

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.7/SR.104
8 December 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Fifth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Monday, 4 December 1950, at 10 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Illicit Traffic

1. Summaries of Reports on Illicit Transactions and Seizures.

(E/NS.1949/Summary 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; E/NS.1950/Summary 1, 2, 3, 4)

2. Illicit Traffic in 1949

(a) Annual Reports of Governments for the year 1949 made in pursuance of article 21 of the 1933 Convention, as amended by the 1946 Protocol (Chapter V only)
(E/NS.1949/1...)

(b) Observations of the Government of Turkey on Chapter V of its Annual Report for 1949 under article 21 of the Convention of 13 July 1933 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol of 11 December 1946 (E/CN.7/208)

(c) Memorandum on Illicit Traffic in 1949 (E/CN.7/212)

(d) Review of the Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs throughout the world during the year 1949 and the first nine months of 1950 (E/CN.7/213)

CONTENTS: (continued)

3. Situation in Germany
Control of the Illicit Traffic in Narcotics in Germany
(E/CN.7/206)
4. Situation in Thailand
Request by the Representative of the United States of
America for the addition of two sub-items to the item
on Illicit Traffic (E/CN.7/210/Add.1)
5. Heroin Diversion in Italy
6. Summary of Annual Reports of Governments for 1948 made in
pursuance of article 21 of the 1931 Convention, as amended by
the 1946 Protocol (Chapter - General: Section Illicit Traffic
only) (E/NR.1948/Summary)
7. Offer for sale in China of 500 tons of opium (E/CN.7/211)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SATTANATHEAN	India
<u>Members:</u>	Colonel SHEARMAN	Canada
	Mr. HSIA	China
	Mr. MAEMCUD LABIB	Egypt
	Mr. VAILLE	France
	Mr. AMINI	Iran
	Mr. RABASA	Mexico
	Mr. KRUYSSSE	Netherlands
	Mr. AVALOS	Peru
	Mr. BORATYNSKI	Poland
	Mr. OR	Turkey
	Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. ZAKUSOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. ANSLINGER	United States of America
	Mr. NIKOLIC)	Yugoslavia
	Mr. KRASOVIC)	

Also present:

Mr. MAY President of the Permanent Central Board

Secretariat:

Mr. STEINIG Director of the Division of Narcotic
Drugs, representative of the Secretary-
General

Mr. BOLTON Secretary of the Commission

ILLICIT TRAFFIC

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and referred members of the Commission to all the relevant documents before them.

He announced that the representative of the International Criminal Police Commission would be arriving in New York too late to attend any meeting that day; he would, however, be informed of the discussion on illicit traffic and would be given an opportunity of making a statement on that subject to the Commission.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) said that the review prepared by the United States Government on the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs throughout the world during the year 1949 and the first nine months of 1950 (E/CN.7/213) mentioned Iran as one of the main sources of opium. Yet the amounts of opium of supposedly Iranian origin which had been seized in the United States were very small and amounted to only 30 kg. He wondered whether it was really profitable for drug traffickers in the United States to import opium from Iran when they could get it much more easily and much more cheaply in Mexico. The Iranian Government had taken very strict measures to prevent any illicit traffic; in view of Iran's large production of opium, the small quantities seized seemed to indicate that those measures had been successful. He asked the United States representative for further details regarding the opium of supposedly Iranian origin so as to enable his Government to take any appropriate measures if need be.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that the Mexican Government was carrying out a strong drive to stamp out poppy cultivation. That accounted for the small quantities of Mexican opium which were now available. Hence United States traffickers had had to go back to the old sources of supply which included Iran. It was true, however, that amounts of Iranian opium had greatly decreased. Most of the opium reaching the United States from Iran was smuggled by merchant vessel personnel.

/Mr. CR

Mr. OR (Turkey) drew the attention of the Commission to document E/CN.7/208 which gave details of the measures taken by the Turkish Government against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. The legislation which permitted free trade of opium within Turkey had been revoked after the Ankara meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the principal opium-producing countries, in the light of the recommendations made by that Committee. A licensing system had been introduced and penalties for the offenders had been increased. A special commission on illicit traffic had been set up in the Turkish Ministry of the Interior. It had taken many administrative measures to decrease illicit traffic as much as possible and had referred the legal aspects of the question, such as the need to revise legislation, to a special commission set up under the Minister of Justice. That latter commission had proposed an amendment to the Penal Code which was now being considered. Under Turkish regulations, whenever there was no special law dealing with any particular type of offence the tribunal concerned referred to the Penal Code itself. The penalties provided for in the Penal Code, however, were not sufficiently severe to deter drug traffickers.

One of the principal aims of the new campaign waged by the Turkish Government was to suppress the clandestine manufacture and distribution of heroin. In addition to an extensive campaign against illicit manufacturers and traffickers in heroin, the Government had taken steps to establish strict control over both the import and the use of acetic anhydride, which was used to manufacture heroin out of morphine. In conclusion, he recalled the statement made by the Turkish representative to the third conference of the World Health Organization on the campaign against the manufacture and use of heroin in Turkey.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) wished to congratulate the Turkish Government on the steps it had taken to stamp out traffic in heroin. He wondered whether the Turkish representative could give a list of the clandestine laboratories which had been suppressed in Istanbul during 1949 and 1950, and also some information on the quantities of heroin seized. It should be remembered that much heroin was being smuggled from Turkey into Canada, the

United States and Egypt. The Turkish Government's report (E/CN.7/208) stated that addiction to narcotic drugs did not constitute a social problem in Turkey. That statement might be true of Turkey as a whole, but it did not seem to apply to the city of Istanbul where in one hospital alone the number of admissions of drug addicts had increased from 100 to 400 in one year.

He agreed that strict control of the import and use of acetic anhydride would help to stamp out the illicit manufacture of heroin.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) said that he welcomed the efforts made by the Turkish Government because large quantities of heroin had been smuggled into the United States ~~and thence into Canada from Turkey~~. The illicit manufacture of heroin could not be suppressed as long as there remained any clandestine laboratories. The measures to control the use of acetic anhydride should be very effective in that field.

The United States representative was right in his comments on the danger of illicit opium and heroin coming from Turkey. In that connexion, Colonel Sharman referred to an article published in an American magazine which gave an account of co-operation between the United States of America and Turkey in the field of suppressing the illicit traffic in heroin.

Mr. OR (Turkey) said that clandestine laboratories manufacturing heroin needed hardly any equipment and were thus extremely mobile and could be set up or dismantled at a few hours' notice at any suitable spot chosen by the traffickers. That rendered the task of the police extremely difficult.

Drug addiction did not constitute a social problem in Turkey. The main narcotic drug involved was hashish. The annual report for 1948 showed that out of 144 seizures, hashish accounted for 75 per cent while heroin and morphine accounted for only 7 per cent each. The figures for 1947 showed that 85 per cent of all drug addicts used hashish and only 3 per cent opium. However, since the number of heroin addicts had been increasing,

the Turkish Government had taken steps to combat any illicit traffic in that drug. There were only two legitimate uses for acetic anhydride in Turkey: it could be used in official laboratories and for the manufacture of artificial silk. The quantities required for those two purposes were comparatively small so that it had been quite easy to assess Turkey's annual requirements of the substance. Future imports would be allowed only to meet those legitimate requirements. The end of free trade in opium within Turkey and the control of acetic anhydride had dealt a double blow to illicit traffic in heroin. It should be remembered, however, that no regulations or penalties, however stringent, could deter traffickers when the profits involved were considerable. His country was doing its utmost to stamp out the trade, which was a danger to all mankind.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that at least some of the clandestine laboratories in Turkey had been of substantial size, since the quantities seized had been 10 kg. of heroin in one case and 15 in another.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that document E/CN.7/213 (page 25) referred to France as one of the "principal sources of supply" of narcotic drugs. France might be used by traffickers as a country of transit, but it could hardly be described as a source of supply. The French police were very active in their endeavours to stamp out all illicit traffic, but despite very sustained efforts, it had never discovered any clandestine laboratories of heroin or any other drug ^{in 1950.} It was obvious that France, like the United States, found it impossible to suppress all traffic, especially when it was purely transit traffic. In that connexion he wished to emphasize the need for better police co-ordination at the international level.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) confirmed the interpretation given by the French representative. The report (E/CN.7/213) should not have referred to France as a source of supply but merely as a country through which narcotic drugs passed in transit.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) pointed out that the Progress Report contained no information on seizure reports from France.

Mr. VAILLE (France) referred the Canadian representative to the annual report which provided full information on French control measures in connexion with illicit traffic. From the information available it appeared that France was among the countries which had carried out existing conventions most strictly and had achieved the best results on its own territory. In connexion with the campaign against illicit traffic, he mentioned the case when the French Police had first learned of a seizure made aboard a French plane through the United States press and stressed the need for closer co-operation between the international police of all countries.

He had been struck by the fact that countries such as the United States, Peru and Mexico which did not allow the use of heroin for medical purposes, had very large quantities of that drug available on the illicit market.

He wondered whether the Canadian and United States representatives could inform him of the percentage of heroin addicts out of the total number of drug addicts in their countries.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) recalled that he had already stated that the percentage of drug addicts in the United States was 1 in every 3,000. Half of the cases were cases of heroin addiction.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) said that heroin accounted for most cases -- at least 75 per cent -- of drug addicts in Canada.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) said that illicit traffic in heroin in Mexico was of very little importance. The main problem in his country was that of marihuana addiction. He had been clearly stated in recent reports that heroin had been scarce on the illicit market in Mexico.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) said that the Review of Illicit Traffic (E/CN.7/213) contained no references to any seizures effected in France during the period under review. The French representative had explained that the information was contained in the French Annual report, but he felt that it would be more appropriate if the French Government reported on seizures in the regular manner, as otherwise a false impression might be created.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that he would take note of the Netherlands representative's request.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of India, wished to enlarge on the measures which had been taken in India to institute control of narcotic drugs and which were only referred to briefly on page 30 of the Review (E/CN.7/213). An all-India policy had been introduced for the first time, extending control measures to the former Princely States and eliminating previous distinctions. The All-India Opium and Excise Conference of 1949 had adopted important policy decisions and had ruled that consumption of opium, except for medical and scientific purposes, should cease within ten years.

The consumption of opium was strictly controlled in most Indian States, and was prohibited in several, discretion lying with the State authorities in each case. The position was rather different in the former Princely States where conditions were more primitive; large quantities of opium, for example, were consumed by buffaloes and other draught animals in the absence of other medicaments. However, those States too had been asked to comply with the decision to eliminate opium consumption within ten years. Hence, it was expected that the per capita consumption would be reduced to the limit of 6 lbs. within that period.

It had also been decided to reduce and eventually cease exports to neighbouring countries and to make the laws and regulations with respect to narcotic drugs more uniform, with particular emphasis on the former Princely States. As from April 1950, Indian laws relating to the cultivation of opium had been extended to those States. Other measures taken included the appointment of a Narcotics Commissioner in India, working under the Central Government, and of additional staff for factory and customs supervision. As a result, his Government had been able to effect large seizures in the former Princely States and at certain ports, including Bombay and Calcutta.

/Colonel SHARMAN

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) expressed his great interest in the Indian representative's statement. He understood that retail shops in the vicinity of the large ports had been closed down and wished to ask whether it was the new Indian policy to reduce the number of retail shops generally, or to retain the present number of shops with smaller quantities of opium for sale.

Mr. SATTANATHAN (India) said that his Government's policy was to reduce progressively the number of shops selling drugs or alcohol as they constituted a great nuisance.

Mr. MAHMOUD LABIB (Egypt) claimed that the narcotic drugs seized in his country had proved to come from Syria and Lebanon. Since these countries were apparently to have 60 million square metres under hashish cultivation in 1950, yielding approximately 360 tons of the drug in each country, it could be expected that considerable quantities would be smuggled to Egypt.

The Arab League States planned to set up a Narcotics Bureau to prevent the cultivation and smuggling of narcotic drugs in the Member States. He hoped that representatives of Syria and Lebanon would be invited to attend the meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Mr. MAY (President of the Permanent Central Board) referring to the remarks of the representative of India pointed out that any figure per head of population of the average consumption throughout the world could not be applied to any one country, owing to the differences in the factors governing national consumption.

Mr. OR (Turkey) could not deny that there was undoubtedly some truth in the Egyptian claims that Turkish opium was being smuggled into Egypt via Syria and Lebanon. He quoted, however, from the Yearbook of the Aleppo Chamber of Commerce to show that Syria had exported to France 85 tons of opium in 1948 and 232 tons in 1949. That exceeded the total Turkish production, so that all the opium could not possibly have come from Turkey. Opium was cultivated in Syria itself and was also imported from other countries.

/Mr. VAILLE

Mr. VAILLE (France) had no information on that transaction but wondered whether opium was not merely in transit in France. In connexion with the question of acetic anhydride he expressed doubt whether control of that product would ensure easy control of heroin in all countries, since acetic anhydride was extensively used in the chemical industry. In that regard, he would welcome the views of the USSR and Netherlands representatives, who were experts in that field. He also suggested that the Secretariat should refer the question to a committee of WHO for proper advice.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) agreed that it would be difficult to control the use of acetic anhydride in certain countries having a large chemical industry, although it would no doubt be possible in other countries, such as Turkey. As far as the Netherlands was concerned, he doubted whether it would be possible to effect such control, quite apart from the question of its necessity.

Mr. CR (Turkey) also felt that action to control acetic anhydride should not be taken in countries having an extensive chemical industry, but admitted that it could be taken in Turkey.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that the question of the production of hashish in Syria and Lebanon should be referred to the governments of those countries for comment. He supported the Egyptian proposal that Syrian and Lebanese observers should be asked to attend meetings of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN invited representatives to proceed with discussion of the item "Offer for sale in China of 500 tons of opium" (E/CN.7/211).

/offer

Offer for sale in China of 500 tons of opium (E/CN.7/211)

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that it be resolved that the opium in question should not be purchased by any country represented in the Commission and that the 500 tons should be destroyed.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) supported the Yugoslav proposal, pointing out that as the cultivation of opium poppy had been prohibited in China, that country could not export that product.

Mr. HSIA (China) observed that the Yugoslav representative was perhaps not in possession of all the facts. The opium in question was not stored in Hongkong or any other centre where it would be available. It would be appropriate in that regard to hear from the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) had no information other than that contained in document E/CN.7/211, which reproduced exactly the facts of which His Majesty's Government had been informed by the Governor of Hongkong. It was clear that the China in question was the People's Republic of China.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that 300 of the 500 tons had been offered to commercial firms in exchange for cotton on a barter basis. Detailed information was available in respect of 130 tons held at Tientsin, and on a further quantity held at Peking.

The sale of the 500 tons of opium would constitute a violation of the existing conventions concerning narcotic drugs.

Mr. HSIA (China) confirming that the Chinese Government concerned was the Peking regime, claimed that the present situation on the Chinese mainland constituted a complete reversal of the National Government's policy in the past few decades. In support of that statement, he quoted at length from an article by Mr. Edward Hunter, a United States correspondent in Singapore; that article alleged that the Chinese Communists were obtaining United States

dollars from the shipment of opium to neighbouring areas, including Thailand, Macao, and Hongkong; that the writer had evidence of large quantities of opium being transported by mule train from Eastern Tibet on the borders of Burma and Thailand; that such shipments could not be made without the knowledge and connivance of the Communist authorities, as the arrangements required for the carriage of the opium to such distant markets as Indonesia and the Philippines were far too extensive to be possible without such official co-operation.

