



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/CONF.14/SR.9

29 June 1953

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

UNITED NATIONS OPIUM CONFERENCE  
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 17 June 1953, at 9.45 a.m.

CONTENTS

Consideration of the draft protocol for regulating the production  
of, international and wholesale trade in, and use of opium:  
preamble, article 1, article 2, new article 3, articles 3  
and 4 (E/2186, E/CONF.14/L.32, 44, 45, 51, 57 - 59, 68, 71,  
73 - 76, 78, 80) (continued)

<u>President:</u>	Mr. LINDT	Switzerland
<u>Executive Secretary:</u>	Mr. YATES	
<u>Administrative Secretary:</u>	Mr. PASTUHOV	

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT PROTOCOL FOR REGULATING THE PRODUCTION OF,  
INTERNATIONAL AND WHOLESALE TRADE IN, AND USE OF OPIUM: PREAMBLE, ARTICLE 1,  
ARTICLE 2, NEW ARTICLE 3, ARTICLES 3 AND 4 (E/2186, E/CONF.14/L.32, 44, 45, 51,  
57-59, 68, 71, 73-76, 78, 80) (continued)

The PRESIDENT explained that the Conference would consider the draft protocol article by article. He referred to the decisions already taken with regard to the procedure to be followed for consideration. The draft text of an article and all the amendments relating to it would be discussed in the Plenary Conference if at least one third of the members present and voting considered it necessary (E/CONF.14/L.32). If it were decided not to have a discussion, the texts would be immediately put to the vote.

Title (E/CONF.14/L.44)

The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that there were two amendments to the title of the draft protocol, one submitted by the delegation of Switzerland (E/CONF.14/L.76) and the other by the observer from Sweden (E/CONF.14/L.73). He recalled that under rule 46 of the rules of procedure, the Swedish observer's amendment could not be put to the vote except at the request of a delegation participating in the Conference.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) thought that the text proposed by the observer for Sweden was the clearest which had been put forward. He accordingly requested that that amendment (E/CONF.14/L.73) should be put to the vote.

Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden) presented his amendment. He recalled that the Economic and Social Council had convened the Conference with a view to the consideration of a draft protocol designed expressly to limit the

production of opium. The concept of limiting the production of opium to medical and scientific needs had never been abandoned, since it had been embodied in the third sub-paragraph of the preamble and in many other provisions of the protocol. It was therefore to be expected that it should appear in the title alongside the concept of regulation. Furthermore, the wording of the title should be such as to make it quite clear to public opinion that the purpose of the protocol was indeed the limitation of opium production.

Mr. VAILLE (France) proposed that the Conference should proceed to the discussion of the two amendments.

That proposal was adopted by 14 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. van MUYDEN (Switzerland) presented his delegation's amendment (E/CONF.14/L.76). It was true that the protocol was designed to regulate the international and wholesale trade in and use of opium, but it was also intended, so far as possible, to limit the production of opium. The title proposed by his delegation was therefore more logical than that originally used in document E/2186. It also bore a closer relation to that which had been used for the draft protocol for a number of years.

Mr. VAILLE (France) was opposed to the proposals put forward by the representative of Switzerland and the observer from Sweden. The protocol was not designed expressly to limit the production of opium. It was based on the free order principle, limiting the production of the producing countries only in so far as that would be done by the law of supply and demand, and did not preclude over-production, always provided that the excess quantities produced did not find their way into the illicit traffic. Furthermore, it was pointless to refer in the title, to the cultivation of the poppy plant, as it went without saying that the controls imposed would have to apply to the plant itself. Public opinion must not be misled into believing that the protocol really limited the production of opium.

Mr. KYRCU (Greece) associated himself with the comments made by the representative of France.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) pointed out that the title proposed by the observer from Sweden corresponded more closely than any other to the text of the protocol in its present form, as it took into account the insertion of the new article 3 which dealt with the control of poppy-cultivation for purposes other than the production of opium.

Mr. van MUYDEN (Switzerland) thought that, if the principle stated by the French representative were to be taken into account, many provisions of the protocol would require amendment, particularly the first sentence of article 3 and paragraph 1 of article 4 (E/CONF.14/L.45), which referred to the limitation of the quantity of opium produced in the world and of the international trade in opium to medical and scientific needs.

