

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.7/SR.153  
15 August 1951

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 23 May 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft Report to the Economic and Social Council on the sixth session  
of the Commission (E/CN.7/L.7/Add.2, 3 and 4;  
Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev.1) (continued)  
Communication from the Observer of Thailand

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. SATTANATHAN	India
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SHARMAN	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. KAMEL FAHMY	Egypt
	Mr. BOURGOIS )	France
	Mr. VAILLE )	
	Mr. AMINI	Iran
	Mr. BORATYNSKI	Poland
	Mr. OR	Turkey
	Mr. ZAKUSOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. ANSLINGER	United States of America
	Mr. KRASOVIC	Yugoslavia

Observer: Mr. EGIDI

Italy

Also present: Mr. MAY

Chairman of the Permanent Central  
Opium Board

Secretariat:

Mr. STEINIG

Director, Division of Narcotic  
Drugs

Mr. BOLTON

Secretary of the Commission

DRAFT REPORT TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL ON THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE  
COMMISSION (E/CN.7/L.7/Add.2, 3 and 4; Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev.1)

Document E/CN.7/L.7/Add.2 (continued), Paragraph P (continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. EGIDI (Observer, Italy), took a  
seat at the Commission table.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, emphasized that the new draft took account of the desires expressed by members of the Commission at the previous meeting. He had considered it better to use the expression "invites the Government of Italy to study" rather than "recommends that the Government of Italy should study" in paragraph 2. The text of the third paragraph had also been altered slightly.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the draft submitted to the Commission at the previous meeting had been unacceptable to him. Although the variant in Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev. 1 was somewhat more satisfactory, he was still not able to accept it. Paragraph 2 (b) in particular was certainly an interference in the internal affairs of Italy. The Italian Government should decide for itself what measures should be taken to combat the illicit traffic in heroin.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that he would abstain from voting on the draft. He had been in favour of submitting a formal draft resolution with more detailed considerations to the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. KAMEL FAHMY (Egypt) regretted that the text contained the word "invites" instead of "recommends".

/Mr. VAILLE

Mr. VAILLE (France) agreed.

Mr. EGIDI (Observer, Italy) said that he had noted Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev. 1 with interest. Members of the Commission were aware that the competent Italian authorities, in particular the High Commissariat for Public Health, had been in touch with the Permanent Central Opium Board for some time on the matter of limitation of the consumption of diacetylmorphine in Italy. At its fifth session, the Commission had asked the Italian Government to reduce production of the drug gradually to fifty kilograms a year. Consumption of heroin, which had reached 195 kilograms in 1948 and 190 kilograms in 1949, had not exceeded 130 kilograms in 1950. The High Commissariat for Public Health, in accordance with the Permanent Central Opium Board's recommendations, had instructed hospitals and physicians to reduce the use of heroin, and was about to take even stricter measures in order gradually to reach the figure of 50 kilograms. As the Italian Government had informed the Commission during its fifth session, the rather large consumption of heroin in Italy was due to the fact that it was used in hospitals and sanatoria in the treatment of tubercular diseases of the respiratory passages.

In its reports to the Secretariat on illicit traffic in 1949 and 1950, the Italian Government had described what it had done to prevent the diversion of heroin into illicit channels. Certainly the steps taken to restrict the use of heroin for medical and scientific needs would also have the effect of reducing illicit traffic.

Mr. Egidi thanked the Commission for the attention it had given to the problem. In view of the measures his Government had already taken and was taking, there was no need for the Commission to make detailed recommendations to it. The competent Italian authorities were following the problem of heroin consumption very closely, and they were fully aware of their international responsibilities in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Italian Observer for his full and interesting statement. As the Italian Government was prepared to accept the Commission's recommendations forthwith, it did not seem necessary to vote on the question. It would be better for the Commission just to include the draft in its report.

/Mr. AMINI

Mr. AMINI (Iran) recalled that he had been in favour of sending a formal draft resolution to the Economic and Social Council. He had abstained when the question whether the Italian Observer should be invited to give his views had been put to the vote. Now, after the Observer's statement it did not seem that a vote should be taken. If the United States representative approved, it would be enough for the Commission to take note of the Italian representative's statements and entrust him with transmitting its observations to the competent Italian authorities instead of including the proposed paragraph in the report.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) thought that it mattered little whether the decision was adopted unanimously or not. It was essential for the recommendations to be made to the Italian Government in the form of a decision included in the report. There was nothing in Conference Room Paper No.13/Rev. 1 running counter to Italy's sovereign rights. It merely pointed out that the situation in regard to illicit international traffic in heroin was not satisfactory, and asked the Italian Government to consider the possibility of taking certain measures. He would vote for the draft paragraph F with which Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev. 1 was concerned.

Mr. KAMEL FAHMY (Egypt) thought that the Commission should consider whether the Italian Observer's explanations were satisfactory or not. If they were satisfactory, there was no point in the Secretary-General communicating with the Italian Government.

Mr. KRASOVEC (Yugoslavia) recalled that the Commission had considered the question of illicit traffic in heroin at its two previous sessions. It seemed that the measures taken since then were not entirely satisfactory. In the circumstances, the Commission should take the proposed decision.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that he had been interested in the Italian Observer's explanations, but could not accept the Egyptian suggestion. The decision should certainly be included in the report. The Commission might perhaps alter it in the light of the Italian Observer's explanations. For example, it might delete paragraph 2 of Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev. 1 and combine paragraphs 1 and 3.

/Mr. SHEARMAN

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) welcomed the co-operative spirit in which the Italian Government was working with the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Supervisory Body to solve the problem of high consumption of heroin for medical purposes and was happy to hear the Italian Observer's assurances about reduction of that consumption. However, a further question had arisen of stocks in Italy sufficient for ten years' legitimate consumption and he would like to receive the same assurances from the Italian Observer in regard to the reduction of those stocks.

