



PROVISIONAL FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

# UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL  
E/CN.7/SR.117  
15 December 1950  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

## COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

### Fifth Session

#### PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Sunday, 10 December 1950, at 2 p.m.

#### CONTENTS:

Draft single convention (E/CN.7/AC.3/1, E/CN.7/AC.3/2,  
E/CN.7/AC.3/3/Rev.1, E/CN.7/AC.3/4, E/CN.7/AC.3/4/Corr.1)  
(continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SATTANATHAN	India
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<u>Members:</u>	Colonel SHARMAN	Canada
	Mr. HSIA	China
	Mr. LABIB	Egypt

Any corrections to this record should be submitted in duplicate in either of the working languages (English or French), not later than 1800 hours on 31 January 1951, to the Director, Language Services Division, Room F-302, Lake Success. Corrections should bear the appropriate symbol number and be enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

UNITED NATIONS  
ARCHIVES

Members (continued):

Mr. BOURGOIS	}	France
Mr. VAILLE		
Mr. AMINI		Iran
Mr. RABASA		Mexico
Mr. KRUYSSSE		Netherlands
Mr. AVALOS		Peru
Mr. BORATYNSKI		Poland
Mr. OR		Turkey
Mr. ZAKUSOV		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. TENNYSON		United States of America
Mr. KRASOVEC		Yugoslavia

Also present:

Mr. MAY	President of the Permanent Central Opium Board
---------	---

Representative of a non-governmental organization: Category B:

Mr. MARABUTO	International Criminal Police Commission
--------------	---

Secretariat:

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

DRAFT SINGLE CONVENTION (E/CN.7/AC.3/1, E/CN.7/AC.3/2, E/CN.7/AC.3/3/Rev.1,  
E/CN.7/AC.3/4, E/CN.7/AC.3/4/Corr.1) (continued)

Chapter V - Section 29

Mr. AMINI (Iran) wished to point out in connexion with paragraph 174 that the establishment of a central administration might present certain difficulties. In his country, questions connected with narcotic drugs came under the Ministries of Finance and Foreign Affairs. He suggested that all correspondence in that connexion should be sent through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN observed that the English text used the word "may" which did not imply any obligation.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) suggested that the French text of paragraph 174 should be altered to convey the same meaning.

Mr. OR (Turkey) said that in Turkey questions concerning opium came under the Ministries of Health and Commerce, whereas correspondence was sent through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The provisions of paragraph 175 on the amalgamation of the functions of the special administration and the central office might create difficulties for some Governments.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) approved the idea contained in Section 29, since it might be desirable for control to be exercised by a single authority. However, he felt that paragraph 175 was merely repetitive.

Mr. OR (Turkey) said that it would be impossible for his country to reform the organization of its administrative branches as was suggested in Section 29. He felt that Governments should be free to organize their administration as they chose.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) said that he agreed on that point with the Turkish representative. Governments should be free to organize their administration services responsible for the application of the Convention according to their own ideas. He felt that the commentary attributed more importance to the question of a central authority than the section itself. He therefore felt that Section 29 was easier to accept. In European countries, narcotic drugs generally came under the health services as well as under the police and the system gave excellent results.

Mr. MAPABUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) expressed his agreement with the Netherlands representative regarding the separation of functions and recalled that the central national offices of his organization often possessed a special section responsible for the suppression of the illegal traffic in narcotic drugs.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) said that in his country also the question of narcotic drugs came under two different services. However, he was not opposed to the chapter, in view of the fact that it envisaged a purely optional measure.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) thought that in view of its flexible wording, Section 29 was acceptable to all Governments.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) proposed that the text of Section 29 should be modified to take into account constitutional requirements in the various countries.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think it would be necessary to set up new control organs in each country. He suggested that the provisions of paragraph 171 should be strengthened so that Governments assumed more specific obligations. In fact, if a Government wished to suppress the illegal traffic, it could do so. He noted that in his country neither the illegal traffic nor drug addiction existed.

Chapter VI - Section 30.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) drew attention to paragraph 188 of the French text, the wording of which seemed to be incomplete.

