

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY

APR 29 1977



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.7/SR.830
24 February 1977

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Twenty-seventh session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 830th MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 22 February 1977, at 9.35 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. BABAIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics)

CONTENTS

Report of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (agenda item 12)
(continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within one week of receiving the record in their working language.

Corrections to the records of the meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.77-2961

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL (E/CN.7/596 and Add.1-2)
(agenda item 12) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its consideration of document E/CN.7/596/Add.1.
2. Mr. DI GENNARO (Italy) said that, in a letter on the subject of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) which he had sent to Governments on 26 March 1971, the Secretary-General of the United Nations had indicated that he intended to appoint from time to time for specific periods, not more than three consultants to advise the Secretary-General, his Personal Representative and the Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs on the planning of short- and long-term programmes and projects to be financed from the resources of the Fund. It would be interesting to know whether the intended action had been taken. Only if there were compelling reasons for doing so should the Commission replace the consultants referred to by the Secretary-General by the committee on UNFDAC policy guidelines proposed by the Executive Director of UNFDAC and the Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs.
3. The proposal (E/CN.7/596/Add.1, para. 12) that that committee should consist of nine members was also a source of concern to his delegation because it was most unlikely that the views of the Commission as a whole would be adequately represented in such a small group.
4. Under rule 20 of its rules of procedure, the Commission was not entitled to establish an inter-sessional committee. There was, therefore, a legal impediment in the way of adopting the proposal (E/CN.7/596/Add.1, para. 17) that the committee should meet for one or two working days prior to the opening of the plenary session of the Commission. Furthermore, the financial implications of the proposal could not be disregarded.
5. For all those reasons, his delegation considered that it would be preferable to defer action on the proposal until the Commission's next session.
6. Mr. KUSEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he did not fully share the views of the Italian representative. He supported the proposal in paragraph 9 of document E/CN.7/596/Add.1 that a committee on UNFDAC policy guidelines should be set up. He did not consider, however, that the proposed committee should meet during sessions of the Commission, because small delegations would be unable to be represented on both the Commission and the Committee.
7. Referring to paragraph 12 of document E/CN.7/596/Add.1, he suggested that the proposed committee should consist of five or seven members rather than nine. In order to ensure continuity in the committee's work some of its members should remain in office for more than one year; perhaps only two or three of its members should be replaced each year. He could see no reason why the committee should not meet two or three days before the opening of the Commission's sessions.
8. In his view, the cost of the proposed committee should be met by the Fund. With reference to paragraph 1 of document E/CN.7/596/Add.1, and paragraph 94 of the Commission's report on its fourth special session, he agreed that there was no need to issue two semi-annual reports.

9. Ms. FALCO (United States of America) said that, as her delegation had stated earlier, the United States saw no need for an additional committee in view of the regrettably small size of the Fund. If, however, the majority of the members of the Commission believed that additional guidelines should be offered to the Fund beyond those which could be offered during the Commission's sessions, her delegation would not object to arriving one or two days before the opening of a session in order to discuss the Fund's programmes with other interested delegations. Her delegation would, however, favour a committee of the whole rather than a committee of nine. Discussion in such a small body as a committee of nine would only lead to duplication of debate and unnecessary expenditure of scarce resources.

10. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's attitude to the question of the Fund was well known. The USSR gave a considerable amount of assistance to the developing countries, particularly in the field of public health. The work done in that field had a great effect on drug abuse control.

11. He recalled that the representatives of the United Kingdom, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany had questioned the advisability of establishing a committee on UNFEDAC policy guidelines. In accordance with the task entrusted to it by the Economic and Social Council, the Commission should concentrate on ways and means of improving existing machinery rather than establish a new committee, and on simplifying the drug abuse control system rather than complicate it.

12. His delegation was not convinced that there was a real need for the proposed committee.

13. Mr. VAILLE (France) said that it was apparent from the statements of the previous speakers that all delegations were not familiar with the Commission's traditions or its rules of procedure.

14. The Italian representative had suggested that, according to rule 20 of the rules of procedure, a committee of the Commission could not meet before the opening of the Commission's session. According to the last sentence of that rule, however, a committee of the Commission could be authorized to sit while the Commission was not in session. There was, therefore, no reason why the proposed committee should not meet two days before the opening of the Commission's session. As some members of the Commission would recall, the Commission's committee on illicit traffic had met in that way over a period of 10 years.

15. The United States representative's proposal that the proposed committee should meet, as a committee of the whole, two days before the Commission's session would be tantamount to prolonging the session. That could not be done without considerable additional cost. It was improbable, therefore, that the Secretary-General would agree to the proposal.

16. Mr. DI GENNARO (Italy) said that the French representative's interpretation of rule 20 of the rules of procedure was unacceptable. According to that rule, the Commission could set up such committees as were deemed necessary and refer to them any questions on the agenda for study and report. Quite obviously, therefore, a committee could not be established until the agenda had been adopted, and agendas were not adopted before the opening of a session.

17. It should be noted, further, that in English the word "session" could be interpreted in two ways: it could mean a series of meetings of a body or it could mean a single meeting. In his opinion, the word "session" at the end of rule 20 meant a single meeting.

18. Mr. de BEUS (Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control), said that he and the Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs had put forward the proposal in document E/CN.7/596/Add.1 in response to a request by the Commission. If the Commission found the proposal unsatisfactory, the Secretariat would not be offended.

19. Many members of the Commission appeared to consider that the proposed committee would be too cumbersome, might give rise to a number of new problems and would complicate matters rather than simplify them. On the other hand, a number of members considered that some informal and practical means of putting forward policy guidelines to the Fund should be found.

20. In the circumstances, he suggested that the Commission should request the Secretariat to prepare a new proposal for submission at the next session, taking into account all the views expressed in the course of the debate. It was his understanding that any new machinery proposed should be practical and informal.

21. Mr. KUSEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation would welcome a legal opinion on the question whether, under rule 20 of the rules of procedure, the Commission would be entitled to set up a committee which would meet one or two days before the Commission's next session.

22. Mr. VAILLE (France) suggested that there was no need to consult the legal adviser at Headquarters on the question. Those who had been working with the United Nations for 20 years knew that, under the rules of procedure, the proposal in document E/CN.7/596/Add.1 was valid. Neither the Executive Director of UNFDDAC or the Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs would have put forward the proposal had that not been the case.

23. Mr. KUSEVIC (Yugoslavia) explained that he had merely wanted a legal interpretation of the rule by jurists present at the Commission's meeting.

24. Mr. NOLL (Secretary of the Commission) said that he could not give an official legal opinion on the matter. All he could do was refer to the practice the Commission had adopted for a number of years in the past, when a committee had been established to consider, during sessions, the question of illicit traffic. The understanding of the Secretariat was that, so far as the rules of procedure were concerned, it would be possible to adopt a similar procedure for the proposed committee on UNFDDAC policy guidelines.

25. The CHAIRMAN noted that the representative of Yugoslavia was satisfied with the answer given by the Secretariat.

26. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) said that his delegation could accept the proposal made by the Executive Director of UNFDDAC. In preparing the new proposal the Secretariat should take account of all the views expressed in the Commission on the question. It might be advisable, too, to explain the scope of the proposed Committee's work.

27. Mr. VAILLE (France) said that any machinery suggested in the revised proposal should be pragmatic, practical and inexpensive. He agreed with the Argentine representative that information concerning the scope of the committee's work should be given. There was considerable misunderstanding in the Commission about the role of the proposed Committee.

28. Mr. GUJRAL (India) endorsed the proposal that the Secretariat should prepare a revised proposal in which account would be taken of the comments made during the present debate. The revised proposal should be circulated well in advance of the Commission's fifth special session so that delegations could consult their Governments on the question.

29. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not object to the preparation of a new proposal. He considered, however, that all views, including those of delegations which considered it inadvisable to set up a committee, should be reflected in the Commission's report.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the opinions of those in favour of the proposal and of those opposed to it would be reflected in the Commission's report. He suggested that the Commission should take note of document E/CN.7/596/Add.1 and request the Secretariat to prepare a revised proposal for submission at the next session, taking into account the comments made in the Commission during its discussion of the question.

31. It was so decided.

32. Mr. HUGHES (World Health Organization) said that he wished to comment briefly on some of WHO's epidemiology programme activities, which were being supported by UNFDAC and carried out in close collaboration with the staff of the Division of Narcotic Drugs.

33. The major developments during the second operational year of the programme, which was just ending, included the collection of data on common reporting forms in eight countries. The countries submitting data were: Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Puerto Rico (United States of America) and Thailand. A preliminary analysis of those data had been reviewed at a meeting of investigators in September 1976 at Geneva. That meeting had resulted in agreement on the "minimum essential" data items required by decision-makers for effective programme planning. Those items would now be collected as "core data" in the different WHO projects. He was glad to report that forms for WHO projects during the coming year had been designed to ensure comparability with data being collected by the Division of Narcotic Drugs. In two countries, in fact, the Division's manual would be tested in conjunction with WHO data-gathering projects and by WHO investigators.

34. The first major project during the coming year would involve the testing of an epidemiological case-reporting form for collecting "minimum essential" as well as "recommended optional" data on drug users in contact with various institutions. A meeting of collaborating investigators was tentatively scheduled for August 1977, when the results and methodology of the study would be reviewed for publication. They could then be made available for use by interested Governments for a variety of purposes, such as treatment programme reporting and intensive case-finding studies.

