

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.7/SR.285
27 May 1955
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Tenth Session

JUN 2 1955

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 4 May 1955, at 2.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Scientific research on narcotics (E/CN.7/289, chapter VII;
E/CN.7/L.103, L.107, L.110, L.114 and L.117) (continued)

Protocol for limiting and regulating the cultivation of the poppy plant,
the production of, international and wholesale trade in and use of
opium: Economic and Social Council resolution 548 C (XVIII)
(E/CN.7/285 and Corr.1, E/CN.7/L.113/Rev.1) (continued)

Illicit traffic: a. Reports on the illicit traffic in 1954 (E/CN.7/292,
E/CN.7/293; E/CN.7/R.4 and Add.1-7; E/NS.1954/Summaries 2-10;
E/NS.1955/Summaries 1 and 2; E/CN.7/L.106 and L.111) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. VAILLE	France
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. SALDANHA	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. HOSSICK) Mr. FARMILLO)	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. LABIB	Egypt
	Mr. PANOPOULOS	Greece
	Mr. ARDALAN	Iran
	Mr. RABASA	Mexico
	Mr. CALLE y CALLE	Peru
	Mr. FORYS	Poland
	Mr. ÖZKOL	Turkey
	Miss VASILYEVA	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. WALKER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. ANSLINGER	United States of America
	Mr. NIKOLIC	Yugoslavia
	Mr. DANNER	Federal Republic of Germany
<u>Observers:</u>	Mr. KIDRON	Israel
	Mr. GEBARA	Lebanon
	Mr. GRANDJEAN	Switzerland
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. MAY) Mr. ATZENWILER)	Permanent Central Opium Board
<u>Representatives of specialized agencies:</u>		
	Dr. HALBACH	World Health Organization
<u>Representatives of non-governmental organizations:</u>		
<u>Category B and Register:</u>		
	Mr. NEPOTE	International Criminal Police Commission
	Mrs. BESH) Mrs. SMITH)	International Council of Nurses
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. YATES	Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs
	Mr. PASTUHOV	Secretary of the Commission

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ON NARCOTICS (E/CN.7/289, chapter VII; E/CN.7/L.103, L.107, L.110, L.114 and L.117) (continued)

Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that his Government was in favour of establishing a United Nations narcotics laboratory as early as possible. Iran, as a producing country, earnestly hoped that the origin of opium might soon be determined with certainty so that no more groundless accusations of the kind referred to by the Yugoslav representative at the previous meeting could be made. The Iranian Government, which had co-operated with the analysts to the best of its ability, in particular by supplying samples, would continue to follow the same line of action.

With regard to the proposals at present before the Commission, he understood that the authors of the various texts were in agreement on a number of points. He suggested that they should meet and prepare a combined text on which it would be easier for the Commission to vote.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) wished to make it clear that when the Economic and Social Council had voted on the question of setting up a United Nations narcotics laboratory, his delegation had understood that the laboratory's findings regarding the origin of opium would be conclusive. If that were not so, the United States delegation might wish to reopen the whole question of setting up a laboratory. Steps should be taken to resolve disputes between chemists and obviate recriminations of any kind. For that reason the Canadian draft resolution (E/CN.7/107) seemed to him inadequate. He would therefore vote against it as well as against those proposed by India (E/CN.7/L.110) and Greece (E/CN.7/L.114).

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) had been much surprised to hear the Greek representative say that Turkish opium could be distinguished with certainty from Yugoslav opium. He had never before heard such a statement. He would like to know if there were also differences between Greek, Bulgarian and Yugoslav opium. Referring to a remark made by the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting, he said that he did not expect that an infallible method would ever be found enabling the origin of opium to be determined in every case. There

(Mr. Nikolic, Yugoslavia)

would always be some mistakes, but at least the methods used should be fairly certain. For the time being chemists, including Mr. Farmilo and Mr. Fulton, agreed that while it was possible to distinguish with certainty between, for example, opium produced in India and Yugoslav opium, that did not apply to opioms of Balkan origin, as they were called in document ST/SOA/SER.K/36.

Mr. LABIB (Egypt) reminded the Committee that his country neither cultivated nor manufactured narcotic drugs, but was unfortunately a victim of the illicit traffic. Hence his delegation was entirely in favour of the early establishment of a United Nations laboratory. Even when the laboratory had been set up each country should naturally continue its research work in its own laboratories; however, it would be useful to have, in addition to the national laboratories, a United Nations body to which to turn.

