

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL  
E/CN.7/SR.101  
6 December 1950  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Fifth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FIRST MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Friday, 1 December 1950, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

1. Adoption of the Agenda (E/CN.7/205, E/CN.7/205/Add.1)
2. Progress report of the Division of Narcotic Drugs (E/CN.7/196, E/CN.7/196/Add.1)
3. Annual summary of laws and regulations relating to the control of narcotic drugs-1948 (E/NL.1948 Summary)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SATTANATHAN	India
<u>Members:</u>	Colonel SHARMAN	Canada
	Dr. HSIA	China
	Dr. MAHMOUD LABIE	Egypt
	Mr. BOURGOIS)	
	Mr. VAILLE )	France
	Dr. AMINI	Iran
	Mr. RABASA	Mexico
	Mr. KRUYSSSE	Netherlands
	Dr. AVALOS	Peru

Members: (contd)

Dr. BORATINSKY	Poland
Dr. 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. KRASOVEC	Yugoslavia
<u>Also present:</u> Mr. MAY	President of the Permanent Central Opium Board
<u>Secretariat:</u> Mr. STEINIG	Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs, Representative of the Secretary-General
Mr. BOLTON	Secretary of the Commission

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (E/CN.7/205, E/CN.7/205/Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Sub-Committee set up at the previous meeting to examine the provisional agenda had unanimously decided to recommend to the Committee the following order of priority and the following timetable:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Item number in provisional agenda</u>
<u>December 1950</u>			
1	Friday:Afternoon	Progress report of the Division of Narcotic Drugs Annual summary of laws and reg- ulations relating to the control of narcotic drugs-1948	6 (now 1)    9 (now 2)

/2 Saturday:Morning

<u>Date</u> <u>December</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Item number</u> <u>in provisional</u> <u>agenda</u>
2	Saturday: Morning	Annual reports for the years 1948 and 1949 made in pursuance of article 21 of the 1931 Convention, as amended by the 1946 Protocol	7 (nov 3)
	Afternoon	Drug addiction	11 (nov 4)
4	Monday: Morning	Illicit traffic (including the situation in Thailand and in Italy)	8 (nov 5)
	Afternoon	Continued	
5	Tuesday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	Continued	
6	Wednesday: Morning	Abolition of opium smoking in the Far East.	10 (nov 6)
		Methods of determining the origin of opium by chemical and physical means	12 (nov 7)
	Afternoon	Interim Agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs	4 (nov 8)
7	Thursday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	Continued	
8	Friday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	Continued	
9	Saturday: Morning	Single Convention	5 (nov 9)
	Afternoon	Continued	
11	Monday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	Continued	
	/12 Tuesday:		

<u>Date</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Item number in provisional agenda</u>
12	Tuesday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	Continued	
13	Wednesday: Morning	Report of the United Nations Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf to the Economic and Social Council	3 (now 10)
	Afternoon	Continued	
14	Thursday: Morning	Continued	
	Afternoon	No meeting	
15	Friday: Morning	Other business	13 (now 11)
	Afternoon	Continued	
16	Saturday: Morning	Adoption of the report and adjournment.	

That time-table was based on the assumption that simultaneous interpretation would be provided at all meetings and that members would keep the discussion short. Otherwise, it might have to be readjusted in the light of circumstances. Morning meetings would be held from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and afternoon meetings from 2.30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

The revised agenda and time-table were adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a representative of the Bolivian Government and the Chairman of the United Nations Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf, Mr. Fonda, should be invited to attend the discussion of that Commission's report.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that representatives of the Italian, Belgian and Swiss Governments should be invited to send observers to attend the Commission's discussion on the interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs. Those countries had already been represented by observers during the discussions on that same subject at Geneva.

/It was so decided.

It was so decided

The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion on illicit traffic would also deal with the situation in Thailand, which concerned both Thailand and Burma, and with the situation in Italy. He proposed therefore that representatives of the Thailand, Burmese and Italian Governments should be invited to attend the Commission's discussion on that question.