35. A closely related treatment evaluation project would be carried out by the same collaborating institutions. During the pilot work in 1976, instruments had been tested for collecting data on changes that occurred in patients during and following treatment. Second-generation treatment assessment instruments were now being finalized and would be forwarded to investigators during the coming month for field testing on small samples of patients assigned to pilot treatment evaluation studies. Although that was a difficult area of operational research, recent visits by programme staff to Burma, Malaysia and Thailand had found planning actively under way. In one of those countries, 40 patients included in the 1976 pilot study had been continuously followed on a monthly basis by using the WHO pilot progressive form, and a six-months follow-up study of those cases was expected shortly. In another country visited, a pilot study was already under way to compare the effectiveness of in-patient versus out-patient detoxification of heroin and opium users. A WHO expert in treatment evaluation was to visit several collaborating institutions in Asia in the middle of 1977.
36. A third project agreed on at the September 1976 meeting aimed at ensuring comparability in surveys of drug use among young people. Instruments and instructions had been sent to collaborating investigators in late 1976 for testing in nine countries: Burma, Canada, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Thailand and the United States. That project should be finalized during 1977 with the preparation of a document containing recommendations of collaborating investigators for the widespread application of the survey instruments and methods.
37. The fourth major project would complete pilot testing of the WHO guidelines for reporting available information on the non-medical use of dependence-producing drugs. The investigators responsible for the study at the London Institute of Psychiatry had selected experts to review the different types and sources of data collected during the past year for a monograph which should be finalized in 1978. The monograph should guide planners in other countries to recognize and use a variety of types and sources of epidemical data that were either already existing or that could be generated.
38. More important, however, than the data being generated in those projects were the development of common instruments and methods for the application phase that was about to begin and the establishment of co-operative methods whereby investigators from developed and developing countries could learn to work together, to learn from one another and to share in the development of a common technology, especially in countries where WHO/UNFDAC programmes were being implemented.
39. Parallel with those activities, a methodology had to be devised to meet immediate programme needs and to take advantage of unique data-gathering opportunities. For example, in August 1976 a WHO consultant had visited Afghanistan to develop the work plan for the health sector of the proposed United Nations/Afghanistan programme for drug abuse control. In a three-week period, the consultant, equipped with a short interview form and a supply of medicines, had been able to interview a total of 246 self-admitted opium-dependent persons in two villages of the Badakshan region who had been told that they could have a medical consultation. It was of interest to note that 81 per cent of the 246 respondents had indicated that they had used opium initially for health problems. Those data suggested that the availability of basic medical care for the treatment of diarrhoea, bronchitis, rheumatism and

accident injuries might serve as a primary preventive measure for reducing the significant proportion of new cases in communities which now lacked health care services.

40. Reference had been made earlier, to the Hill Tribe Village survey carried out in Thailand in October 1976. WHO had now received a draft final report from collaborating investigators at Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok and expected the findings of the survey to be published during the coming year. That survey had been the first step of a programme in which some villages were scheduled for treatment programmes, while others would serve as controls. It was believed to be the most comprehensive survey of drug use yet carried out in a rural opium-producing community and it would provide groundwork for future programmes in Thailand and other countries.

41. Although the work done so far was preliminary in nature, it was gratifying to see the beginning of results and to find such able investigators in collaborating countries. During the coming year, WHO expected a number of those projects completed and their results published and made available to planners in the countries concerned, as well as in other countries which might find the WHO methods of direct relevance to their needs.

42. Mr. EYRIES VALMASEDA (observer for Spain), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that his delegation fully supported UNFDAC's objectives and stressed the need to increase contributions to the Fund. His own Government had already made two contributions, one of \$10,000 on 12 January 1973 and a second of the same amount on 20 June 1975. It was now considering the possibility of making a further contribution on the condition that the Fund continued to be used for the purposes for which it had been established.

43. His delegation was inclined to question the proposed transfer of the laboratory to Vienna, since it would undoubtedly involve considerable long-term as well as immediate costs. He pointed out that the Spanish Government was already contributing indirectly to the Fund, inasmuch as it had increased the number of its agents engaged in the repression of illicit traffic in drugs and was providing fellowships for foreign students in the field of United Nations drug control.

44. Mr. de BEER (observer for South Africa), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that his Government appreciated the value of the various applications of the Fund and was pleased to announce that a further and somewhat larger contribution to it, amounting to 5,000 rand, had already been paid. The future contributions of South Africa would be considered individually on an annual basis.

45. Mr. EL HADEKA (International Arab Narcotics Bureau of the League of Arab States) said that he had previously drawn attention (E/CN.7/SR.816, para. 62) to the problem of the eradication of hashish in Lebanon. He had also mentioned the questions which had arisen in view of the decision taken by the Fund to assist the Lebanese authorities only up to the end of 1976, in the expectation that the Lebanese Government

would complete its overall development programme and be able to fulfill its obligations. He hoped, therefore, that the Executive Director of UNFDAC, or possibly the observer for the FAO, would be able to explain the present situation with regard to the project in Lebanon.

46. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) supported the views concerning the current expenditure of UNFDAC which had been expressed at the preceding meeting by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. In his opinion, the best means of eliminating drug abuse was to eliminate the illegal production and supply of narcotic drugs. His own Government was well aware of the nature of drug abuse and its programmes were carefully oriented accordingly.

47. He wished to point out that the information on pages 39 and 40 of document E/CN.7/596/Add.2 did not correctly reflect his Government's contribution to the projects undertaken in Pakistan. That contribution was, in fact, greater than had been indicated, since, in addition to experts, Pakistan was providing more than 8 million rupees annually to cover administrative costs. Pakistan, therefore, should be considered not only as a recipient country but also as a donor, since it was contributing not only in the form of ideas and planning but also in terms of monetary expenditure.

48. He supported those delegations which had expressed opposition to the expenditure of UNFDAC funds in connexion with the transfer of operations to Vienna. He also considered that, while a survey might be necessary to assess the usefulness of the work of non-governmental organizations in the campaign against drug abuse, he could not support the employment of UNFDAC experts for that purpose.

49. Dr. LO (observer for Senegal), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that he had listened with much interest to the Yugoslav representative's remarks. The Fund's resources were indeed limited and it was difficult to understand the attitude of those developed countries which had serious problems of drug abuse and proclaimed their interest in the Fund, but which, considering their resources, made only very small contributions to it.

50. He was pleased to inform the Commission that his Government had decided to contribute \$3,000 to the Fund as evidence of its concern for the problems of drug abuse and of its devotion to the principle of multilateral co-operation.

51. One delegation had suggested that, in view of the difficulty of finding new sources of financing for the Fund, its operations should be frozen for the time being and that no new ones should be considered. Such an approach would be unjust, however, as it would not take into account the problems of certain developing countries, particularly in Africa, which were drawing up programmes that called for assistance from the Fund. The latter's expenditure in African countries South of the Sahara was at present minimal. That was a dangerous policy, because the problem of drug abuse was taking on increasing and disturbing dimensions in that area. In Senegal, for example, 216,800 kg of cannabis had been seized in 1975. It was obvious that the Fund should devote special attention to the African countries if a latent explosion was to be prevented. His Government did not expect the Fund to solve all Senegal's drug abuse problems, but merely to act as a catalyst, for the country relied primarily on its own resources for its control efforts.

52. He noted that paragraph 6 of document E/CN.7/596 referred to a plan to offer specialized fellowships in the demand field in 1977. He would appreciate further details concerning the duration of those fellowships, the qualifications required of those to whom they would be granted and the countries concerned. Paragraph 8 of the same document stressed the usefulness of regional meetings on drug abuse control. His delegation strongly supported that idea; but regretted that no such meetings had been envisaged for Africa. If a regional adviser was to be appointed for West Africa, his Government would like to nominate a candidate for that post.

53. Dr. SMITH (Canada) announced that his Government had formally approved a contribution to UNFDAC of 200,000 Canadian dollars. That payment followed a total contribution by his country of 1 million Canadian dollars in the past five years.

54. His delegation wished to reaffirm its strong support for UNFDAC, which was a unique and extremely valuable institution. It also reiterated its support for the idea of devoting particular attention to projects aimed at reducing the demand for illicit drugs. He noted with satisfaction the plan to begin offering specialized fellowships in the demand field for 1977 and the provision being made for treatment and rehabilitation in the country programmes. He hoped that the Fund would move further in that direction.

55. The Fund's work was of course intended to be of a pilot nature and to serve as an indication of what could be done in the field of drug abuse control. Its pilot projects had to be taken up by appropriate funding agencies, either in the country concerned or, in the case of developing countries, with the assistance of larger lending institutions or aid agencies. In connexion with such items as crop replacement, in particular, that work should be associated with such international aid agencies as UNDP, operating through the appropriate Government bodies, international organizations and specialized agencies.

56. He noted from paragraphs 21 to 25 of UNFDAC's report (E/CN.7/596) that steps had been taken in implementation of the Commission's resolution 2 (S-VI) which had called for further development of the practice of arranging periodic objective evaluations of UNFDAC-supported projects. He welcomed the fact, referred to in paragraph 23, that in future the role of outside evaluators would assume increasing importance. In view of the pressure on the administrators of the Fund, he could agree that individual progress reports on operations financed by the Fund should be submitted on an annual rather than on a semi-annual basis and he supported the suggestion that 30 June should be taken as the reporting date.

57. He would welcome reconsideration by the Fund of the manner in which information on financial operations was presented to the Commission. In particular, it would be helpful to have a clearer picture of anticipated expenditure for realistic programme delivery in current and future years, as opposed to project data. At present, the difference between those two figures made it difficult to assess the financial status of the Fund in respect of specific allocations.

58. His delegation was concerned about reports that UNFEDAC, a voluntary fund, would have to bear, in respect of those posts financed by the Fund, part of the cost of the proposed transfer of personnel to Vienna. He hoped that a clear breakdown of the costs of that move would be prepared for consideration by the Board under agenda item 13. In particular, he would like an assurance that those additional costs would not be charged against the budget of the Division of Narcotic Drugs, the International Narcotics Control Board or the Fund.

59. He supported the suggestion by the representative of Pakistan that there should be some evaluation of the counterpart contribution of recipient countries, in order to provide a global assessment of the efforts being made by all countries of the world in the fight against drug abuse.

60. Mr. GUJRAL (India) said it was gratifying to note that, in keeping with the recommendations of the Commission at its fourth special session the Fund now proposed to give special attention to projects designed to reduce demand for illicit drugs. It was also to be hoped that the future programmes financed by the Fund might include projects related to limitation of the manufacture of psychotropic substances to medical requirements. The production of such substances in the industrialized countries was out of all proportion to the medical needs and constituted an important source of supply for the illicit market.

61. For its part, India had always offered to contribute in kind by providing expert personnel for any purpose to which the resources of the Fund might be applied. Some of his country's leading scientists were already collaborating with the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory in conducting research to increase the yield of phenanthrene alkaloids per unit of cultivated area. India had also offered to host at New Delhi an international pilot course for law enforcement officials of neighbouring countries in co-ordination with the Central Training Unit of the Division of Narcotic Drugs. The Unit had responded favourably to the offer and the precise timetable for the course was in process of preparation.

62. Ms. FALCO (United States of America) said that her delegation associated itself with the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia in suggesting that the Fund should, in future reports, present its budget in terms of expenditure by object class so as to show expenditure in broad categories, such as personnel costs, equipment, maintenance, rentals and travel, with sub-categories under those general headings to indicate how funds had been spent. It would also be useful if the Fund would provide the Commission with its projected budget expenditure one year in advance. The Commission would then have an adequate basis for evaluating the priorities and cost effectiveness of the Fund's activities. Such information being readily available to the Fund, its inclusion in future reports should not constitute an undue administrative burden.

63. Several delegations had expressed reservations about the desirability of the Fund's continued support of personnel positions in the secretariats of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Her delegation understood those reservations and agreed that there was much room for improvement in the priority accorded to drug abuse in the regular budgets of the specialized agencies and of the United Nations itself.

64. It supported the view expressed by the representative of Pakistan concerning the contribution made by his and other recipient countries to Fund's projects. Those counterpart country contributions were vital to the success of the Fund's efforts and they should be given the public recognition they deserved. Lastly, her delegation associated itself with the request made by the representative of Canada for a complete statement of the financial implications of the Fund's transfer to Vienna.

65. Mr. STURKELL (Sweden) said that his delegation was pleased to note the increased attention which the Fund was giving to projects designed to reduce demand for illicit drugs. He wished to inform the Commission that his Government had decided to support the Fund for the coming years on the same scale as in the past, which meant that the Swedish contribution would be approximately \$50,000 per year.

66. Miss FRIDERICH (observer for the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that UNESCO, like the other specialized agencies, fully supported UNFDC's programmes for drug abuse control. She wished to assure the Commission that the Fund did not support the specialized agencies' activities except in respect of certain aspects of projects which those organizations performed in the capacity of executing agency. The agencies sought to co-ordinate their activities and decided, in informal meetings, on the best means of performing their tasks. The fact that certain activities had been entrusted to the specialized agencies was a sign of confidence in them as organizations specialized in a given field.

67. The activities of UNESCO were labour-intensive, requiring a great deal of work and relatively little investment in equipment. When UNESCO organized a meeting, paid for by the United Nations or by the Fund, a number of accessory costs were not covered, such as expenses relating to accounting, interpretation, and translation of the final report. The countries in which such meetings were held also helped to cover their cost.

68. In addition to the studies mentioned in document E/CN.7/596/Add.2, UNESCO had produced studies on Peru, Bolivia and Jamaica. A study on the youth press had been issued in English and French and a Spanish version would be issued shortly. A follow-up study sought to determine whether young people who had been treated for drug abuse were re-integrated into society or remained marginal elements. A group of young sociologists had made an evaluation study on educational programmes. That report was available in English and French and would shortly be translated into Spanish, UNESCO meeting the cost of the Spanish version. It would be helpful if members of the Commission could assist UNESCO in the distribution of those various studies outside the organization's own distribution network.

69. The Lomé meeting referred to on page 23 of document E/CN.7/596/Add.2 had been the first of its kind held in Africa. The participants had stressed the importance of traditional African values and the need to encourage the population to participate in national development with all their energy, which excluded the harmful use of alcohol or other drugs. Stress had also been placed on the need to use educational methods to dissuade young people from the abusive use of drugs and alcohol.

70. UNESCO had also participated in a United Nations programme in Thailand and would shortly be holding a meeting for key officials of Ministries of Education. The organization's activities also included a meeting on adult education to be held in Sweden, at which the problem of drugs would also be examined. The Fund's participation in the latter meeting would be limited to the services of a consultant, while the Scandinavian countries would pay for the travel and subsistence costs of the participants.

71. Her organization would like to see UNFDAC follow up the initial work it had done. It was unwise to arouse enthusiasm and then to tell those concerned that it was not possible to continue to help them. Once a programme had been initiated through a fellowship or a meeting, it was essential for it to be continued. In that connexion, she was pleased to note that the Commission had requested an increase in the activities undertaken with the object of reducing demand for drugs.

72. Mr. GREENSHIELDS (Observer for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) said that he wished to reply to questions raised at the previous meeting by the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Narcotics Bureau of the League of Arab States concerning the Hashish Eradication Project in Lebanon. The Government of that country had made an initial request to the Fund for help in carrying out a programme to eradicate hashish production. A seven-year, \$20 million programme, had been regarded as the minimum time and investment requirement to eradicate the existing cannabis plantations and to substitute economically viable agricultural enterprises.

73. The project agreement had provided for United Nations assistance during a three-year phase and it had not been assumed that a very modest investment input over three years could possibly result in the eradication of an activity which yielded an estimated \$60 million a year and which was supported and even protected to a large extent by a number of high level government officials.

74. Prior to the Fund's project in Lebanon, the Government had begun, in 1966, to develop a substitute agricultural economy and had placed primary emphasis on replacing cannabis growing with sunflower cultivation. Up to 1966, the Government's reliance essentially on force had proved to be too costly in lives and had accomplished little. The Lebanese Council of Ministers had decided in 1966 that a more constructive course of action would be first to provide an alternative means of livelihood for the cannabis growers and then to resort to force if necessary.

75. The Government's 1966-1972 sunflower programme had not been too effective. Studies which had been made indicated that sunflower seed was not an economically viable substitute crop. However, those studies had erred in that they had been based on empirical evidence rather than on the real potential of sunflower production, using proper cultivation methods. The FAO/UNFDAC project, however, had demonstrated that sunflower seed was in fact a viable substitute crop.

76. The budget for the Lebanese project had included \$300,000 from UNFDAC and \$200,000 from the Lebanese Government. The Fund had made two allocations to FAO as executing agency. Actual cash expenditure by FAO contemplated for 1974 to 1976 had been about \$430,430. On 31 December 1976, FAO had had a provisional balance of \$108,969 out of the funds allocated to it for the project. Upon termination of

the project at the end of 1976, there was a shortfall of about \$370,000 in FAO's total budgeted expenditure on it. While some might view that as failure on his organization's part, he regarded it rather as a credit to his organization's careful and closely managed operations. FAO had not incurred expenditure for equipment and expert services which it had not considered essential. Required expert services had been made available to a considerable extent through co-operation with on-going UNDP projects. The Lebanese Government had fulfilled its financial commitments in every respect. It had maintained and even increased the price support for sunflower seed.

77. As far as the impact of the project was concerned, he pointed out that prior to the launching of the project, no serious attempt had ever been made to assess the country's hashish production. UNFDAC had sought to obtain accurate information and had made arrangements for aerial photography of the bulk of the known producing area. One of the first tasks undertaken in 1974, had been a village-by-village survey of hashish production, which revealed that 90 per cent of the production was in 30 villages within a radius of 10 kilometres of Baalbek. The 1974 survey had recorded less than 200 hectares in the Hermel area with an estimated 6.2 tons of processed hashish. A survey in 1975 had recorded a reduction of 300 hectares, slightly over 10 per cent. An important fact revealed by the continuing investigations had been the control exercised over production. It had been learned that a large part of all cannabis growing was in the villages of the Government's Yammourie irrigation project area. The water from that project was controlled by a few individuals who had a special interest in maintaining hashish production. Unless the villagers agreed to grow hashish, they were unable to obtain water. Another important development noted in the 1975 survey had been the fact that an increasing proportion of processed hashish was being converted into hashish oil, a highly concentrated drug.

78. The survey of production in 1976 had been hampered by the civil war situation but had shown a substantial increase over 1975. It had been discouraging to note that such an increase occurred when the project staff were unable to work actively in the area. Another discouraging fact revealed by the 1976 survey had been that for the first time six villages had started to grow opium poppies. Those developments showed what happened in the absence of project staff, police, narcotic agents and government officials.