Mr. EGIDI (Italy) thought the figure quoted was exaggerated, although he had no exact information as to the level of existing stocks. He did not doubt that the measures already taken and those which were going to be taken would result in reducing stocks in the same proportion as consumption. The Italian Government had shown its good will in the fight against illicit traffic in heroin, and that had been recognized by various members of the Commission. He therefore saw no need for an official communication to the Italian Government. The Commission's recommendations would appear in the summary record and he could transmit them to his Government.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) was in a position to corroborate the data given by the Canadian representative; his estimates of the stocks were not exaggerated. They amounted to some 200 kilograms, and yet the Italian Government had authorized production of another 30 kilograms in 1951. The Commission's decision should certainly be included in the report.

The CHAIRMAN put the sub-paragraph of paragraph P dealing with Italy (Conference Room Paper No. 13/Rev.1) to the vote.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. KAMEL FAHMY (Egypt) said that he had abstained from voting. He had not been able to vote for the sub-paragraph because the Commission had already made its views known officially to the Italian Observer. He had not voted against it because he was not sure that the explanations given were satisfactory.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) said that he had abstained, not because he did not agree with the recommendation in substance, but because he could not accept its form. The Italian Observer's explanation seemed satisfactory.

/Mr. HOARE

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) felt that the Commission had the right to take decisions of that kind, but had abstained because he would have preferred to have paragraph P amended in accordance with the United States representative's proposal.

Document E/CN.7/L.7/Add.3

Paragraphs A, B and C

Paragraphs A, B and C were adopted.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) noted, with reference to the French text of paragraph D of the section entitled "Drug Addiction", that there had never been any question of launching a campaign ("lancer une campagne") of education and propaganda against the use of narcotic drugs.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, agreed. The English text correctly stated the purpose of the discussion on education and propaganda against the use of narcotic drugs. He suggested that the French text should be brought into line with the English text.

It was so decided.

Paragraph D, as amended in the French text, was adopted.

Document E/CN.7/L.7/Add.3 was adopted with the above change.

Document E/CN.7/L.7/Add.4

Chapter I

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, explained that the Commission's discussions had failed to make clear what work was to be entrusted to the Secretariat and what questions the Commission would itself discuss at its next session. The Commission had not given the Secretariat specific instructions to prepare a study on synthetic drugs, and he had therefore not thought that he should include the subject in the Secretariat's work.

/On the other

On the other hand, the Commission had expressed a desire to discuss the question at its subsequent session. The Commission was master of its agenda, and the best way to express that decision would therefore be to say that the Commission had asked the Secretary-General to include the item in the provisional agenda of the next session, the Secretariat being responsible for the preparation of the agenda.

Mr. VAILLE (France) thought that "une question relative aux stupéfiants synthétiques" in paragraph 8 (b) of the French text should be changed to "la question des stupéfiants synthétiques".

The Commission had asked for the question to be discussed at its next session, but had thought that it should come after the question of a single convention.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, accepted the French representative's amendment and suggested that the English text should accordingly be changed to "the question of the synthetic narcotic drugs".

Chapter I was adopted with the above amendment.

#### Chapter II

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, noted with reference to paragraph 10, that the Commission had not had time to study the "Annual Summary of Laws and Regulations Relating to the Control of Narcotic Drugs." That document was as voluminous as the "Summary of Annual Reports of Governments for 1949", and as the Commission had decided to postpone consideration of the latter until its seventh session, he had thought that it would take the same decision with regard to the former and had inserted a paragraph to that effect.

Chapter II was adopted.

#### Chapter III

Mr. VAILLE (France), referring to paragraph 15 (v) thought that the majority of the Commission had actually been opposed to maintaining the clearing-house system, but that the United Kingdom representative had asked that no decision should be taken until the Permanent Central Opium Board had been consulted. Consequently two versions of the text should be prepared: one

/relating

relating to the maintenance of the clearing-house system, and another in the event of the clearing-house system being abolished. Preparation of the texts would, however, not be an easy task for the Secretariat.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) thought that the Commission must choose one of the two solutions. The majority had spoken against the clearing-house system. He therefore did not understand why sub-paragraph (v) should refer to the possibility of modifying the system.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), Rapporteur, explained that no decision had been taken. Some members had objected in principle to a clearing-house system, while others had said that everything would depend on its method of work. That was why the sub-paragraph referred to the possibility of a modification.

He then drew attention to part G of paragraph 15. Strictly speaking, it did not refer to a decision by the Commission. But, as the Commission had wished to follow a procedure which would allow governments represented on it to study the views of the Permanent Central Opium Board and of the Supervisory Body on the draft single convention as soon as possible, he had taken the liberty of saying that the observations should be sent directly to governments, that is, without passing through the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Opium Board) said that the members of the Board could submit their observations on the functions which the two bodies mentioned in section G would be exercising under the single convention in June. The Board's general comments on the draft would not be available before its session in November.

Paragraphs 14 and 15 were adopted.

Mr. ZAKUSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not yet received the Russian translation of the report. He reserved the right to make his comments on the parts of the report which had just been examined when he received the translation.

/Mr. AMINI



Mr. AMINI (Iran) proposed adjournment of the meeting in view of the fact that the French translation was not ready.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE OBSERVER OF THAILAND

The CHAIRMAN informed the Commission of the contents of a communication which the Secretariat had just received from the Observer of Thailand.

The Observer had done everything in his power to obtain the information he had promised to secure for the Commission, but had not received complete information from his Government so far. He would transmit that information to the Commission as soon as it became available. If he did not receive it before the end of the sixth session, he would send it to the Secretariat for transmission to the individual members of the Commission.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.