates, the Supervisory Body decided to address a letter to the Guatemalan Government directing its attention to the fact that they showed under Heading III of statistical Form B(L) a reserve stock level representing for morphine $4\frac{1}{2}$ times, for diacetylmorphine $2\frac{1}{2}$ times, for cocaine and codeine $1\frac{1}{2}$ times and for dionine $7\frac{1}{2}$ times the estimated annual consumption for those several drugs in 1937. After explaining the meaning of the term "reserve

stock" and directing the Guatemalan Government's attention to the practice of other Governments in the matter and to the possibility of submitting supplementary estimates should the stocks prove insufficient, the Supervisory Body asked the Guatemalan Government to be good enough to re-examine its revised estimates for 1937, in order that the estimates for reserve stocks might be framed in conformity with the requirements of the Limitation Convention. No reply has yet been received to this letter, which was addressed to the Guatemalan Government on June 22nd, 1937.

Panama - By a letter of August 24th, 1936, the Panama Government's attention was directed to the fact that the estimates for 1937 make no provision for the country's requirements in the matter of codeine or dionine. As estimates for the drugs in question were supplied for the three previous years and the statistics of exporting countries show certain exports of codeine and dionine to Panama during those years, the Supervisory Body directed the Government's attention to the fact that owing to the absence of estimates for 1937 Panama would not be allowed to import any quantity of the above-mentioned drugs during that year.

The Supervisory Body also noted that the estimates for morphine and cocaine rose from 2 kg. and 1 kg. respectively for 1936, to 9 kg. and 2 kg.620, and requested explanations on the subject. At the same time, it was pointed out to the Panama Government that its estimates were not accompanied by a statement of the method employed in calculating the amounts shown in them.

No reply having been received to this letter, a reminder was sent by telegram on October 6th, 1936; no reply has been received to this.

Afghanistan - By a letter of August 22nd, 1936, the Afghanistan Government's attention was directed to the fact that its annual estimates for 1937 were given as 5 kg. and 10 kg. for morphine and cocaine respectively; the returns of exporting countries show, however, that the total amount of morphine exported to Afghanistan during the years 1934 and 1935 was less than 1 kg. and that the total amount of cocaine exported to Afghanistan during that period was less than 2 kg. The Supervisory Body asked for information concerning the method by which those estimates had been calculated and suggested that some reduction might be made in the estimates, namely, to 3 kg. of morphine and 5 kg. of cocaine.

On September 4th, 1936, the Secretary received simply an acknowledgment from the Royal Legation of Afghanistan in London; the note accompanying the estimates for 1938 (see Document O.S.B./44, page 36) may, however, be regarded as a reply to the Supervisory Body's letter of August 22nd, 1936.

China - The Supervisory Body's request for explanations, addressed on August 20th, 1936, to the Chinese Government, concerning its estimates for 1937 and the Government's reply of July 9th, 1937, were communicated to the Supervisory Body on August 14th, 1937 (Document O.S.B./S.E./1937 (24)).

In his reply to the Secretary's communication, the Chairman suggested that this reply should be considered during the examination of the Chinese estimates for 1938, and Professor Tiffeneau proposed that it should be discussed at the present session of the Supervisory Body.

Iran - By its note of August 19th, 1936, transmitted by a member of the Secretariat to the Director-General of Public Health at Teheran, and in the course of a conversation

on November 4th, 1936, with M. Entezam, the Permanent Delegate of Iran in Geneva, the Secretary explained the situation arising out of the fact that the Government of Iran had supplied for 1937 two estimates, dated respectively March 30th, 1936 (communicated to the Secretary on August 11th, 1936), and April 18th, 1936 (received by the Secretariat on June 9th, 1936).

On accepting the more recent estimate - that of April 18th, 1936 - the Advisory Body found that it gave neither the level of reserve stocks, the amounts necessary to bring those stocks to the desired level, nor a statement of the method employed in calculating the consumption estimates.

M. Entezam stated that he would refer the matter to his Government and communicate the latter's reply to the Supervisory Body as soon as possible. No reply has yet been received by the Secretariat.