The Swiss delegation objected to the title proposed by the observer for Sweden. It would prefer that the title should contain no reference to control of the cultivation of the poppy plant, as the protocol dealt primarily with the control of opium - which implied control of the poppy plant. From the point of view of the protocol, the problem of the use of poppy straw for the illegal manufacture of alkaloids was a matter of secondary concern, already partly subject to regulation under the 1931 Convention. The title of the protocol should not therefore refer to it.

The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment of the observer from Sweden (E/CONF.14/L.73) which was the farthest removed in substance from the original proposal.

The amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 12, with no abstentions.

Preamble (E/CONF.14/L.44, E/CONF.14/L.71, E/CONF.14/L.80)

Mr. JONKER (Netherlands) presented the amendment submitted by his delegation to the third paragraph of the preamble (E/CONF.14/L.71). Although the Main Committee had decided that the protocol should contain a reference to the use of poppy straw for the manufacture of alkaloids, it was obviously untrue to say that the use of poppy straw was one of the most urgent problems arising in connexion with the control of narcotic drugs.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) recalled that, after a lengthy debate, the Main Committee had decided by a large majority to retain the words that the Netherlands representative was now proposing to delete.

Mr. VAILLE (France) saw no point in discussing the amendment proposed by the Netherlands representative.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) agree with the representative of France.

By 14 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions, the Conference decided not to discuss the Netherlands amendment (E/CONF.14/L.71).

The Netherlands amendment was adopted by 12 votes to 11, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. PASTUHOV (Secretariat) explained the modifications proposed by Secretariat (E/CONF.14/L.80) in the arrangement of the preamble and the wording relating to signatures to the protocol.

Mr. YATES (Secretariat), in reply to a question from Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) explained that it was the practice of the United Nations to use the form "The Contracting Parties" rather than "The High Contracting Parties", which had been the form used in the days of the League of Nations. The Secretariat suggested that the Conference should not depart from that practice.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) approved that suggestion and pointed out that the Main Committee had already by implication subscribed to the views of the Secretariat, as the expression "The High Contracting Parties" was not used in the body of the protocol.

Mr. YATES (Secretariat) in reply to a question from Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden), confirmed the fact that the signatories to the protocol would be listed at the end of the protocol itself, while the signatories to the Final Act, i.e. all the delegations participating in the Conference, would be listed at the end of the Final Act.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) assumed that at the end of the Final Act some such phrase as "In witness whereof, the representatives and observers, duly authorized, have signed this Final Act", would appear.

Mr. PASTUHOV (Secretariat) said that that would be the case.

Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) reserved the right to comment at a later stage on the drafting of the sentence.

The changes proposed by the Secretariat (E/CONF.14/L.80) were adopted.  
The preamble, as amended. (E/CONF.14/L.44) was adopted unanimously.

Article 1 (E/CONF.14/L.44. E/CONF.14/L.74)

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia), speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Committee, said that the text of article 1 in document E/CONF.14/L.44 had been adopted only provisionally. The Main Committee had agreed that the chapter containing definitions would have to be reviewed when the complete text of the protocol was drafted.

The PRESIDENT confirmed that statement. It had been suggested by the Business Committee that the eighth report of the Drafting Committee (E/CONF.14/L.74) which made a number of changes in article 1 should be discussed in plenary session.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the first proposed change was intended only to complete the first sentence of article 1. It had been found that it was not always possible to indicate expressly the cases in which the definitions did not apply and that consequently the words "or where the context otherwise requires" should be added to the sentence.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) supported the proposal and pointed out that a similar formula was used in Indian legislation.

Mr. DUBE (Monaco) thought that a more general formula such as "except where otherwise indicated in this Protocol" would be preferable as the word "context" might be misleading.

Mr. CONTINI (Secretariat) said that there was no standard clause. Different formulas were used in the various instruments dealing with narcotic drugs.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) preferred the text as it stood.

The amendment submitted by the representative of Monaco was rejected by 9 votes to 4, with 14 abstentions.

The first amendment to article 1 (E/CONF.14/L.74) was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, said that the new definition of the word "territory" did not make any substantive change in the text. The Drafting Committee had felt that the definition would be more explicit if it referred to the system provided for in the 1925 Convention.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom), answering a comment by Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan), confirmed that some States, both federal and non-federal, might be considered as a number of separate entities for the purposes of the application of the system of control provided for in the 1925 Convention. The proposed definition took into account the position of those States, but did not cover Pakistan, since Western and Eastern Pakistan were not treated as separate entities in the application of the 1925 Convention.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) concurred.