It was so decided.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) informed the Commission that Mr. Marabato, observer of the International Criminal Police Commission, was expected to arrive at New York on Monday, 4 December. He therefore asked the Chairman to adjust the timetable of the meetings in such a way that the observer could participate in the discussions on illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that an observer of the International Criminal Police Commission would be invited to attend the Commission's discussion on illicit traffic.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that he would refer to the situation in Indonesia in connexion with the abolition of opium smoking in the Far East, and therefore proposed that a representative of the Indonesian Government should be invited to attend the discussion on that point.

It was so decided.PROGRESS REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS (E/CN.7/196, E/CN.7/196/Add.1)

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) said that the Division of Narcotic Drugs had tried to present a concise and clear summary of the progress made by the Commission and the Secretariat of the United Nations during eighteen months which had elapsed since the fourth session of the Commission.

That survey showed that the nature of the Commission's work had undergone a change. In addition to its regular task of advising the Economic and Social Council how parties to various international conventions concerning narcotic drugs should implement those conventions, the Commission had also advised the Council on the manner in which existing conventions could be simplified and their scope widened so as to tighten up the international control of narcotic drugs.

During the past eighteen months, the Secretariat had devoted much time to the drafting of two new treaty instruments and various studies to accompany them, had serviced a mission sent to Bolivia and Peru to investigate the problem of the coca leaf and had also serviced three meetings held by the principal opium-producing countries and the principal opium-manufacturing countries, in Ankara, in Geneva and more recently in New York. Furthermore, the Secretariat had also had to send staff to the Ankara meeting, as well as to service the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council at Geneva, and a meeting of the principal opium-manufacturing countries also held in that same town.

In accordance with a decision taken by the Economic and Social Council, the Secretariat had prepared the draft of a <sup>(simple or rather)</sup> unified convention to replace the eight existing international conventions on narcotic drugs. The draft had been completed in February 1950 and circulated on 7 March 1950. Shortly afterwards the Secretariat had also circulated a commentary on the draft.

The results achieved by the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Principal Opium-Producing Countries held in Ankara in November and December 1949 had exceeded expectations. Many attempts had been made in the past to promote an agreement between the opium-producing countries on a division of the world production and trade in opium; even the League of Nations itself had found that to be a most difficult task. The Ankara meeting, however, showed that agreement in that field was both possible and feasible. Full agreement had not yet been reached, but the outstanding questions were so clear and so few that it should not be too difficult to agree on a solution in the near future.

The third major task of the Secretariat had been connected with the Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf in Bolivia and Peru. The findings of that enquiry were before the Commission which would advise the Economic and Social Council on the measures that should be taken. The Council would then forward its recommendations to the Governments of Bolivia and Peru. The Commission of Enquiry had come to the conclusion that the two countries in question should agree to limit their production of coca leaf so as to cover only medical, scientific and other lawful requirements.

The protocol signed in Paris in 1948 to bring under the 1931 convention all the narcotic drugs still outside that convention had been ratified in December 1949, barely a year after its signature. That was a most outstanding success. The United Nations Secretariat which was working under the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Economic and Social Council, had devoted the past year and a half to the fulfilment of its two main duties: the strict application of existing treaties and the improvement of international control of narcotic drugs.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) referred to pages 15 and 16 of the progress report (E/CN.7/196) which stated that the Secretary-General had transmitted copies of two United States communications on synthetic drugs to the Director-General of the World Health Organization for his information. He asked whether those communications had been transmitted under Article 1 of the 1948 protocol and whether the Secretary-General had already received an answer from WHO.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) said that under Article 1 of the 1948 protocol only a party to that protocol could request that action should be taken under Articles 2 and 3. At the time the Secretary-General had received the two communications in question from the United States Government, the United States had not yet ratified the protocol. The Secretary-General, however, had thought that it would be useful to acquaint WHO informally with the contents of those two communications. After the United States Government had ratified the protocol, the Secretary-General had sent a second communication to WHO on 15 November 1950, officially requesting action under Article 1.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) recalled that, at its previous session, the Commission had requested the World Health Organization to consider the possibility of adopting standard names for certain drugs which were still known under several different names. It would be interesting to know what action had been taken by WHO in the matter.