Philippines. By its letter of August 24th, 1936, the Chairman of the Supervisory Body directed the attention of the Secretary of State of the United States of America to the fact that the estimates for consumption for the Philippine Islands were based on the estimates submitted by importers. The Supervisory Body asked for information concerning the steps taken by the Government of the Philippines to compare these estimates of the importers with the actual consumption of the drugs during the years preceding the year for which the estimate was supplied. At the same time, it pointed out to the Government that no statistics of consumption for the Philippines had been supplied and that in the absence of such statistics the Supervisory Body was not able itself to make a comparison between the estimates supplied and the country's actual needs.

The communication of the Department of State dated July 22nd, 1937, which was forwarded at the same time as the estimates for 1938 and is reproduced in document O.S.B./44(b), page 18, contains a reply to this request for explanations.

FRENCH TERRITORIES

At its ninth session (August 1936), the Supervisory Body requested Professor Tiffeneau to apply to the competent French authorities to furnish information concerning the following territories:

French Guiana. Request for explanations concerning fluctuations in the importation of morphine during the period 1933 - 1935 and discrepancies between the import statistics and consumption estimates.

In the matter of codeine, the Supervisory Body requested further information concerning the relation between the estimated consumption of morphine (250 grammes) and that of codeine (2 kg. 500).

French Indo-China. The request for explanations concerned the causes of the increase in the codeine estimates for 1936 and 1937 (over 27 kg.) compared with previous years (4 kg. 500).

Syria and Lebanon. The French Government's attention was directed to discrepancies between the estimates for morphine consumption (8 kg.) and the import statistics which, for the period 1933 - 1935, were always under 4 kg. The Supervisory Body suggested that the estimate in question be reduced to 6 kg.

As regards codeine, the consumption estimate of 25 kg. seemed far too high, seeing that in 1934 the actual imports were approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ kg. and in 1935 $17\frac{1}{2}$ kg.

Morocco. The request for explanations concerned the reasons for the increased consumption estimate for codeine, which had risen from 15 kg. in 1935 and 1936 to 21 kg. 600 in 1937.

* * *

No reply has yet been received to the Supervisory Body's requests for explanations concerning the above-mentioned French territories.

BRITISH TERRITORIES

Sierra Leone. At its ninth session, the Supervisory Body accepted the estimates for Sierra Leone, deciding, however, to omit from the Statement for 1937 the estimates supplied under Headings III and IV and requesting the Chairman to direct the attention of the Colonial Office to the fact that there was some confusion between Headings I (consumption) and III (level of reserve stocks).

As a result of the Chairman's action, revised estimates were received on November 11th, 1936, and were communicated to the members of the Supervisory Body in document O.S.B./34(m) on December 17th, 1936. These revised estimates, which were accepted by the Supervisory Body, were communicated to Governments in the first supplementary statement for 1937.

Kenya. The 1937 estimates show, for morphine, diacetylmorphine and cocaine, considerable increases compared with the estimates for 1936; the Chairman was accordingly requested to direct the attention of the Colonial Office to this situation and to the fact that the estimates were also greatly in excess of the imports for previous years.

On November 3rd, 1936, the Secretary received revised estimates for Kenya which were communicated to members of the Supervisory Body in Document O.S.B./34 (m) of

December 17th, 1936. The reductions effected more particularly for codeine, dionine and cocaine - namely from 255 grammes, 63 grammes and 2 kg. 296 respectively to 10 grammes, 10 grammes and 200 grammes respectively - subsequently proved to have been too drastic, and supplementary estimates have since been supplied for the three drugs in question (see Documents O.S.B./S.E.1937(3) and O.S.B./S.E.1937.(23)).

These supplementary estimates were accepted by the Supervisory Body.

III. SUPPLEMENTARY, REVISED OR LATE ESTIMATES FOR 1937.

By August 21st, 1937, 60 supplementary, late, revised or amended estimates had been received for 1937, of which 35 were considered by the Supervisory Body and communicated to Governments in the two supplementary statements for 1937; one estimate supplied by mistake was withdrawn by the Government concerned (Siam); three estimates (Timor, Angola and Guatemala) have been held over pending replies to the Supervisory Body's requests for explanations; 11 estimates examined by the Supervisory Body will be inserted in the next supplementary estimate, and eight will be examined at the present session; two (Czechoslovakia and Colombia), examined by the Supervisory Body, will be reconsidered at the present session.

IV. ANNUAL ESTIMATES FOR 1938.

The number of annual estimates for 1938, received this year by the date laid down in the Convention (August 1st) was 80 (27 countries and 53 territories); 44 estimates for 26 countries and 18 territories) reached the Secretariat between August 2nd and 21st. Altogether 124 annual estimates, for 53 countries and 71 territories, were received by August 21st 1937.

It is interesting to note by way of comparison, that in 1933 the number of annual estimates received by August 1st was 11; in 1934, 53; in 1935, 65; in 1936, 77, and in 1937, 80. In this connection it should be mentioned that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Supervisory Body at its fifth session, reminders were sent to the 36 Governments whose annual estimates for 1937 had not been received on August 1st, 1936.

Between August 9th and 16th, the Secretary communicated with the Delegations of nine Governments at Geneva, directing their attention to the fact that the estimates for their countries had not been received on August 1st, and requesting them to make the necessary representations to their Governments, in order that the estimates might arrive before the opening of the Supervisory Body's session, i.e., before August 26th. Following on this action, the estimates of four countries were received, by August 21st, 1937.

V. MODIFICATION OF THE DATE OF ISSUE OF THE STATEMENT
OF ESTIMATES.

(See the Secretary's Progress Report submitted at the
Ninth Session, Document O.S.B.35, page 9 et seq.

The delegates to the Conference which met in June 1936 to consider the Draft Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic concluded an administrative agreement whereby the latest date for the issue of the annual statement of estimates would be altered from November 1st to December 1st of each year, so that the Supervisory Body might have sufficient time to obtain from Governments such explanations and information as might in certain cases be necessary. The Procès-Verbal embodying the new arrangement will come into force as soon as it has been signed by all the Parties to the Limitation Convention. Forty-four Governments parties to this Convention have signed the Procès-Verbal up to to-day (August 23rd, 1937). The total number of ratifications of the Limitation Convention is now sixty-two and the Procès-Verbal has accordingly still to be signed by another eighteen Governments before it can take effect.

The Governments of the following countries have not yet signed:

Europe: Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, San Marino. Central America: Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Salvador. South America: Chile, Colombia, Peru, Asia: Saudi Arabia, Iran. Africa: Sudan. Oceania: Australia. (See also the comparative tables, Annex II).

At its twenty-second session (May 24th - June 12th, 1937), the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other

Dangerous Drugs expressed in its report to the Council the hope that the Procès-Verbal would be signed as soon as possible by all the Governments which had not already done so, in order that the new arrangement might apply to the annual statement of estimates for 1938, due under the new arrangement on December 1st, 1937.

In the second half of June the Secretary approached, through the Permanent Delegations at Geneva or members of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, the Governments which have not yet signed the Procès-Verbal in question, requesting them to do so as soon as possible and drawing their attention to the fact that, in this particular case, it was merely a matter of procedure which should not cause any difficulties.

In a letter of April 9th, 1937, the German Government informed the Secretary-General of the conditions on which it would be prepared to sign the Procès-Verbal. This letter and the Secretary-General's reply of June 29th, 1937, are reproduced in Annex I to this report.

VI. ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNTS OF MORPHINE NECESSARY FOR CONVERSION PURPOSES.

At its tenth session the Supervisory Body observed that there were still considerable discrepancies between the estimated amounts of morphine required for conversion and the amounts actually converted.

The amounts of morphine intended for conversion were estimated at about 33 tons for 1934 and 31.3 tons for 1935; in 1934, however, only 21.6 and in 1935, 22 tons were converted. Thus, the estimated amounts exceeded the

amounts actually converted by 11.4 tons in 1934 and 9.3 tons in 1935, or by 53% and 43% respectively. The estimates for 1937 gave at the time when they were considered by the Supervisory Body: 30 tons as the amount of morphine required for conversion; the highest total amount of morphine converted during the four years 1932-1935 based on the statistics furnished by Governments to the Permanent Central Opium Board is about 22 tons in 1935. The estimated amount for 1937, therefore, exceeded the latter figure by about 8 tons, or 36%. Since the Supervisory Body's last session, as a result of supplementary estimates supplied by certain manufacturing countries, the total quantity of morphine estimated to be necessary for conversion in 1937 amounts to about 37 tons.