With regard to the proposals under discussion, he thought the Committee should vote first on the Indian amendment and then, if it were rejected, take up the United States and Canadian draft resolutions. In his opinion a combined text based on the two draft resolutions would be the best solution.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) said that his country, since it neither produced raw materials nor manufactured narcotics, regarded the problem objectively. He recalled Economic and Social Council resolution 548 D (XVIII) which referred to the General Assembly the question of the establishment of a United Nations narcotics laboratory, and General Assembly resolution 834 (IX), by which the General Assembly had decided that the laboratory should be established at Geneva. True, the members of the Third Committee had proposed in the course of the debate that a final decision on that point should be taken only after the present session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, but he could see nothing in resolution 834 (IX) to show that the Assembly had adopted that proposal. Legally, therefore, the principle of the establishment of a laboratory had been accepted unreservedly and the next step was to consider how the General Assembly resolution should be put into practice. The United States delegation had made a proposal to that effect in paragraph 3 of its draft resolution.

(Mr. Rabasa, Mexico)

With regard to the practical side of the future laboratory's work, there was obviously no infalliable method for determining the origin of opium. Nevertheless the laboratory should base its conclusions on solid foundations. In order to do so it must have clearly-identified samples. Economic and Social Council resolution 548 D (XVIII) emphasized that aspect of the problem by requesting Governments within whose territories opium was licitly produced - which, according to the 1953 Protocol, at present numbered seven - and Governments within whose territories there was illicit production notwithstanding their efforts to suppress it, to furnish the Secretariat with clearly-identified samples in so far as that might be possible (paragraphs 9 and 10 of the resolution). In accordance with the provisions of that resolution, the Mexican Government had furnished samples, while making it clear, as he had already explained, that they were not necessarily of Mexican origin. The laboratory should of course specify in every case the methods by which it had reached its conclusions.

On the one hand the Commission should take practical steps to implement the General Assembly resolution to which he had referred; on the other it should provide the laboratory with a solid foundation for its work, a point covered by clause (a) of paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution, which recommended the development of "sound methods". His delegation would be prepared to support that draft resolution on condition that his comment concerning the specification of the methods used were taken into account and that the following sentence were added to the said clause: "these methods must be standardized on opium furnished with the absolute guarantee of the Government concerned that it was produced in that country and reference to the methods employed should be given whenever origin of a seizure is determined by such methods."

Mr. SALDANHA (India) said he had listened to the Mexican representative with particular interest as he too had reviewed the history of the question of the establishment of a laboratory from the consitutional point of view. He could not, however, agree with the Mexican representative's interpretation that the General Assembly resolution was final and that all that remained to be done was to decide how to give effect to it.

(Mr. Saldanha, India)

He himself had already pointed out that the question of principle had been decided; he had no quarrel with it, but wished to draw attention to subparagraph (f) of the preamble of the United States draft resolution.

The important issue was whether the research had reached a stage where the origin of opium could be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty. In resolution 548 D (XVIII) the Economic and Social Council had noted the divergence of views reflected in the report of the Committee of Chemical Experts. Only one year had elapsed since that Committee had submitted its report. He was aware that the research work had been actively continued since then, and that progress had been made; nevertheless this was a matter of vital importance to the opium-producing countries, its object being the fixing of responsibility on one or the other of these countries for opium which had been seized in the illicit traffic. If, therefore, the laboratory's conclusions had to be accepted by all opium-producing countries, they must be based on standardized methods the validity of which was generally recognized, not merely by national chemists, however eminent, but by an international body of experts. This was an international, and not merely a national matter. If the Commission depended upon the advice of an international organ like the World Health Organization in matters medical, he did not see why the Commission should not agree to his suggestion for a pronouncement by an international group of chemical experts on standardization of the scientific methods for the determination of origin of opium.

He had already drawn attention to the need which had been felt by last year's Committee of Experts for a reappraisal, and it was in order to avoid the risk of premature action by the Commission that he had proposed that the Committee of Experts should be convened again to carry out the reappraisal. The matter was too important to be decided hastily. He had no very strong views on the committee's composition; one of the advantages of appointing the same group of experts was that they had already examined the material available a year ago and would, therefore, be in the best position to review the progress made since.

With reference to the United Kingdom representative's comment on the Indian amendment, he explained that he was not asking that the method of determination of origin of opium should be infallible. The words "with a reasonable degree of

(Mr. Saldanha, India)

certainty" had been included at the end of the Indian amendment to cover that point. Moreover, the amendment had nothing to do with the Canadian draft resolution and applied only to the United States draft. He had no objection to a limited practical application of the methods already developed, as suggested in the Canadian resolution. He supported Dr. Farmilo's recommendation that a seminar should be organized, as that would be the best way in which the question of standardization of the methods developed for the determination of origin of opium could be decided.