/Mr. STEINIG

ICL 96/5/101/2

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) replied that he had recently received a communication from WHO stating that it had adopted standard names for two drugs and would use those names exclusively in the future. It had adopted the name pethidine for the drug which was currently known also under the names of dolantin, demerol, isonipocaine, etc. and the name methadone for the drug which was currently also known as amidone, dolophine, adanon, etc.

Dr. MAHMOUD LABIB (E- pt) recalled that a new drug known as mephenon had recently been discovered. He wondered whether it would be considered as a narcotic drug.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) replied that prima facie mephenon appeared to be a hydrochloride of one of the drugs listed in the communication from the United States representative (E/CN.7/196, page 16), namely, 6-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenyl-3-heptanol (otherwise identified by symbol N.I.H. -2933). If that was the case and if the basic substance came under control as a result of the United States communication, then the hydrochloride would automatically come under control as well.

Mr. VAILLE (France) confirmed Mr. Steinig's analysis of the nature of the drug known as mephenon. The discussion showed what useful work WHO could do in adopting standard terminology.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) urged that, although the Commission had agreed to adopt a standard name in the case of various drugs, the chemical name and formula should always appear together with the name.

Mr. VAILLE (France) explained that the WHO Expert Committee on the Unification of Pharmacopoeias had considered that question and had agreed that the standard names adopted should at the same time be non-proprietary names. He agreed with the USSR representative that the chemical name and formula should appear together with the standard non-proprietary name. The standard name adopted for inclusion in the pharmacopoeias could be used to designate the drug when it was sold on the market, just as penicillin was sold under its standard name, but should never be used as a trademark.

/Mr. KRUYSSSE



Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) added that the standard name should be given to the basic substance and not to its salts. In the case of ketobemidone, mentioned on page 16, the name should have been applied to the basic substance instead of to the hydrochloride.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the summary record of the meeting should be communicated to WHO so that its Expert Committee could take the Commission's views into account.

It was so decided.

Colonel SHARMAN (Canada) referred to section 17 of the report (page 40) which covered the work on the determination of the origin of opium by chemical and physical means. Sixteen Governments had been requested to supply opium samples and eleven countries, including Canada, had volunteered to take part in the work of chemical research. The work was however being seriously delayed by the lack of sufficient samples and he wondered what progress was being made in that connexion.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) replied that additional information on the subject was given on page 22 of the addendum to the progress report (E/CN.7/196/Add.1). It was true, in general, that opium samples were coming in very slowly and although some active research was being carried out by the United Nations, there had not been enough samples to supply all the countries which had offered to collaborate in the research.

Dr. OR (Turkey) and Mr. VAILLE (France) explained that their Governments had both sent the quantity of samples that they had been asked to supply. They would be prepared to supply further samples if they were asked to do so.

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) explained that a great variety of opium samples was needed, not only from different countries but also from specific regions within various countries.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Secretariat should contact representatives of the Governments concerned while the Commission was in session in order to explain the requirements fully.

It was so decided.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Commission should take note of the progress report and express its appreciation for the work done by the Secretariat.

It was so decided.

ANNUAL SUMMARY OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS  
-1948 (E/NL.1948/Summary)

Mr. STEINIG (Secretariat) regretted that the third annual summary governing the laws and regulations promulgated in 1949 had not yet been circulated. It was ready in manuscript but had not yet been printed. It should be ready for distribution during the month of January 1951.

The annex to the document before the Commission (pages 97 to 106) listed the laws and regulations which had been carefully reviewed, summarized and mentioned under the appropriate headings in the body of the text. The laws and regulations were numbered in the annex so that there would be some continuity with succeeding summaries. There was also a cumulative index (pages 107 to 119) which would appear in future summaries and would always refer back to all preceding summaries.

For the time being, the annual summary would take the place of the digest of all laws and regulations which the Economic and Social Council had asked the Secretariat to prepare. Work had been started on the digest, but some years would elapse before it could be completed.

Mr. VAILLE (France) congratulated the Secretariat on the work it had accomplished but wished to draw attention to certain errors in the annual summary, which should be corrected.