The above excesses of estimates as compared with actual requirements constitute a margin which, as the Supervisory Body points out in the introduction to the Statement for 1937 (page 6), seems more than sufficient to cover any miscalculation of the estimated amounts of drugs derived from the conversion of morphine needed for domestic consumption or for the export trade of manufacturing countries.

As the Supervisory Body thought it would be useful to call the special attention of manufacturing countries to this situation, the Secretary-General in his Circular Letter of January 18th, 1937 (C.L.12.1937.XI) informed Governments of these facts and appended to his Circular Letter a synoptical table showing the amounts of morphine used for conversion during the period 1932-1935 and the estimated amounts of morphine required for conversion purposes for the period 1934-1937.

The Governments of the United States of America and the Netherlands have replied to the Secretary-General's Circular Letter, and their replies are reproduced in Annex III to the present report.

VII. VARIOUS TRADE NAMES (REGISTERED NAMES) FOR
DIHYDROHYDROOXYCODEINONE, DIHYDROCODEINONE,
DIHYDROMORPHINONE AND ACETYLDIHYDROCODEINONE.

At its ninth and tenth sessions*, the Supervisory Body considered the advisability of including:

dihydrohydrooxycodone,
dihydrocodeinone,
dihydromorphinone and
acetyldihydrocodeinone,

in the Statement under their scientific names only, omitting the registered trade names under which the salts of those drugs are sold. It was pointed out that those drugs, the salts of which were at first manufactured only in Germany under the registered names "eucodal" (salts of dihydrohydrooxycodone, "dicodide" (salts of dihydrocodeinone), "dilaudide" (salts of dihydromorphinone) and "acedicone" (salts of acetyldihydrocodeinone), are now manufactured in other countries under different names. The Secretariat, which was requested to investigate the matter, has collected the following information, extracted from the communications of Governments transmitted in accordance with Article 20 of the Limitation Convention, the annual reports sent to the Advisory Committee and the communications from members of the Supervisory Body who were asked to make enquiries of their respective Governments.

* See Minutes of the ninth session, page 6, and of the tenth session, pages 18-19.

DIHYDROHYDROOXYCODEINONE,

(the salt of which is manufactured in Germany under the trade name "eucodal").

Hungary (extract from the annual report for 1935): "Dr. Egger's new factory has succeeded in converting thebaine into dihydrohydrooxycodone and proposes to place this new product on the market, under the trade name "hydrolaudin", as a substitute for eucodal".

Czechoslovakia (extract from the annual report for 1935): "The firm Interfarma of Prague has been authorised to manufacture dihydrohydrooxycodone hydrochlor. ('dinarcon'). It has produced only a small quantity of this narcotic drug for home consumption for medical purposes."

Japan (extract from the annual report for 1935):

<u>Drug the manufacture of which has been authorised:</u>	<u>Drug converted:</u>	<u>Firm authorised:</u>
cocaine dihydrooxycodone *	thebaine	Takada Chobei Shatan Co, Osaka"

DIHYDROCODEINONE

(the salt of which is manufactured in Germany under the trade name "dicodide").

Netherlands: In its verbal note of April 15th, 1935, the Netherlands Government, in accordance with Article 20 of the Limitation Convention, informed the Secretary-General that "M. J. Lewenstein, Amsterdam, Heerengracht 95, was authorised on March 16th, 1935, to manufacture dihydrocodeinone and its salts and to sell them for home consumption and for export. M. Lewenstein proposes to place bitartr. of dihydrocodeinone on the market under the name "hydrocod".

* The term used is obviously incorrect.

United States of America. At the ninth session of the Supervisory Body, Mr. May was requested to find out unofficially from his Government whether any of the four drugs mentioned above were manufactured in the United States and, if so, under what trade name they were sold.