In conclusion, he said that opium was also finding its way from Central China to Hongkong and Macao and was intended for consumption primarily in China; some, however, eventually reached other countries, including Australia.

At this stage the CHAIRMAN intervened and said that as the Chinese representative was not confining his observations to the topic under discussion he might conclude his observations without further digression.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) objected that the Commission should not waste its time listening to slanderous attacks on the People's Republic of China. If there were any question of that country engaging in the opium trade, reference should be made directly to the Central People's Government.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the total world legitimate requirements in opium being 450 tons a year, the purchase of the quantity in question whatever the origin would jeopardize the very principle of the Interim Agreement.

Mr. OR (Turkey) supported the Yugoslav proposal, but wished to amend it to the effect that Members of the United Nations who had signed the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs should not buy the opium.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) said the problem was wider in scope and included not only Chinese opium but opium from Lebanon and other countries. If such a resolution was adopted it should not specifically mention China. He felt, however, that the proposal should not be considered in connexion with the item under discussion but rather under item 10 of the agenda on limitation of the production of opium. He even doubted whether the adoption of any resolution on the subject was necessary, since it was clear, because of the licenses required, that no Member of the United Nations would buy on the illicit market.

/Mr. AMINI

Mr. AMINI (Iran) supported the Netherlands representative and suggested that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred until it had been submitted in writing.

Mr. HSIA (China) wished to emphasize the aspect of the problem caused by the consumption of the opium by countries bordering China, and the problem of stopping illicit traffic with those countries.

He would support the draft resolution and felt that it might be expressed in even stronger terms.

The CHAIRMAN, in view of the differences of opinion on the subject, said the Commission would defer further consideration until the draft resolution was submitted in writing at its next meeting.

Situation in Germany (E/CN.7/206)

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) suggested that discussion of the situation in Germany should be postponed until the following day when the observer of the ICPC, who would be able to provide useful information on the subject, would be present.

It was so decided.

Heroin Diversion in Italy.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) said that the permanent representative of Italy had been informed that the subject of heroin diversion in Italy would be discussed by the Commission. Since Italy was not a Member of the United Nations, the attendance of its representative was purely optional.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that in several cases involving the illicit traffic in heroin in the United States the source of the heroin had been found to be Italy.

One case had involved such large quantities that the United States had called the attention of the Italian Government to it. At the invitation of the latter, two United States officials had been sent to carry out investigations in Italy in collaboration with the Italian police department. It had been found that large quantities of heroin were being purchased by Italian retailers from legal sources and subsequently diverted to illicit channels. In October 1950, some traffickers had been arrested and a total of 7 kilogrammes of heroin had been seized.

He wished to point out that the estimates submitted by Italy to the Permanent Central Board for the use of heroin had been about 150 kgs. per year, whereas the estimates of neighbouring countries only amounted to about 20 kgs. That seemed to indicate an attempt to give an appearance of legitimacy to illegitimate transactions and suggested the existence of a serious violation of international conventions. He felt that the Italian Government's attention should be drawn to the matter.

Moreover, under a recent economic agreement between the Italian Government and the military authorities in Trieste, trade restrictions had been removed and import and export permits for narcotic drugs were no longer required. It should be pointed out to the military authorities in Trieste that trade in dangerous drugs could never be made free.

He indicated that he wished to introduce a draft resolution on the question of illicit traffic at the Commission's following meeting.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Board) said the Board had for some years been disturbed at the amount of heroin consumed. It had requested the Italian Government to explain why its estimates for heroin were so large, and had suggested that they should be reduced. A letter to that effect had been sent to the Italian Government during the Board's previous session. As the Commission knew, the Board could not reduce estimates without the consent of the Government concerned. No reply had been received from Italy before the Board adjourned and a statement would be made on the subject in the estimates for 1951. If no

results were obtained by ordinary means, the Board would be obliged to take more serious action. The question of control in Trieste was also under consideration by the Board; its competence in the matter was, however, limited, and he felt that action by the Commission was required.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) indicated that some of the illicit heroin under discussion had also found its way to Canada. He gave details concerning a recent case when heroin had been seized in Montreal on a ship arriving from Italy.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission might ask the Secretariat to convey the substance of the discussion on the matter to the Italian Government for its comments.

It was so decided.

Situation in Thailand. (E/CN.7/210/Add.1)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. U Ba Maung (Burma) and Mr. Konthi Suphanongkhon and Luang Irakob Thanakit (Thailand) took their seats at the Commission table.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that enormous seizures of opium, the alleged source of which was Burma, had been made almost daily in Thailand. There was no evidence with regard to the origin of the opium, although there were some indications that it might come from China.

He drew attention to certain statements in document E/CN.7/210/Add.1, which he felt required explanation. He wished, for example, to know whether it was correct since it did not seem to be borne out by the statistics, that Thailand had had recourse to raw opium from India and Iran to meet its needs. He would be glad if seizure reports were submitted.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Opium Board) quoted from the paragraph on Thailand in the Board's report to the Economic and Social Council, which would be published the following month. In the statistics on prepared opium for 1949, Thailand reported that the quantity manufactured was 17,191 kgs., the quantity

of raw opium used in the manufacture of prepared opium (including 1,836 kgs. of prepared opium reboiled for the manufacture of prepared opium) was 21,920 kgs., and the quantity consumed was 16,457 kgs. According to the seizure returns, 2,948 kgs. of raw opium had been released for the manufacture of prepared opium. According to the remaining statistical returns, no other raw opium had been available; whereas, according to the return on prepared opium, 20,083 kgs. of raw opium had been used in the manufacture of prepared opium. A similar situation had arisen some years previously and the question had been raised with the government of Thailand, but in spite of many reminders no reply had been received, and the question had never been cleared up.

Mr. SUPHAMONGKHON (Thailand) said that since he had come prepared only to attend the General Assembly he was not in a position to provide the Commission on Narcotic Drugs with exact figures. He could merely give the Commission a general outline of the facts and he was sure that his Government would later submit a fully detailed report to the Commission.

As had been stated in the communication to the Secretary-General, the illicit traffic in opium was mainly in the Northern territories of Thailand. It was his government's policy to combat opium smoking in Thailand, but it could only do so if its neighbours exercised strict control over the production and sale of opium. The increase in the illicit traffic in opium in the past few years had been due to the troubled political situation in neighbouring countries, including in particular Indo-China and Burma; as a result the opium which would normally have gone to those countries had instead been smuggled into Thailand. Since the Northern part of Thailand was hilly it was difficult for the authorities to take the necessary action, but serious measures had been taken in an effort to combat the traffic.

Amendments to the Opium Act, which would increase the penalties imposed on those who infringed it, were pending. A special commission composed of representatives of the main Government Departments had been established to draw up a plan to combat the illicit smuggling of opium. Inspection stations had been

set up along the borders of Thailand, as a result of which a much larger number of illicit traffickers had been arrested.

He would not deal with the specific cases mentioned by the United States, since information on them had already been submitted to the Secretary-General. In view, however, of all the efforts which had been made by his Government to suppress the traffic, he considered it very regrettable that it had been stated that his Government derived certain advantages from the illicit traffic in opium. Referring to an article which had quoted incorrect figures, he cited the prices for raw and prepared illicit opium and the rewards paid by the police for the handing over of opium. Since the latter were less than the former, it was unlikely that anyone would smuggle opium in order to turn it over to the police.

In answer to the United States representative, he explained that no date had been specified with regard to the import of opium from India and Iran. Thailand had formerly imported opium from those countries, but had not received any during the past two years.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission should express appreciation to the representative of Thailand and should consider the subject closed.

It was so decided.

Mr. U Ba Maung (Burma) and Mr. Konthi Suthamonkhon and Luang Irakob Thanakit (Thailand) withdrew.

The meeting rose at 2.55 p.m.