The second amendment to article 1 (E/CONF.14/L.74) was adopted.

Mr. SHARMAN (Supervisory Body) was afraid that the proposed definition of the words "export" and "import" would not cover exports from one State to a territory of another State.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) assured Mr. Sharman that the proposed definition in fact covered exports of the kind to which he had referred.

Mr. VAILLE (France) agreed.

Mr. SHARMAN (Supervisory Body) said that the explanation was satisfactory

Mr. HOSSICK (Canada) proposed that the words "of the same State" at the end of the definition should be deleted in order to remove the difficulty mentioned by Mr. Sharman.

Mr. VAILLE (France) opposed the proposal which he considered dangerous. He felt that the words "of the same State" were essential.



The PRESIDENT said that the oral amendment proposed by the Canadian representative could be put to the vote since article 1 had been only provisionally adopted by the Main Committee.

Mr. JONKER (Netherlands) pointed out that the Canadian proposal was not strictly speaking an amendment and that, under rule 32, a delegation could request that parts of a proposal should be put to the vote separately.

The Canadian representative's proposal was rejected by 18 votes to one, with 7 abstentions.

The third amendment to article 1 (E/CONF.14/L.74) was adopted.

Article 1 (E/CONF.14/L.44) as amended, was adopted by 27 votes, without opposition.

Article 2 (E/CONF.14/L.44, E/CONF.14/L.51, E/CONF.14/L.58, E/CONF.14/L.59, E/CONF.14/L.78)

Mr. van MUYDEN (Switzerland) submitted his amendment (E/CONF.14/L.78) which called for the replacement of the words "every producing State" in article 2, sub-paragraph 1, by the words "a Party which permits the production of opium". The Swiss delegation felt that the proposed wording was more logical since the main object of the protocol was to lay down the obligations of States Parties to it.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) requested a discussion of the Swiss amendment.

The PRESIDENT said that a proposal could be discussed if one third of the members present and voting so requested.

The Conference decided by 9 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions to discuss the Swiss amendment (E/CONF.14/L.78)

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) thought the wording of the Swiss amendment was an improvement but was opposed to its adoption because there was not sufficient time to consider what consequential changes would be necessary elsewhere in the Protocol.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) opposed the Swiss amendment which needlessly limited the scope of the Protocol from the point of view of the control exercised by producing States, whereas the Protocol would impose obligations even on States which were not parties to it.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had expressed the view in the Main Committee that the obligations imposed on Parties should not be extended to States not parties to the protocol. The Committee had not supported that view. Bowing to the decision of the Committee, he would therefore vote against the Swiss amendment.

Mr. PHAM HUY TY (Vietnam) supported the Swiss amendment which eliminated any confusion that might arise in regard to the definition of producing and exporting States. The two groups of States were not identical. It was desirable to indicate that article 2, paragraph 1 referred to States which permitted the production of opium.

Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden) thought that it would be logical to use the word "Parties" and not "producing States" in article 2, sub-paragraph 1, as well as in article 3, sub-paragraph 1. The Conference should therefore adopt the Swiss amendment.

Mr. van MUYDEN (Switzerland) thanked the Vietnamese representative and the Swedish observer for their support and explained that his amendment was concerned only with article 2. His delegation did not ask that the words "producing State" should be replaced whenever they appeared in the protocol.

The PRESIDENT put the Swiss amendment to the vote (E/CONF.14/L.78)  
The amendment was rejected by 17 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) presented his amendment to article 2, sub-paragraph 1 (E/CONF.14/L.51)

The PRESIDENT put the Indian amendment to the vote.  
The Indian amendment was adopted by 33 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) said in explanation of his vote that he had opposed deletion of the words "and its administrative organization" because the Main Committee had decided after discussion to retain them.

Mr. KURINO (Japan) introduced his amendment to sub-paragraphs 1 and 5 of article 2 (E/CONF.14/L.59). If that amendment were adopted, sub-paragraph 1 instead of stating that every producing State had to establish one or more agencies, would require every such State to establish a single agency or, if its Constitution did not permit that, to establish several agencies. The amendment was drafted with the assistance of the Secretariat, in order to avoid possible misinterpretations of the article, without changing any of the principles already adopted by the Main Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) proposed that the Japanese amendment be discussed.