79. It had been asked what were the prospects for complete eradication of hashish production if the project was continued. He understood the Fund's position to be that since the project had demonstrated that there were viable substitute crops which could replace hashish, its job was done and the responsibility for further action now rested with the Government, which might seek the help of UNDP and other development assistance agencies. That position had not been supported by FAO or UNDP. The Lebanese Government had desired the Fund's participation in the difficult task ahead, because it had recognized that its own efforts had fallen short. Association with the Fund had been considered vital and he contended that the latter's continued participation remained essential if hashish production was to be eradicated in Lebanon. In his opinion, the prospects for success were excellent with the Fund's association. Without it, the prospects were not good. No drug eradication project could succeed unless the farmers themselves were convinced that it was best for them to abandon production of the drug. By and large,

the stage of full farmer acceptance and co-operation had been reached in the Lebanon. To discontinue the project at the present crucial time would mean the eventual loss of farmer acceptance which had been earned only with the greatest of effort. The FAO team had faced physical dangers and had remained on the job, a fact which had not been unappreciated by the farmers and village leaders of the Bekaa valley.

80. Another important and favourable factor was the departure from the Government of a number of high-level persons with a personal interest in maintaining hashish production. Still another favourable development was the fact that the project had selected and trained a dedicated corps of agricultural engineers who were now living and working in the project area.

81. In conclusion, he said that for the Fund to cease its assistance as soon as some substitute crops had been proved economically viable was a questionable policy. Identifying the viable substitute crops was merely the beginning of the long-range, costly task of ensuring the firm establishment of such crops as a permanent part of the farm economy.

82. Mr. GHERIB BRAHIM (Observer for Tunisia), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said his delegation hoped that the resources made available to the Fund, whose activities were steadily increasing, would be used in particular to help countries requesting its assistance to improve their technical and administrative organization in such a way as to enable them to control drug abuse and prevent its spread. Despite its limited resources, his country had wished to show the importance which it attached to the problem by making an initial contribution to the Fund in 1975. He was pleased to announce that his Government had decided to make a second contribution and that the necessary formalities to that end had been initiated in January 1977. A further contribution had also been decided for the year 1977.

83. Mr. VAILLE (France) noted some overlapping of projects, particularly in the area of education and prevention. He agreed with the Canadian representative that it would be helpful if the documents submitted to the Commission showed, in addition to the contribution by the Fund, the amount contributed by other co-executing agencies. He would like to know whether, apart from the Governments of Thailand, Burma and Turkey and the Central Training Unit, other parties had entered into commitments to guarantee the continuation of certain projects. It was obvious that UNFEDAC could not continue to bear the cost of certain activities indefinitely; as its Executive-Director had stressed, the Fund could act only as a catalyst. His delegation was satisfied with many of the projects undertaken with the assistance of the Fund, particularly those concerning the Administrative Manual on Drug Control Treaties; Assistance to National Narcotics Laboratories; Meetings of Operational Heads of National Narcotics Law Enforcement Agencies, Far East Region; Training Fellowships at the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory; Regional Drug Control Adviser, Middle East; Regional Narcotics Co-ordination Officer, South-East Asia; Action Programmes of Youth Organizations Against Drug Abuse; Study on Chronic Effects of Long-Term Use of Cannabis and the Pakistan Country Programme for Drug Abuse Control. It recognized that all those projects would have had no chance of implementation without the assistance of the Fund.

84. Mr. EL HAKIM (Egypt) considered that until the Fund's financial situation had improved, it would be more prudent to concentrate on completing on-going and short-term projects before embarking on new ones. He hoped that if regional advisers were appointed for Africa and Latin America, as was contemplated in paragraph 8 of document E/CN.7/596, the experience gained in the Middle East and South-East Asia regions would be taken into account. The advisers should be persons of high competence, from the region if possible, and with a full understanding of the inter-relations between the various countries of the region. His delegation was particularly interested in the National Legislation and Regulation Project which he considered would be very useful in helping Governments to avoid duplication, acquainting them with the experience of other countries and in assisting them to develop their legislation in the most appropriate way.

85. His delegation had also been interested in the reply given by the representative of PAO concerning the hashish eradication project in Lebanon. That project was an extremely important one for the countries of the region because Lebanese hashish was smuggled to other countries and because of the increasing tendency to smuggle hashish in the dangerous form of hashish oil. Some delegations had commented on the low rate of participation by rich Arab countries in the work of the Fund. The continuation of the Lebanese project would unquestionably give those countries an example as well as evidence that the international agencies concerned were carrying out work of relevance to them. In that connexion, the Executive-Director of the Fund might give some thought to reviewing the current philosophy of the Fund. His delegation was convinced that interest in the Fund would be enhanced if the dangers of drug abuse were more firmly emphasized and if the relationship between drug control and national development was underscored.

86. Mr. DAGBEGNIKIN (Togo) considered that, on balance, the Fund had carried out much useful work. It had often been said that a few countries keenly interested in the existence of the Fund made substantial contributions to it while the overwhelming majority of countries gave it little financial support. His own country, like many others in the same situation, had very limited resources, but it had nevertheless announced a symbolic contribution to the Fund as a demonstration of its political will to see the latter continue. His delegation also wished to stress that financial contributions were not the only way of helping the Fund, and it had been very pleased to hear the representative of UNESCO refer to the considerable material assistance made available by the Government of Togo to a UNESCO seminar on drugs recently held in Lomé. Those who complained that the African countries were poor contributors to the Fund and that they should, therefore, not make excessive demands on it, should, he believed, reconsider their attitude.

87. It had also been stressed that no new operations should be undertaken in view of the Fund's financial situation. His delegation wished to know whether the proposed transfer of the United Nations Division of Narcotic Drugs from Geneva to Vienna was an on-going or a new operation. Why should the Fund bear the cost of the transfer if there were to be no new operations? Furthermore, it should, at all times, be kept in mind that the fight against drug abuse was a global struggle and that the policy of attacking the problem in one particular area on the ground that it was assuming particularly acute proportions in that area while neglecting it in another was an unsound one. While the problem was being eradicated in one area it could appear in another, unless continuing and adequate control was exercised.

88. Senegal, where a seizure of 230,000 kilos of cannabis had taken place in 1976, was a case in point. The recommendation not to embark on new operations should therefore be re-examined very carefully, because there was a strong feeling that the problem of drug abuse now required attention in the African countries. The Commission must realize that the problem of drug abuse was becoming serious on that continent and that appropriate action needed to be taken. The African countries did not expect the Fund to carry out large-scale operations; they merely wished it to act as a catalyst in starting activities in which the African Governments and people concerned would participate.

89. His delegation supported the proposal that the Fund should produce an annual report presenting information on a region by region basis. In conclusion, he wished to appeal to those countries which were major manufacturers of psychotropic substances and which were flooding countries like his own with those substances to assume their responsibilities under the 1971 Convention.

90. Mr. TOPERI (Turkey) said that the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had enquired at the preceding meeting whether the poppy straw collected from the 1976 harvest in Turkey had been sold. He pointed out that, in compliance with the 1961 Single Convention, Turkey duly provided the Board with all relevant production and export figures. Accordingly, his delegation believed there was no need to give detailed information to the Commission. It wished to point out however, that the 1976 harvest, which had been purchased and collected from the farmers by the Soil Products Office was now in storage in Government monopoly bins. Negotiations for the sale and export of the crop were under way with various foreign firms. The 1975 harvest had been completely sold, and more than half of the 1976 harvest had either been sold or committed. If the Turkish Government was unable to sell part of the crop, it would be stored and ultimately processed in the Turkish alkaloid factory which was scheduled to begin production in March 1978. The Turkish Government considered the price mechanism established by the State monopoly to be a most important factor in the complete success of its programme, and was determined to maintain the purchasing price for the farmers.

91. Mr. NEPOTE (ICPO/Interpol) said that the fight against narcotic drugs accounted for approximately 35 per cent of ICPO/Interpol's operational activities, and that the organization spent approximately 2,500,000 Swiss francs annually on them. It received two kinds of assistance from the Fund; the first consisted of partial reimbursement of the cost of certain bulletins produced by Interpol and the second took the form of provision of fellowships to countries which wished to send participants to ICPO/Interpol conferences. In that context, ICPO/Interpol was prepared to develop a systematic policy of conferences at the regional level for officials concerned with the illicit traffic in drugs if the Fund, for its part, was prepared to assist the developing countries in sending experts to those conferences.

92. Dr. LING (Director, Division of Narcotic Drugs) said that the Division of Narcotic Drugs and UNFEDAC greatly appreciated the co-operation of WHO in the joint work undertaken on the epidemiology of drug dependence. The studies made by WHO and the Division would provide the Commission as well as national authorities with a mechanism for evaluating objectively on-going and future treatment programmes. On that basis, an evaluative examination would permit decisions to be taken which would assist Governments to utilize the most effective and economical ways of treating and rehabilitating victims of drug abuse. The Division and the Fund looked forward to continuing that important work not only in conjunction with WHO, but also in concerted action with UNESCO and the ILO.

93. He recognized that there was in Africa an increasing traffic in substances of abuse and that the use of psychotropic substances was growing there. Several representatives from African countries had raised the question of a regional adviser for the African area and the Division, as the chief adviser and executing agent of the Fund, would give appropriate advice and support to that request.

94. He had also taken note of the concern expressed by several delegations regarding costs related to the move to Vienna, particularly since they might have a definitive influence on the budgets of the Division, the Board and the Fund. There appeared to be a desire for a clear breakdown of the costs to be incurred as a result of the transfer of the secretariat to Vienna and for an assurance that the costs of the move would not be borne by the Fund or out of the regular allotments to the Division and the Board. Those issues, as well as other related issues, would be brought to the attention of the appropriate bodies, with the permission of the Director-General, so that they might be clarified. He had taken note of the reservations expressed by a number of delegations concerning Fund support of personnel of United Nations bodies and executing agencies involved in drug abuse control. That question would be also brought to the attention of the appropriate bodies. He suggested that those matters might be dealt with in greater detail when the Commission discussed its programme of work and priorities.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.