Mr. VAILLE (France) recalled that on the previous day, in connexion with poppy chaff, he had said that the control of that product should only be carried out after manufacture.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) noted that in the lists in paragraphs 186 and 216 (d) hospitals were omitted.

Mr. TENNYSON (United States of America) recalled that his Government had promulgated an Act which prohibited the cultivation of the opium poppy. That Act had been based on the existing conventions, as the competent legal authorities in the United States had felt that the 1912 Convention carried

/with it

with it an obligation to prohibit poppy cultivation. If and when the single convention replaced the 1912 Convention, the United States should be able to find in it a justification of its policy. Paragraph 188 satisfied the United States of America on that point, with the exception of the last part of the sentence: "provided that such measure can be reasonably expected as a contribution towards the international welfare", which it requested should be deleted. It was not appropriate to cast doubt upon efforts to prohibit the cultivation of the opium poppy. The measure was an undeniable contribution to international welfare.

Mr. STEINIC (Secretariat) drew the attention of the United States representative to the terms of paragraph 178, which he thought were sufficient to justify the laws adopted by the United States of America. Thus the law of the United States would continue to be in conformity with the convention.

Mr. TENNYSON (United States of America) nevertheless preferred the deletion of the last phrase of paragraph 188.

Mr. FABASA (Mexico) supported the view of the United States representative. The Mexican Government had forbidden, in its penal and health legislation, the cultivation of the opium poppy and Indian hemp and in doing so had been guided by international treaties. He considered that by recommending prohibition whenever "the prevailing conditions in a country ... render the prohibition ... the most suitable measure for preventing the diversion of opium into the illicit traffic...", countries which did not consider prohibition to be the most suitable measure, were therefore fully justified in maintaining existing laws. On the other hand, in countries such as the United States of America and Mexico, where cultivation of the opium poppy was completely prohibited, the deletion of the last phrase would give the moral support of the international authority to the steps taken by their respective legislative authorities.

Mr. VAILLE (France) recalled that a number of countries had specifically requested, both in Geneva and in New York, that the cultivation of raw poppy seed for oil extraction (pavot à coquette) should not be prohibited. It was not an opium poppy within the meaning of the conventions, and had never given rise to illicit traffic in France. It was, on the contrary, cultivated for its seed for its oil value. If the United States representative's proposal were adopted, all of Section 31 would likewise have to be deleted.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) agreed with the French representative. He thought that paragraph 178 ought to satisfy the United States of America and Mexico.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) was also in agreement with the French representative.

The CHAIRMAN said that, for reasons which had not yet been given, the Secretariat felt that they should retain the phrase which the United States and Mexican representatives had requested should be deleted. Its deletion had also been opposed by other representatives and he therefore proposed that the whole question should be deferred so as to give the Secretariat an opportunity to consider it further.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) drew attention to paragraph 184, which he compared with paragraph 114. The Permanent Central Board could collect data relating to the area under cultivation when it was preparing its studies on production estimates.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) did not think that that warranted any modification of the paragraph. The Permanent Central Board might suggest to each country the number of hectares which should be seeded in order to produce the necessary quantity of opium.

### Section 31

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) referring to paragraph 191, said that control should be instituted only during the manufacturing stage. It would be very difficult to institute controls on the farms, nor would such a procedure be justified by the anticipated results.

Mr. TENNYSON (United States of America) approved the section as drafted. Were he to offer any criticism, it would be to the effect that it should be made even stricter, for poppy straw could be dangerous and it could be used to prepare a morphine solution, which while admittedly impure, could be of interest to the illicit traffic. He explained that it was precisely for that reason that the United States of America had prohibited the cultivation of the poppy.

/Mr. KRUYSSSE

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) observed that that cultivation had never given rise to illicit traffic in his own or in any other European country.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) considered that appropriate provisions should be included to cover any substances which were likely to find their way into the illicit traffic in any part of the world.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) said that, in that case, it would be necessary to include a reservation clause.

The CHAIRMAN said the Secretariat would bear those observations in mind.

#### Section 32

Mr. AVALOS (Peru) stated that his Government would submit its observations on the draft of the single convention when the latter was transmitted to it, but that, in connexion with section 32, it would make its observations when the report on the effect of coca leaf chewing came up for consideration. Its opinions would be based wherever possible on those conclusions in the report of the Commission of Enquiry that could reasonably be accepted.

The Commission decided to consider section 32 after its examination of the report on the coca leaf.

#### Section 33

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a vote on the two alternative texts proposed by the Secretariat. The USSR favoured the prohibition of the cultivation of Indian hemp. Cultivation might be justifiable for scientific reasons; but the requirements in that field were almost non-existent.

Mr. LABIB (Egypt) supported the USSR representative. Although the import of Indian hemp had not yet been prohibited in Egypt, and although some medicines prepared on the basis of that plant were being imported, he, personally, did not believe that its medical use was justified.

Mr. OR (Turkey) also favoured prohibition. Turkish law absolutely prohibited the cultivation of Indian hemp; but his Government was still very

/uneasy

uneasy about the possible use of other varieties of hemp from which hashish could likewise be extracted. He would like to know the views of other Commission members on that point.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) stated that in his country, Indian hemp extracts were used for medicinal purposes. The policy of his Government was to leave each physician free to choose his medicines. Consequently, it supported control of production, but not its prohibition.

Mr. VAILLE (France) listed a number of reasons which made prohibition unacceptable. There was the problem of discriminating between hemp grown for the manufacture of textiles and hemp grown for the manufacture of hashish, as well as the problem of hemp which grew wild. It would also be difficult to prohibit medication which was recommended by the French Academy of Medicine. Further, it could not be asserted that the prohibition of cultivation would reduce the illicit traffic since growers would always be able to claim that hemp grew wild among other crops and it would be difficult to prove that an offence had actually been committed. Supervision would have to be exercised at the manufacturing stage.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) was in favour of prohibition. His Government had ascertained that Indian hemp was dangerous and had prohibited its cultivation although it grew wild in Mexico in large quantities. The text of section 33 would not prohibit cultivation for scientific purposes. Consideration was being given to the use of Indian hemp as a fertilizer but research into the matter had not yet been completed. It would always be possible to reverse the decision if the experiments were successful.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) also supported prohibition. If it was necessary to grow Indian hemp for medical purposes, a small area could be selected in order to eliminate any risk of diversion to the illicit traffic.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) felt that the question should be thoroughly studied before any decision was taken.

Mr. TENNYSON (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Iran.

/Mr. VAILLE



Mr. VAILLE (France) asked the members of the Commission to consider the possible consequences of prohibition. It was not intended to prohibit Indian hemp which grew wild, for instance in the African meadow lands. It should be clearly stated that the measure applied only to hemp which had been sown.

The CHAIRMAN referred to paragraph 20 which defined production. The definition clearly indicated that there was a difference between production and cultivation.

Speaking as the representative of India, he explained that it had been decided in India to subject Indian hemp to the same measures as opium. A committee had been set up to consider whether it would be possible to control the use of wild hemp. In the circumstances, India would vote for control but he felt that before a decision was taken further consideration should be given to the problem.

As Chairman, he proposed that the decision should be deferred.

#### Section 34

Mr. VAILLE (France) proposed that the words "if feasible" in the bracketed portion of paragraph 230 should be deleted for drafting reasons.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada), Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands), Mr. AVALOS (Peru) and Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) observed that the adoption of a procedure under which permits were issued quarterly would be too cumbersome. They were in favour of a system of annual licenses. The sense of the Commission was that the portion in brackets should be deleted and that the word "periodical" should be replaced by the word "annual".

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) explained that the Secretariat had no preference in the matter. The words concerned had been inserted to take into consideration the provisions of national legislation.

Section 35

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) reserved his position with regard to paragraph 245 until his Government had had an opportunity to take a decision regarding the Convention as a whole.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) observed that several provisions of section 35 related to the centralizing bureau. In considering them it would therefore be desirable to take into account the observations made with regard to that organ.