The Conference decided to discuss the Japanese amendment (E/CONF.14/L.59) by 7 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) said that without wishing to express an opinion on the intrinsic value of the Japanese amendment, he doubted whether the Conference, being pressed for time, would be able to reach a mature decision on the proposal.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) supported the Japanese amendment and proposed that it should be specified that the agency would have to perform "all" the functions set forth in article 2.

Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) supported the Japanese amendment, as amended by the United States representative.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) opposed the Japanese amendment as establishing an identity between "one or more government agencies" and "the competent government authorities". The proposed working would cause confusion.

Mr. JOUBLANC-RIVAS (Mexico) supported the Indian representative's remarks.

The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Japanese amendment to sub-paragraphs 1 and 5 of article 2 (E/CONF.14/L.59).

The Japanese amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) introduced his amendment to sub-paragraph 5 of article 2 (E/CONF.14/L.58). While admitting that the parties might find it desirable to determine in advance the prices at which the government agency would acquire ownership of the crops, the Iranian delegation would prefer that they should not be required to do so.

Mr. VAILLE (France) opposed the Iranian amendment, as it would deny States the possibility of using prices to control cultivation of the poppy. The price clause, far from hampering States, would make their control policy more effective and should be retained.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) supported the Iranian amendment. The price clause was too vague for it to be expected to make control more effective. He did not deny that by predetermining a low price a State would to some extent discourage cultivation of the poppy, but the text of sub-paragraph 5, as it stood, placed no such obligation on the parties and nothing would therefore be lost by omitting the price clause.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) also considered that the clause which the Iranian representative proposed should be deleted was too vague to be of any use in achieving the purposes of article 2.

The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Iranian amendment (E/CONF.14/L.58), to article 2, sub-paragraph 5.

The Iranian amendment was adopted by 15 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT put to the vote article 2 as a whole (E/CONF.14/L.44), as amended, the wording of sub-paragraph 7 being that proposed by the Drafting Committee (E/CONF.14/L.74).

Article 2, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

New article 3 (E/CONF/14/L.44, L.75, L.57)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) supported the amendment submitted by the observer from Sweden (E/CONF.14/L.75) as he considered that the suggested new title was much more suitable for an article which dealt not only with poppy straw but also with the cultivation of the poppy.

Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden) thought it desirable that the title of an article should correspond exactly with its contents. The whole of the first part of the new article 3, however, dealt with poppy cultivation and only paragraph (c) related to the control of poppy straw. The Swedish delegation had therefore thought it advisable to propose a new title.

The Swedish amendment (E/CONF.14/L.75) was adopted by 16 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that he had voted against the amendment because the new title was much too long, having regard particularly to the fact that the article in question contained only one paragraph. Moreover, the purpose of the article was to control poppy straw intended for use in the

production of morphine. The title just adopted implied that the cultivation of the poppy would be controlled whatever the use for which the plant was intended.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) introduced the first part of his amendment (paragraph 1 of document E/CONF.14/L.57). He recalled that the words "in its opinion" had been inserted in paragraph (a) of the article at the Mexican delegation's request and that the Main Committee had discussed the same question at length in connexion with the Turkish representative's amendment to article 10. Since the Turkish amendment had been rejected, the words "in its opinion" should be deleted from the new article 3.

Mr. VAILLE (France) proposed that that amendment be discussed.  
The proposal was adopted by 4 votes to 1.

Mr. VAILLE (France) supported the Indian amendment.

Mr. JOUBLANC-RIVAS (Mexico) thought it essential to retain the words "in its opinion", as safeguarding the sovereignty of States. The Mexican delegation had supported the Turkish amendment to which the Indian representative had referred and would therefore vote against the Indian amendment.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Mexican representative that there must be respect for the sovereignty of States, but pointed out that the motives underlying the protocol were humanitarian. That was why the Committee had considered that in certain cases a supra-national authority could justifiably be empowered to intervene in the domestic affairs of a State. As the Committee had taken that attitude in the case of other articles, the Conference should logically adopt the Indian representative's amendment.

Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden) pointed out that the words "in its opinion" did not appear in any of the existing conventions. Even if those words were deleted, the parties would still retain a certain freedom of action, as was clear from the words "such laws or regulations as may be necessary" which appeared in the English text. At the same time, the international authority would be given the right to intervene. The amended text should therefore be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of India that as a matter of general principle a formula of that kind was undesirable. But poppy straw had been raised at the Conference without warning and most delegates had had no instructions. That being so it was not unreasonable to leave Governments rather more freedom of action in that particular field.