Mr. May transmitted to the Secretary Mr. Fuller's reply, from which it appears that only a negligible quantity of dicodide has been manufactured in the United States and this was for clinical experimentation and medical research only. The manufacturer producing it reported it in official returns under the name "dicodide". It has not been offered for sale in the general trade.

DIHYDROMORPHINONE

(the salt of which is manufactured in Germany under the trade name "dilaudide").

Netherlands. In its verbal note of November 30th, 1935, the Netherlands Government, in conformity with Article 20 of the Limitation Convention, informed the Secretary-General "that M. J. Lewenstein, Amsterdam, Heerengracht 95, was authorised on November 16th, 1935, to manufacture dihydromorphinone and its salts and to sell them for home consumption and for export".

This verbal note does not state whether dihydromorphinone salts are manufactured and sold in the Netherlands under a trade name.

United States of America. The above-mentioned letter communicated by Mr. May also contains the following passage: "Dilaudide is produced in the United States by

one manufacturer only. Its production and sale are reported under the trade name 'dilaudide' and it appears to be known through the trade as such...."

Korea (extract from the annual report for 1935):

Drug the manufacture
of which has been
authorised:

Firm authorised:

dihydromorphinone
hydrochloride

Uemura Seiyaku-sho Sakamoto
Yisaku Yakuhinbu.

No trade name was mentioned in the annual report.

ACETYLDIHYDROCODEINONE

(the salt of which is manufactured in Germany under the trade name "acedicone").

The Secretariat possesses no information as to whether this drug or its salts are manufactured in other countries than Germany.

VIII. REVISION OF STATISTICAL FORM B(L)

(1)

At its tenth session, the Supervisory Body expressed the view that it might possibly be advisable to revise Statistical Form B(L) with a view to its simplification. The Permanent Central Opium Board which, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Limitation Convention, "prescribes from time to time" the Form in question, was informed of the Supervisory Body's opinion. At its thirtieth session, it entrusted the examination of

(1) See Minutes of the tenth session, pp. 21-22 and 28.

this question to a Sub-Committee whose report is reproduced in document C.C.P.198. The Sub-Committee in question was of opinion that, as Statistical Form B(L) has now been in use for some four years and the majority of the national authorities are now accustomed to it, it would be unwise to make any alterations. The Sub-Committee has, however, expressed the view that, should the Supervisory Body have any suggestions to make as to necessary amendments to the present text of the Form, the Board would be glad to consider them.

IX. RATIFICATIONS OF OR ACCESSIONS TO THE LIMITATION CONVENTION.

After the tenth session of the Supervisory Body, i.e., after October 16th, 1936, the Limitation Convention was ratified by Latvia on April 3rd, 1937. On August 23rd, 1937, the number of countries which had ratified or acceded to this Convention was 62 (see Annex II).

ANNEX I

Letters exchanged between the German Government and the Secretary-General concerning the publication of the Statement and the signing by Germany of the Procès-Verbal concerning the modification of the date of issue of the Statement.

German Consulate

No. 426

Geneva, April 9th, 1937.

1 Annex.

To the Secretary-General.

Sir,

With reference to this Consulate's letter No. 1029 dated June 5th, 1936, I am instructed by the German Government to communicate to you the following:

As shown by circular letter C.L.23.1937.XI dated January 30th, 1937, and the attached document C.547.M.353.

1936.XI (O.S.B./Statement 1937, public edition) the Supervisory Body, in conformity with its communication to the German Government 12B/26020/4509, dated December 21st, 1936, has not given separate particulars concerning the four patented German products eucodal, dicodide, dilaudide and acedicone in its statement of world requirements of narcotic drugs for 1937, in so far as this statement is intended for publication. Further, the Supervisory Body has marked its statement for 1937 for the use of Governments - O.S.B./Statement 1937 - as "confidential" (see circular letter C.L.200.1936.XI, dated November 2nd, 1936). Thus the Supervisory Body has taken into account, not fully but at any rate in regard to the above-mentioned German products, the German Government's objection to the publication of its statements. Assuming that the

Supervisory Body continues in future to observe the procedure now adopted in regard to its statements, in so far as they are published in any form, this procedure may be regarded as meeting the German Government's objection.