Mr. VAILLE (France) agreed with the representative of Iran. He felt that since the old conventions were adopted, conditions had changed to such an extent that the provisions regarding the limitation of the number of towns, ports and airports through which the importation or exportation of drugs would be authorized had become unnecessary. The question of transit should also be mentioned in paragraph 236. It would also be extremely difficult for the customs authorities to apply the arrangements provided in paragraphs 248 and 249. The same remark applied, as a corollary, to Section 36, paragraph 254.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) also felt that customs formalities would be excessively complicated as a result of paragraphs 248 and 249.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) agreed with the representative of the Netherlands. He proposed that the Supervisory Body and the Permanent Central Board should be consulted in that respect.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) was of the same opinion. Paragraph 252 went too far in that it made aircraft and other transport organizations liable to criminal proceedings.

Referring to paragraph 250, he said that consignments to a bank to the account of a third party were sometimes the only means of obtaining payment for the goods.

/Mr. KRUYSSSE

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) thought that not only should consignments to a bank as provided in paragraph 250 be prohibited but proposed that all consignments should be addressed to the person named in the import authorization.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) agreed. In Canada, customs officers were required personally to ensure that such parcels were delivered to the consignee named in the import authorization.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that exports in the form of consignments addressed to a post office box should be forbidden; consignments to a bank should also be forbidden unless sent by a person named in the export licence.

Mr. BOURGOIS (France) said that that would be an effective method. No one would think of calling to take delivery of illicit drugs only to be arrested.

The Commission decided that further study should be given to the question.

#### Section 36

Mr. VAILLE (France) noted that a reference to ports of call had been omitted in the provisions concerning transit by sea; he thought that the export certificate would be sufficient to authorize transit.

#### Section 37

Mr. VAILLE (France) thought that the text of paragraph 259 was not clear; paragraphs 260 and 261 embodied two alternatives; the word "soit" should be added at the end of paragraph 259 in the French text.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) thought that licences should also be granted to the staff of hospitals concerned with the administration of narcotic drugs, to veterinary surgeons enjoying the right to administer narcotic drugs and to medical practitioners in rural districts. There would be no need to restrict the stocks of pharmacists because their sense of professional responsibility would be a sufficient safeguard.

/Colonel SHARMAN

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) agreed with the representative of the Netherlands on that point. Medical practitioners, dentists and veterinary surgeons should be authorized to supply narcotic drugs.

Sections 38 and 39

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) observed that he would have to consult legal experts on the points in question, as they fell within the competence of the provincial governments in his country.

Mr. AMLINI (Iran) thought that as the provisions of paragraph 270 were self-evident, that paragraph might well be deleted.

Mr. VAILLE (France) agreed with the representative of Iran; it would be hard to apply those provisions. He proposed that the following sentence should be substituted for that paragraph: "Any person sentenced for traffic in narcotic drugs shall have his licence revoked".

The provisions of paragraph 271 were unnecessary; each country should decide for itself what supervisory formalities it wished to apply. He thought that doctors could not be compelled to submit the reports for which provision was made in paragraph 272.

Mr. OR (Turkey) agreed with the representatives of France and Iran.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) thought that to impose such wide obligations on medical practitioners and pharmacists was going too far and that they might well clash with professional secrecy.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) said that Section 39 certainly did not increase the obligations assumed under Article 6 (c) of the Convention of 19 February 1925, which relieved pharmacists from the obligation of keeping records only if the prescriptions <sup>were</sup> retained. Section 39 did no more than confirm that obligation.

Mr. VAILLE (France) thought that if that were so, it would be better to retain the wording of the former Convention to avoid errors of interpretation.

/Mr. KRUYSSSE

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) requested the retention of the provision of the former Convention which exempted minimum quantities of narcotic drugs from measures of control.

The CHAIRMAN said that provision was made for that in paragraph 33. He noted that there was general agreement that the existing provision should be retained.

Mr. LABIB (Egypt) thought that they should be strengthened, as had recently been done in Egypt.

Mr. VAILLE (France) thought that the former text relating to exemptions was a better one.

He agreed with the representative of Egypt with regard to the introduction of stricter measures with respect to the validity of prescriptions.

In France prescriptions were valid only for a week and in certain other countries for even shorter periods. That was an excellent way of preventing therapeutic drug addiction.

Mr. OR (Turkey) said that the validity of such prescriptions in his country was limited to five days.

Mr. AVALOS (Peru) explained that in his country the quantity of narcotic drugs which could be supplied on prescription was in general equivalent to the maximum therapeutic dose for two days. Medical practitioners with official authorization could, however, prescribe larger quantities for a period of eight days in the towns and fifteen days in the rural areas. Article 39 would not prevent the continuation of the existing practice.

In reply to a question by Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia), the CHAIRMAN confirmed the fact that the inspections mentioned in paragraph 273 were national inspections.

Chapter VII -- Section 40

Mr. OR (Turkey) said that although his country was prepared to combat the drug habit, the provisions in that section were of a purely legal nature. He was not competent to deal with them and must await instructions from his Government.

Mr. BOURGOIS (France) also reserved the position of his country on that point.

Mr. KRUISSE (Netherlands) said that his Government in general preferred the alternative version on the left of the page; that on the right did not take sufficient account of differences between the national legislative measures of the various countries.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) said that although he had already discussed those questions with the legal experts of his country, he could not yet take a definite position.

In the alternative version on the right, which was meant to be a shortened version of the provisions of the Convention of 1936, seven offences which had been included in 1936 as the result of a decision by a committee of qualified experts had been omitted from the list of offences liable to punishment. It had also been wrong to substitute "offences committed knowingly" for "intentional participation" and to omit reference to the need to inflict "heavy" penalties.

He also thought that if the alternative version on the left-hand side of the page were adopted, it would be necessary to add to the offences to which extradition must be applied.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) did not agree with the views of the Netherlands representative. Few States were willing to accept the provision contained in paragraph 276; the alternative on the right hand side of the page should therefore be retained for it was an abridged version of the provisions of the 1936 Convention and was a text upon which the Commission could more easily

/reach

reach agreement. An abridged version might nevertheless change the meaning. On that point, he supported the views of the Canadian representative. Finally, the definition given in paragraph 296 was too vague to be included in an extradition treaty.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) agreed that the measures of restraint should be strengthened. He suggested that the members of the Commission should continue to study the question during the next few months, in the light of the Secretariat text.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) said that his country was prepared to consider illicit traffic as a crime against mankind, to which the principle of universality must apply. The Netherlands was therefore in favour of the version on the left-hand side of the page. Extradition was not always absolutely necessary; it should be possible to punish any person guilty of a crime, irrespective of the place where he had chosen to take refuge.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) emphasized the variety of criteria on which various countries had based the provisions of their penal legislation. It was therefore necessary to submit the question to the experts of the different Governments; members of the Commission might be able to go to Geneva in April 1951 with specific instructions on that particular question.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Commission was in unanimous agreement on the principle, but while awaiting subsequent consideration by the legal experts, the Commission reserved its opinion on the choice of methods. He asked the Secretariat to amend the alternative version on the right-hand side of the page in order to take into account the observations of the Canadian and United Kingdom representatives.

Mr. VAILLE (France) asked, in connexion with the cure of the drug habit, that an additional paragraph should make it clear that drug addicts must be treated as sick persons and not as delinquents.

/Mr. AMINI

Mr. AMINI (Iran) observed that some members of the Commission had mentioned the danger of synthetic drugs; he asked the Secretariat to take account of that point in the revised version of the draft convention.

#### CHAPTER VIII

The CHAIRMAN ruled that Chapter VIII would not be discussed at the present session.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the reason for the Chairman's decision.

The CHAIRMAN explained that Chapter VIII dealt only with formal questions the discussion of which was not urgent, as the convention would not be put into force in the near future.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that under Section 44 application of the convention was not obligatory in Non-Self-Governing Territories; if that clause were retained, the work accomplished up to the present would be without purpose. That question was vital, for the simple reason that there was considerable illicit traffic in those countries to which the provisions of the convention would not apply. Moreover, if a dispute arose between two or more parties, it could be brought before the International Court of Justice only if all the parties concerned agreed upon that procedure; that was contrary to the provisions of Section 49.

Any State which wished to become a party to the convention should be authorized to make any reservations it desired with regard to the application of the convention. The objections of other parties had not been taken into consideration. Section 50, paragraph 334, was contrary to the sovereign rights of countries.

The CHAIRMAN adhered to his decision not to discuss Chapter VIII at the present session. It contained questions of policy which would be considered later. The Commission should now decide on the procedure to be followed in future in drawing up the draft of the single convention. He asked the representative of the Secretary-General for his proposals.

/Mr. STEINIG



Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) explained that it would be very difficult to prepare a new version of the draft in the present circumstances. The Commission had taken a decision only on the question of the two Secretariats; many points of view had been submitted on all the other questions. The Commission had decided to devote its April-May session exclusively to the discussion of the provisional agreement and the settlement of current questions. In those circumstances, the Commission could not take up the question of the convention again until January 1952.

He suggested to the Commission that the Secretary-General should not send the draft to Governments after the present session. Members of the Commission and the representatives of the Permanent Central Board and the Supervisory Body could submit their observations in writing to the Secretariat before the end of May. In June, the Secretariat would draft the alternative versions of the sections of the draft convention and would distribute the new draft to members of the Commission at least two months before the seventh session. The Secretary-General would not send the draft to Governments for comment until 1952, after the seventh session.

Mr. OR (Turkey) observed that at its fourth session, the Commission had decided to meet for five weeks; he regretted that the Economic and Social Council had allocated only two weeks for the fifth session. In that period of time it was impossible to conclude the consideration of the items on the agenda. He thought that the Commission should conclude its consideration of the convention before sending it to Governments.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) was prepared to adopt the proposal of the Secretariat. The Commission should resume consideration of the question before the Secretary-General sent the draft to Governments. He asked whether the delays could not be shortened.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Board) remarked that as the Board and the Supervisory Body would not meet before June, it would not be possible for them to send their written observations before that date.

Mr. VAILLE

Mr. VAILLE (France) agreed with the Secretariat's suggestions, but proposed that the members of the Commission should arrive at Geneva in April with specific instructions from their Governments. On arrival, each member would submit a memorandum to the Secretariat; in that way a synthesis of the various views could probably be prepared very quickly, if the Commission agreed to devote two or three days of the session to the question of the draft of the single convention.

Colonel SHEARMAN (Canada) could not see what observations could be added to those made by members of the Commission during the present session and which appeared in summary records.

The CHAIRMAN noted the Commission's unanimous decision not to send the draft to Governments at the end of the present session. He thought that the Commission could devote two or three days of the April session to the question of the draft of the single convention and suggested that at the beginning of the April session, the Commission should appoint a sub-committee to draft various resolutions. The subsequent discussion would therefore deal only with those concrete items.

Mr. VAILLE (France) supported the Chairman's proposal.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) pointed out that if members submitted their memoranda to the Secretariat on their arrival at Geneva, the Secretariat could translate them into the various working languages and could circulate them during the first month of the session. The Commission would still have time to become familiar with the subject before devoting two or three days to the question of the draft of the single convention.

The CHAIRMAN did not think that it would be useful to reproduce the memoranda of the representatives and to distribute them in the form of a voluminous document. The preliminary meetings of the sub-committee would bring out the few points on which there were divergences of views, which would then be discussed.

/Mr. AMINI

Mr. AMINI (Iran) supported the Chairman's proposal as a whole.

It was decided that the Commission would meet on Wednesday, 13 December at 10 a.m. to consider item 12 of its agenda (Report of the United Nations Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf to the Economic and Social Council) and to conclude the discussion of item 7 (f) (Offer for Sale in China of 500 tons of opium).

Mr. VAILLE (France) feared that he would be unable to attend the meeting on Wednesday 13 December and drew the attention of the Commission to the opinion of Professor Monge, Director of the Biological Institute of the Andes on the question of the chewing of the coca leaf in the Andean High Plateau.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.