Mr. DANNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that in his country the poppy had been cultivated for seed for centuries past. Cultivation was not prohibited and was not controlled in any way. It did not occur to farmers to extract morphine from the seed. It would therefore be absurd to enact legislation which would merely draw attention to the possibility of producing morphine. The existing text of the article should accordingly be retained. He recalled that the Committee had voted in favour of inserting the words "in its opinion" by 22 votes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) considered that the existing text gave governments too much latitude, since they might very well reply that there was nothing they could do in that connexion. The arguments advanced by the United Kingdom representative were mistaken. The original text of paragraph 5 of the draft protocol had referred to poppy straw, as was evident from the observations on the question submitted by various countries even before the meeting of the Conference.

In reply to the objections of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, he pointed out that even if the words "in its opinion" were deleted, governments would still have sufficient latitude to decide whether or not it was necessary to enact legislation concerning poppy straw. The purpose of the new article 3 was to prevent the illicit production of opium and morphine from poppies. There was therefore no question of controlling the production of poppy seed. In view of the decision adopted with regard to article 10, the Conference should, if it wished to be logical, adopt the Indian amendment.

The first part of the Indian amendment (E/CONF.14/L.57) was adopted by 19 votes to 4.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) presented the second part of his amendment (paragraph 2 of document E/CONF.14/L.57), which concerned sub-paragraph (a) (ii) of the new article 3 and was designed to set up a control of imports and exports of poppy straw. Sub-paragraph (c), which provided for the transmission of statistics concerning the import and export of poppy straw, was not enough. The Indian amendment did not define the methods for the control that was to be instituted; that would be left to the governments to decide. The Indian amendment had already been rejected by the Main Committee but in view of the large number of abstentions and the fact that the Committee had not given the question sufficient attention, the Indian delegation had decided to put it forward once again. Since morphine was derived from poppy straw, it was hard to see how the illicit manufacture of morphine could be prevented unless countries controlled the import and export of the raw material.

The Committee decided to discuss the second part of the Indian amendment.



Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) did not approve of the amendment.

Paragraph (c), which provided for the transmission of statistics, would enable the Board to obtain all the necessary information. Moreover, all the countries exercised a general control over their exports and imports. There appeared to be no reason why any additional control should be provided for poppy straw.

Mr. RENBORG (Observer from Sweden) pointed out that if, as was hoped, the protocol brought about a reduction of the quantities of opium available on the illicit market, it might well be that traffickers would have greater recourse to poppy straw in order to obtain morphine. The conventions in force provided for only a national control of poppy straw for the extraction of morphine; yet it was well known that illicit traffic was conducted at the international level. If the Indian amendment were adopted, all that countries would need to do would be to introduce a system of export and import licences for poppy straw.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) did not share the Swedish representative's views. The manufacture of morphine from poppy straw was a difficult operation which could be carried out only in specially equipped factories. Moreover, it required vast quantities of poppy straw. The United Kingdom delegation was, generally speaking, opposed to any control that was not absolutely essential.

Mr. DANNER (Federal Republic of Germany) also thought that the production of morphine from poppy straw did not represent any danger. In 1950 Germany had produced 4,619 kg. of morphine by that method, whereas its poppy cultivation would have allowed it to produce 84,000 kg. As those figures showed, only a very small part of the poppy straw was used for the manufacture of morphine. As the production of alkaloids was subjected to a licensing system and the production figures were communicated to the Board, there did not appear to be any advantage in controlling the imports and exports of poppy straw.

Mr. VAILLE (France) thought that such control would have no practical effect. If traffickers wanted to obtain morphine, it would be easier for them to produce synthetic preparations than to extract it from poppy straw.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) pointed out that the Board received figures concerning the poppy straw used in factories, but none concerning the amount of raw material produced.

Contrary to the contention of some representatives, illicit transactions in poppy straw could present a serious danger. He remembered the United States representative having said, at the third meeting of the Main Committee, that there was a large traffic in heroin manufactured from poppy straw originating from countries which did not send in statistics.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) pointed out that heroin could not be manufactured direct from poppy straw. Morphine had to be made first and the moment that process began it fell under the controls required by the 1931 Convention.