The German Government has, however, lodged an objection with the Central Opium Board against the Board's including separate statistics regarding these four German products, contrary to the provision contained in the last paragraph of Article 14 of the Convention of July 13th, 1931, in its statements published in virtue of the penultimate paragraph of No. 3, as this would be likely to injure the legitimate commerce of Germany. It is true that the Central Opium Board intends to take this objection into account in its statement for the year 1936; in spite of the German Government's objection, however, it has included detailed statistics regarding the four German products in question in its report for the year 1935 which is also intended for publication. (See document C.449.M.365.1936.XI, pages 122-129). This Consulate's letter to the Chairman of the Central Board, a copy of which is attached, refers to this matter.

The objection lodged with the Supervisory Body is closely connected with that lodged with the Central Opium Board. In both cases the purpose of the objection was the protection of legitimate German commerce in the four patented German products. In this connection the German Government will only be able to consider signing the Protocol of June 26th, 1936 regarding Article 5 No. 7 of the Convention of July 13th, 1931 (see circular letter C.L.135(a).1936.XI, dated July 30th, 1936) after it has been definitely established that future

statements of the Central Board, in so far as they are intended for publication in any form, will not again contain information regarding the four German products in question in the form of detailed statistics, but only in a single combined item.

I have the honour to be, etc.

(Signed) KRAUEL.

Geneva, June 29th, 1937.

Sir,

With reference to your letter of April 9th last (No. 426), I am glad to note that the German Government no longer objects to the procedure adopted by the Supervisory Body for the publication of statistics relating to eucodal, dicodide, dilaudide and acedicone, i.e. that of indicating these four drugs in a single item in all reports intended for publication, while separate statistics for each of these drugs will only be communicated to Governments in a confidential publication.

As regards the reference made in your letter to the manner in which the Permanent Central Opium Board publishes the statistics, I venture to point out that the latter, in its report to the Council of December 1st, 1936 (Document C.449.M.265.1936.XI., page 5), states, as you yourself observe, that it "proposes to unite the four drugs in a single table in the report to be published on the statistics for the year 1936, and to forward to the contracting parties separate

Dr. KRAUEL,
Consul General,
German Consulate,
6 rue Charles Bonnet,
GENEVA.

statistics for each of the four drugs". I venture to point out that the Central Board, in acting in this way, adopted a procedure similar to the above-mentioned procedure of the Supervisory Body. As early as 1932, the Central Board proceeded in this way, when it communicated to the Governments the statistics for 1931 in an annex separate from the report to the Council (Doc. L.N.P.O.24), which was accompanied by a red slip with the following words: "Tables IV (Dilaudide), V (Dicodide) and VI (Eucodal) are for Governments' Official Use only". The statistics for 1931 intended for publication appeared in another annex to the same report, carrying a separate number (Doc. L.N.P.O.25.1932.XI.).

In my opinion, the last paragraph on page 5 of the report to the Council on this subject (Doc. C.449.M.265.1936.XI) shows that the Central Board proposes to follow this same method in future for the publication of the statistics in question, unless "any contracting party disagrees with the German Government's interpretation of the Convention and the Board's proposals". In that case, a settlement of the dispute must be sought by the measures enumerated in Article 25 of the Limitation Convention. The Board itself is not entitled to take action under this article.

Referring you to the foregoing, I venture to hope that the German Government will agree to the solution proposed by the Central Board in the same way as it has accepted the procedure adopted by the Supervisory Body. The obstacle which has hitherto prevented the German Government from signing the Procès-Verbal of June 26th, 1936 (to alter the latest date of issue of the annual statement of the estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs,

drawn up by the Supervisory Body, as provided for by the International Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931) would thus be removed; in these circumstances, I also hope that the German Government will no longer have any objection to signing that Procès-Verbal.

I have the honour to be, etc.

For the Secretary-General:

ERIC EINAR EKSTRAND,

Director of the Opium Traffic
and Social Questions Sections.

ANNEXE II.

Tableau comparatif indiquant les pays qui ont:

- a) ratifié la Convention de Limitation de 1931;
- b) signé le procès-verbal tendant à modifier la date de communication de l'état annuel établi par l'Organe de Contrôle.

ANNEX II.