The Mexican representative was not correct in observing that the seven countries named in the 1953 Protocol were the only countries authorized to produce opium; under that Protocol, any country could produce opium but only the seven countries mentioned in the Protocol were entitled to export opium. Illicit traffic could, therefore, emanate from any country producing opium, whether it was an authorized exporter or not, and the laboratory, in order to be effective, must extend its studies so as to cover as many countries as possible. The Yugoslav representative had pointed out that it was difficult to distinguish Greek opium from Yugoslav opium. That would be equally true in the case of other countries with common frontiers.

Mr. WEI (China) said that his delegation wholeheartedly supported the United States draft resolution. His Government had always fought against drug addiction and illicit traffic and it felt that it would help if the origin of the opium could be determined. Research had reached a stage where that could be done with a reasonable degree of certainty. Furthermore, the United States delegation did not say that the Laboratory must keep to the methods already developed; on the contrary it should continue its research to find better methods. That was how he interpreted clause (a) of operative paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.103). Immediate steps should, therefore, be taken to establish the Laboratory and he was consequently opposed to the Indian amendment. The Canadian draft resolution seemed to present certain dangers. Certain countries might agree not to reveal true origin of the opium or disputes might arise between the chemists and lead to the recriminations to which the United States representative had referred. Lastly, he supported the United Kingdom amendment (E/CN.7/L.117); countries might have their own research laboratory but the final decision should rest with the international Laboratory.

Mr. PANOPOULOS (Greece) explained, in reply to the Yugoslav representative, that when he had said that Turkish opium, for example, could be distinguished from Greek or Yugoslav opium he had been referring only to the experiments conducted in Greece (ST/SOA/SER.K/37) which had shown that there were very clearly marked differences between samples provided by the three Governments.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) felt that there was general agreement on the principle that a United Nations Laboratory should be established. The only point in the United States draft resolution which had given rise to differences of opinion was operative paragraph 2. If that paragraph was more flexibly drafted, the main difficulties would be solved. He therefore supported the Iranian representative's proposal that the authors of the various drafts should be requested to meet and prepare a new text in the light of the discussion.

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) said that he could not accept operative paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution as it stood because, as he had already said, there were as yet no universally recognized methods for determining the origin of opium with certainty. The results obtained by the various methods did not always coincide. Provision should therefore be made for the use of a series of methods by which a reasonable degree of certainty could be assured. In those circumstances, the Indian amendment (E/CN.7/L.110) seemed particularly logical and he would vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a single method might include several different analytical techniques. The experts' statements and report showed that they envisaged the use of several techniques. In that way, certainty was possible in a considerable number of cases and, as the Mexican representative had rightly said, an element of doubt remained only when no standard samples were available.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) was in favour of the Mexican representative's amendment and thanked the Mexican and Chinese representatives for their support.

Mr. HOSSICK (Canada) said that Mr. Farmilo would be happy to give further information on the possibility of distinguishing between Yugoslav, Greek and Turkish opium.

Mr. FARMILO (Canada) said that it was possible to distinguish two main and clearly defined types of Turkish opium, "druggist" opium and "soft" opium. It was possible that there was also a third type. The first type could be distinguished from most varieties of the second type by determining the calcium and potassium content of the ash. It was not only possible to distinguish Turkish opium from Yugoslav opium but also to distinguish between different types of Turkish opium on the basis of the same tests. Certain types of "soft" and "druggist" Turkish opium could be distinguished from one another by their Pm content. Yugoslav and Greek opium could, to some extent, be distinguished from Turkish opium by microscopic examination. The shape and distribution of the crystals were also important criteria. In his first report, the previous year, the use of the term "Macedonian" to designate opium from Yugoslavia and Greece had perhaps been unfortunate. In this year's report the term used was "Balkan". Thus, it would be seen that a large number of different tests could be used and that, in a few cases, the scientist must make certain reservations. Despite those reservations, such determinations were determinations of origin. If the Greek representative said that he could distinguish between Yugoslav and Greek opium, he (Mr. Farmilo) was ready to accept that statement. Personally, he knew how to do that only in a small number of cases with opium samples from Yugoslavia and Greece, but he was convinced that differences did exist between those types of opium. He hoped that they would be discovered in the future, thereby providing final confirmation of the Greek representative's contention. Even now, electrophoresis revealed certain differences which bore out that contention.

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) noted that the Greek representative was more positive than Mr. