UNITED NATIONS



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.7/SR.183 10 July 1952

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headne arters, New York, on Tuesday, 5 May 1952, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Illicit traffic (continued):

Illicit traffic during 1951 (E/CN.7/234, E/CN.7/236; E/CN.7/L.14)

Control of diacetylmorphine in Italy (E/CN.7/237)

Chairman:

Mr. RABASA

Mexico

Rapporteur:

Mr. NIKOLIC

Yugoslavia

Members:

Mr. SHARMAN

Canada

Mr. HSIA

Chine

Mr. MAHMOUD

Egypt

Mr. VAILLE

France

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY

India

Mr. ARDALAN

Iran

Mr. KRUYSSE

Netherlands

	Members: (con	tinued)
--	---------------	---------

Mrs. MELCHIOR Poland
Mr. AVALOS Peru

Mr. OR Turkey

Mr. ZAKUSOV Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Mr. WALKER United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland

Mr. ANSLINGER United States of America

Observer: Mr. DOSI Italy

Also present: Dr. WOLFF World Health Organization (WHO)

Mr. MAY Permonent Central Opium Board

Mr. MARABUTO International Criminal Police Commission

Secretariat: Mr. HUANG Division of Narcotic Drugs

Mr. BOLTON Secretary of the Commission

ILLICIT TRAFFIC (continued):

ILLICIT TRAFFIC DURING 1951 (E/CN.7/234, E/CN.7/236; E/CN.7/L.14)

Mr. KRUYSSE (Netherlands) said that, as some States which were members of the International Criminal Police Commission were not members of the United Nations, it might be helpful if each organization could keep the other officially informed of all seizure reports received from its members. Some time elapsed between the receipt of seizure reports and the publishing of the United Nations summaries and the information probably reached I.C.P.C. too late to be of use in pursuing offenders. He wondered therefore whether copies of the individual seizure reports received from governments could not be sent on to I.C.P.C. without delay.

Mr. HUANG (Secretariat) said that under the present system the United Nations was co-operating closely with I.C.P.C., for example, by forwarding copies of the United Nations summaries of seizure reports, of the annual reports of governments and of the special memoranda circulated by the Secretariat to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. However, the United Nations had not received reports on current cases from I.C.P.C. although that information would be very helpful for purposes of comparison in preparing the summaries.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) said that, in organizing collaboration between the United Nations and I.C.P.C., vadue importance should not be attached to such aspects as reconciling discrepancies in statistics which, due to the different membership in each organization, would always be present. It was more important for the two organizations to exchange information on the activities and whereabouts of treffickers.

Mr. MARABUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) said that generally the United Nations summaries of seizures reached his organization too late to be of much use in pursuing offenders. He suggested, therefore, that when a case of illicit traffic might have international repercussions, copies of a government's reports -- particularly if the government was not a member of I.C.P.C. -- should be forwarded as soon as possible to assist his organization in conducting its investigation.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs used the seizure reports to form a general picture of the illicit traffic throughout the world. As the United Nations usually received those reports some time after the seizures had taken place, the information was often out-of-date and of little direct use to I.C.P.C. In the circumstances, he thought that a further voluminous exchange of reports would not further and might possibly impede the work. Moreover, since the Secretariat of the United Nations was not concerned with police functions, the police services of the countries concerned should, in important cases, get into direct touch with each other.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) agreed with the comments of the representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom. He pointed out that I.C.P.C. worked on the basis of direct information and not of seizure reports, as the latter were issued only after a considerable delay.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) enlarging upon his previous remarks recalled one case involving a seizure of several hundred pounds of opium in which the Governments of Canada, India and the United States had communicated with each other directly and the case had been settled long before the United Nations summary of the seizure was published.

Mr. MARABUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) agreed that the prompt transmission of information was essential and that direct communication between governments was probably the most effective procedure. There were some States which did not exchange information with his organization, however, and he wondered whether they could not be induced to do so.

In reply to Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt) Mr. MARABUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) said that in the past year attempts to smuggle narcotic drugs by air had increased. His organization had sent a circular to governments asking for information on such cases, but it had not received complete replies from every country.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Mexico, agreed that close co-operation between the United Nations and I.C.P.C. was desirable, but he also felt that on certain occasions direct communication between governments was essential. The Commission could explore the matter further in connexion with the joint draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.14).

Mr. KRUYSSE (Netherlands) said it was important to train members of the regular police force to deal with drug traffickers, particularly where governments did not maintain special narcotics squads. I.C.P.C. had organized a demonstration on narcotic drugs for customs and police officials, for use mainly in Western Europe, but available to all members of I.C.P.C.

That exhibition was at present in the Netherlands. If offered information on the properties of opium and displayed samples of opium and its derivatives. His Government hoped that the exhibit would serve to increase police vigilance and lead to more effective control of the illicit traffic.

Mr. DOSI (Italy) was convinced of the value of training regular police officials to deal with narcotics cases.

Italy, which was a member of I.C.P.C., had established eight schools, where all types of enforcement officers were trained to handle narcotics cases. In certain cases even police from other countries were trained at those institutions. Twelve officers from Syria were now in Italy studying techniques for the control of the illicit traffic.

Mr. MARADUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) thanked the Netherlands for having shown that exhibit, in accordance with a resolution on the subject adopted recently by his organization.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission should express appreciation of I.C.P.C.'s work and take note of its Memorandum (E/CN.7/236). It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the draft resolution on the illicit traffic during 1951, submitted jointly by the representatives of Egypt, France, Mexico and the United States of America (E/CN.7/L.14).

Mr. MARMOUD (Egypt) affirmed his Government's belief that national measures alone could not cope with a world-wide problem. International co-operation was essential to the proper limitation of the production of and traffic in narcotic drugs. Many cases such as those mentioned in the report by the Director of the Arab League Permanent Anti-narcotics Bureau (E/CN.7/238) could be cited as evidence of the successful results brought about by inter-governmental co-operation. The best solution to the illicit traffic problem would be to provide for permanent communication between the national bodies responsible for the control of narcotic drugs and he would therefore support the draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.14).

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) said that he sympathized with the purpose of the proposed draft resolution, but would like to offer an amendment to paragraph (a). He suggested that the text should be amended to read "by national efforts alone, and that international co-operation is essential;" the phrase "of fundamental importance" was not strong enough to express the basic idea.

The United Kingdom amendment to paragraph (a) (E/CN.7/L.14) was adopted.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN pointed cut that the draft resolution would be put to the vote as a whole after it had been reviewed paragraph by paragraph.

establish permanent in paragraph (b). The phrase did not express clearly enough the idea it was intended to convey. He also thought that the phrase "the manner in which referred principally to the mechanical means of communication, rather than to the particular governmental departments or services which were to handle the communications. He proposed that paragraph (b) whould be anended to read "to arge Governments to take immediate steps, if they have not already done so, to adopt the practice of direct communication between national administrations controlling the illicit traffic." The second part of the paragraph should also be amended to read "the Government concerned shall determine the channel through which ...".

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) said he would accept the word "channel" if that amendment meant that a single body would be designated to handle communications relating to the illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Mexico, accepted the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph (b), which clarified the text. The essential thing was to establish which national organization or service should handle such matters.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) pointed out that as paragraph (b) mentioned "national administrations", the subsequent appearance therein of the phrase "if more than one administration exercises control" was confusing. He suggested that it should be amended to read "if in any country more than one department exercises control."

Mr. KRUYSSE (Netherlands) proposed that the amendment to paragraph (b) should read "if within a country more than one department exercises control ...".

That amendment was accepted.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada), although agreeing that international co-operation was essential in order to combat the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, said that it would be difficult for Canada to co-operate as closely with all countries parties to the narcotics Conventions as it did, for example, with the United States of America, which was a neighbouring country. He wondered whether the sponsors of the draft resolution expected governments to establish close co-operation with all parties or whether a government could make the extent of its co-operation dependent upon the individual circumstances.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that in general only neighbouring countries would be able to co-operate as closely as Canada and the United States of America. He favoured direct co-operation when necessary rather than "administrative" co-operation.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) said that it was partly because he had had in mind the point raised by the representative of Canada that he had suggested the replacement of the phrase "to establish permanent" by "adopt the practice of". The various national administrations should know which were the corresponding services in the other countries and how they could be contacted. It would be useful to compile a complete, up-to-date list of those authorities.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom representative. The United States of America, for example, co-operated closely with about twenty-seven countries in the control of the illicit drug traffic. It was important that the names of the agencies responsible for controlling the traffic should be known to all governments. Just as there was a list of authorities issuing export authorizations and import certificates, so there might be a list of those agencies.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Mexico, explained that the joint draft resolution merely called for co-operation between the various national departments responsible for control of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. He agreed that the natural course of events led to closer co-operation between neighbouring States than between countries situated far apart.

Mr. MARABUTO (International Criminal Police Commission) said that the International Criminal Police Commission had already overcome some of the difficulties to which the United Kingdom representative had referred. I.C.P.C. corresponded with about forty governments interested in control of the illicit traffic and had asked each country to designate the organ or department responsible for such control.

He suggested that paragraph (b) should be amended to include a phrase requesting governments to consult I.C.P.C. documents whenever necessary, since they included information from certain countries which might not be available elsewhere.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) supported the United Kingdom amendment and wondered whether paragraph (b) was to a great extent an affirmation of existing practice.

At the CHAIRMAN's request, Mr. BOLTON (Secretary of the Commission) read paragraph (b) of the joint draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.14) as amended by the Netherlands and United Kingdom representatives.

Paragraph (b), as amended, was accepted.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) suggested that paragraph (c) should be redrafted to read:

"(c) To ask Governments to review their preventive system with a view to ensuring that their preventive organizations are adequate to combat the illicit traffic within their territories."

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) supported the United Kingdom amendment.

Paragraph (c) as amended, was adopted.

The joint draft resolution submitted by the representatives of Egypt, France, Mexico and the United States of America, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

CONTROL OF DIACETYLMORPHINE IN ITALY (E/CN.7/237)

In view of the scheduled departure of the Italian observer, the Commission agreed to move that item sheed on the agenda.

Mr. DOSI (Italy) said that at the previous session of the Commission the Italian Government had been asked to submit a report on the measures taken to control the diacetylmorphine traffic in Italy. The Italian authorities had taken all measures possible to combat the traffic and had, moreover, ordered the temporary suspension of heroin production.

The suggestions of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had been noted and the budget of the enforcement services had been accordingly increased.

Some relaxation in control of the illicit traffic had been inevitable as a result of the war, but the authorities had examined the situation so as to re-organize the control system as soon as possible. In particular, every effort was being made to limit the use of heroin. The strict instructions issued to public health offices had given appreciable results. The amount of heroin consumed had fallen from 227 kilogrammes in 1947 to 95 kilogrammes in 1951.

The situation in Trieste had facilitated the operations of drug traffickers, and an extensive traffic between Yugoslavia, Italy and the United States of America had been discovered.

In 1951 various measures had been adopted to bring the situation in Italy back to normal. The production of heroin had been suspended indefinitely and factories had been forbidden to sell basic morphine, which was easily transformable into heroin. Existing stocks were being used by hospitals.

The problem of heroin had recently been re-examined with a view to further limitation or even abolition of its therapeutical use and a special inter-ministerial committee had been established to co-ordinate control of the narcotic drugs traffic. A bill had also been prepared regulating the production, trade in, and consumption of drugs, which had been considered by the Supreme Health Council and would be submitted to Farliament. It provided for more severe penalties for narcotics offenders. Illicit traffic in drugs was already

punishable as an offence under the Penal Code, and in order to reinforce police action, provision had been made for a special branch of the police to deal exclusively with drug control. Special measures were taken for the identification of drug traffickers and all relevant data were circulated to customs guards. In 1947 the Italian police had joined ICPC and co-operated fully with that body in the international control of the drug traffic. There was also special collaboration between the Italian police and the United States Bureau of Narcotics.

It might be concluded from the information he had given that the measures taken by the Italian Government to control the production and trade in narcotic drugs and suppress the illicit traffic, were becoming increasingly effective.

Referring to the Egyptian representative's question at a previous meeting as to the privileges and immunities granted by Italy to international organizations, Mr. Dosi said the usual diplomatic privileges and immunities were granted. His Government extended a cordial invitation to the Commission and would receive it most hospitably should it decide to hold a session in Italy.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) expressed his Government's appreciation of the excellent work done by the Italian Government and its co-operation in efforts to suppress the illicit traffic. Several years before there had been a very big traffic in heroin from Italy, but at the present time control services had been efficiently organized and the traffic had been considerably reduced.

Referring to the Italian representative's statement that the production of heroin had been suspended, he pointed out that Switzerland had recently prohibited production and hoped that the suspension in Italy would be converted into total prohibition. Referring to the Italian Government's practice of granting passports to persons of Italian origin deported from other countries for narcotics offences, he understood there was a legal provision compelling the Government to issue passports to such persons, but hoped it might be possible to refrain from doing so in the case of drug traffickers.

Mr. DOSI (Italy) said that total prohibition of heroin was a question within the competence of the Supreme Health Council. It was hoped that a decision would soon be taken on the matter. In the meantime, production had been suspended; doctors had been requested to substitute other drugs for heroin; and at present the authorization of the Ministry in Rome was needed before a physician could administer heroin.

In the case of passports, under the new republican constitution an Italian citizen had the right to receive a passport if he was not being sought by the police. The Government would, however, exercise a certain discretion, and if a person was suspected of going abroad in order to traffic in narcotics, he would not receive a passport.

In answer to a request from Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) for clarification of his remarks on Trieste, Mr. DOSI (Italy) said a report submitted by the Allied police in Trieste gave proof of the discovery of a large illicit traffic between Yugoslavia, Italy, Trieste and the United States. In the free port of Trieste narcotics were sometimes received from Yugoslavia as well as from other countries.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that there were two zones in the free territory of Trieste. There was no illicit traffic in zone B, and he would be most surprised if there was any such traffic between the two zones since the frontier between zone B and zone A was very carefully guarded. Yugoslavia had no responsibility for what might occur in zone A.

The CHAIRMAN expressed appreciation of the Italian Government's efforts and thanked Mr. Dosi for his presence at the session.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.