Comparative table indicating the countries which have:

- a) ratified the Limitation Convention of 1931;
- b) signed the Procès-verbal to alter the date of issue of the annual Statement drawn up by the Supervisory Body.

a)
Pays parties à la Convention de 1931.
Countries parties to the Convention of 1931.

b)
Pays qui ont signé le procès-verbal.
Countries which have signed the procès-verbal.

EUROPE.

Allemagne	-
Autriche	Autriche
Belgique	Belgique
Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord	Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord
Bulgarie	Bulgarie
Danemark	Danemark
Dantzig(Ville libre de)	Dantzig
Espagne	Espagne
Estonie	Estonie
Finlande	Finlande
France	France
Grèce	Grèce
Hongrie	Hongrie
Irlande(Etat libre d')	Irlande (Etat libre)
Italie	-
Lettonie	-
Liechtenstein	Liechtenstein
Lithuanie	-
Luxembourg	-
Monaco	Monaco
Norvège	Norvège
Pays-Bas	Pays-Bas
Pologne	Pologne
Portugal	Portugal
Roumanie	Roumanie

a)

b)

Saint-Marin	-
Suède	Suède
Suisse	Suisse
Tchécoslovaquie	Tchécoslovaquie
Turquie	Turquie
U.R.S.S.	U.R.S.S.

AMERIQUE.

Canada	Canada
Etats-Unis d'Amérique	Etats-Unis d'Amérique
Costa-Rica	Costa-Rica
Cuba	Cuba
République Dominicaine	-
Guatemala	-
Haïti	Haïti
Honduras	-
Mexique	Mexique
Nicaragua	-
Panama	Panama
Salvador	-
Brésil	Brésil
Chili	-
Colombie	-
Equateur	Equateur
Pérou	-
Uruguay	Uruguay
Venezuela	Venezuela

ASIE.

Afghanistan	Afghanistan
Arabie Saoudienne	-
Chine	Chine
Inde	Inde
Irak	Irak
Iran	-
Japon	Japon
Siam	Siam

AFRIQUE.

Egypte	Egypte
Soudan	-

OCEANIE.

Australie	-
Nouvelle-Zélande	Nouvelle-Zélande

Government replies to the Secretary-General's
Note verbale concerning the conversion of Morphine.

1. NETHERLANDS

"Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

"The Hague, April 29th, 1937.

"League of Nations Department.

"With reference to the circular letter of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, dated January 18th, 1937 (C.L.12.1937), concerning the discrepancies between the quantities of morphine estimated as required for conversion and the quantities effectively converted, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands has the honour to state that up to the present discrepancies between the estimates and the quantities effectively converted in the Netherlands have been of small importance, as shown by the following figures:

	Estimate	Quantity effectively converted.
1934	300	375
1935	440	368
1936	650	647

The estimate for 1937 has been calculated as exactly as possible."

The Secretary-General of the
League of Nations.

2. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Secretary of State of the United States of America refers to communication No.C.L.12.1937.XI., dated January 18th, 1937, from the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, in regard to the discrepancy which appears to exist between the world total of the estimated requirements of morphine for conversion into other drugs and the world total of the amounts actually converted during the calendar year 1935. In this connection, the Secretary-General and the Drug Supervisory Body are referred to the Secretary of State's note dated February 19th, 1936, in regard to similar apparent discrepancies for the calendar year 1934.

In explanation of the apparent discrepancy for the calendar year 1935, there is quoted below the statement of the American authorities charged with administration of the laws controlling narcotic drugs:

"... The same general conditions obtained with respect to the year 1935, for which it was estimated that 5560 kilograms of morphine would be required for conversion into codeine, dionine and dilaudide during the year, whereas at the close of the year only 4245 kilograms of morphine had been used for such purpose. However, this variation was not due to an excessive estimate, but to an inadequate production. The production of codeine alone during the year was 275 kilograms less than actual requirements for consumption and export, and 1153 kilograms less than the quantity required to meet consumption and exports and to bring reserve stocks up to the desired level. If during the year sufficient codeine to meet full requirements had been manufactured, it would have been necessary to have produced and converted a much greater quantity of morphine."

Department of State,
Washington.

March 16th, 1937.