On page 44, at the end of the paragraph under the heading "France", it was stated that: "Preparations containing narcotic substances are generally subject to the same provisions as these substances themselves excepting preparations expressly listed in another schedule than Schedule B, which is the schedule listing the narcotic substances, and those preparations which may be classed as 'exempted preparations'". There were in fact no narcotic substances listed in France under any schedule other than Schedule B. The only ones listed under Schedule C were: syrop of morphine, containing 0.5 per cent of morphine hydrochlorate -- an exempted percentage; paregoric elixir, containing 5 per thousand

of opium powder -- again, an exempted percentage; opium syrup, containing .5 per thousand medicinal opium and "Diacode" syrup (a weak opium syrup) containing 1 per thousand medicinal opium -- again exempted percentages.

On page 47, under the heading "France" in sub-section (e), the word "decree" (decret) should read "Order" (arrêté). That was an important point for, since the decree of 19 November 1948, the schedules of poisonous substances in general and of narcotic drugs in particular had been established by Ministerial Orders, a process which was much quicker than that of decrees. The same correction applied where the word "decree" appeared under the heading "France" on page 54. It also applied where the word appeared in two separate sentences on page 69: "Supplies of doctors' samples of pharmaceutical specialities, supplied in accordance with regulations laid down by decree of the Ministry of Public Health and Population . . . - The Minister of Public Health and Population may enumerate by decree the poisons which pharmacists may, under these conditions supply to dentists and midwives" - and further on, "Dentists authorized under the same conditions and for the same purposes to possess and provide preparations containing such narcotics as are listed by decree of the Minister of Public Health and Population".

On page 47, under the heading "Greece" in sub-section (f), it was stated that the French product "nargenol" was composed of campho-sulphate of "dihydroxycodeinone". The substance was actually composed of "campho-sulphonate" of "dihydroxycodeinone".

In another paragraph on France, on page 48, it was stated that: "The quarterly statistical returns on import and export of narcotic substances are to be made only annually in the case of codeine and diionine." There was actually no such regulation in France and that statement was probably due to a confusion with the procedure for providing statistics for the Permanent Central Opium Board.

Again on page 48, it was stated with regard to codeine and diionine that: "The exempted preparations may be preparations intended for all usages other than for external use, but must not be solutions intended for injections". That statement was incorrect because, as it was explained earlier in the same text, codeine and diionine were subject to the normal regulations regarding concentration, the dosage not to be exceeded and the weight of the substance in the containers in which it was distributed to the public.

/Finally,

Finally, he pointed out that there was no mention in the annual summary of the extremely important decision taken in an order issued on 15 April 1949 to prohibit the import, manufacture and use in France of acedione, methadone and B-Hydroxyd-B-diphenylethylamine.

At the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. VAILLE (France) undertook to submit his corrections in writing so that the Secretariat could issue a corrigendum to the summary of laws and regulations.

Mr. KRUYSSE (Netherlands) referred to the heading "Bilateral Agreements" which appeared on page 43 of the document and noted that it had rather too strict a legal meaning to cover all the points listed under it. For example, the penultimate paragraph of the section referred to a purely administrative agreement reached by various officials and not to an agreement between Governments.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) agreed with the Netherlands representative that the heading "Bilateral Agreements" was hardly appropriate, although it had obviously been difficult for the Secretariat to find a suitable heading to cover the various points mentioned in the section. He suggested the wording "Agreements and Arrangements" as a possible alternative.

The Chairman said that the Secretariat would take those comments into account when preparing the following summary.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) informed the Commission that his country had recently made substantial changes in its legislation on narcotic drugs. The control of the production and export of opium had been transferred from the Ministry of Foreign Trade to the Ministry of Public Health. A Co-ordinating Commission had been established within the Ministry of Public Health, in which the Ministries of the Interior, Agriculture, Foreign Trade and Foreign Affairs were represented. The new law under which those changes had been effected also provided for more stringent penalties in cases of infringement and illicit traffic.

Mr. ANSLINGER

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) was glad to note that the laws on barbiturates and benzedrine were mentioned in the summary even though the substances themselves were not covered by existing international conventions. It was quite possible that those substances might later come under international control and it would therefore be useful to have some background information on the laws and regulations relating to them.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Commission should take note of the annual summary of laws and regulations (E/NL.1948/Summary) and record its appreciation of the work done by the Secretariat in preparing the document.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.

6/12 p.m.