The second part of the Indian amendment (E/CONF.14/L.57) was rejected by 14 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

The new article 3, as amended, was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Article 3 (E/CONF.14/L.65 and 74)

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia), Chairman of the Drafting Committee, pointed out that the Committee's amendment (E/CONF.14/L.74) contained only drafting changes.

Mr. VAILLE (France) proposed that there should be no separate vote on drafting amendments but that they should be adopted at the same time as the article.

It was so decided.

Mr. KRISHENAMOORTHY (India) thought that the English text would be improved if the word "State" in the eighth line of sub-paragraph 2 (a) were replaced by "Party" and the word "Party" in the ninth line by "State", and that in both English and French texts the word "State" in the eleventh line should be replaced by "Party".

Mr. VAILLE (France) and Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) thought it unwise to amend the present text, for such hastily made amendments might have consequences that it was impossible to foresee at the moment.

The amendments proposed by the Indian representative were adopted by 5 votes to 4, with 15 abstentions.

Article 3, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Article 4 (E/CONF.14/L.45 and 68)

Mr. OR (Turkey) presented his amendment (E/CONF.14/L.68). The arguments that had been put forward in support of the adoption of a provision reducing the list of exporting producer countries to four were to be found in the summary records (E/CONF.14/AC.1/SR.10, 11 and 12). The main opposing argument had been that free competition must be safeguarded, but the representatives of the United States, Switzerland and China had pointed out that even if the number of countries authorized to export were reduced to four, the principle of free competition would be safeguarded.

Mr. PHAM HUY TY (Vietnam) proposed that there should be a discussion on the Turkish amendment.

The Conference decided, by 9 votes to 4, to discuss the amendment.

Mr. HOSSICK (Canada) thought that if three countries were struck off the list of those authorized to export, a kind of opium monopoly would be set up. His delegation could not accept that principle and would vote in favour of the retention of the article as it stood.

Mr. VAILLE (France) recalled that at Ankara, where the question of establishing a monopoly had been considered, stocks had been set aside and quotas reserved for countries that were not to form part of the proposed monopoly. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had adopted the principle that the countries authorized to export should be those which had exported opium in 1950; those were the seven countries named in article 4. Two of the countries on that list had not taken part in the Conference but for political reasons it was important that they should be kept on the list.

Mr. van MUYDEN (Switzerland) said that when the Main Committee had taken its decision on article 4 the Swiss delegation had voted for the inclusion of the USSR and Bulgaria and against the inclusion of Greece in the list. In the meantime it had changed its views respecting Greece which it would also like to include in the category of producing countries authorized to export. It was now convinced that the list of countries in article 4 should be in accordance with the principle adopted by the Economic and Social Council. The Swiss delegation would therefore vote against the Turkish amendment.

Mr. QUINTERO (Philippines) said he would vote in favour of the Turkish amendment, because the purpose of the Conference was to reduce and limit the production of opium. The Protocol already provided that countries could produce for their own needs, which meant that the number of producer countries could increase. It would be a pity now to allow the number of countries trading in opium to increase.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) said that the reason he had abstained in the vote the Main Committee had taken on the inclusion of the USSR and Bulgaria in the list had been that those countries had not seen fit to attend the Conference. Nevertheless, he thought that the principle voiced by the Council should be followed and he could not therefore vote in favour of the Turkish amendment.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) supported the Turkish amendment, since the USSR and Bulgaria had declared that they were not concerned with the export of opium.

Mr. PHAM BUY TY (Vietnam) reminded the meeting that during the discussion in the Committee he had reserved the right to revert to the question. He had now received instructions from his Government, which agreed to the limitation of the number of exporting countries to those that had exported opium in 1950. His country was not contemplating any increase in its opium production for the purpose of export.

Mr. OR (Turkey), replying to the objections of the French representative, pointed out that the present situation was altogether different from the situation that had prevailed at the time of the Ankara meeting, when there had been question of a monopoly and 3 per cent had been reserved for certain countries. By the terms of the Protocol, exporting countries would be able to export as they wished.

Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece) thought that the Conference must bear in mind the interest of humanity and not the individual interests of countries. He therefore urged the Turkish representative to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OR (Turkey) replied that his amendment was not designed to protect Turkey's interests. As he had received formal instructions from his Government, he could not agree to withdraw his amendment.

The Turkish amendment was rejected by 16 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.  
Article 4 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

2/7 a.m.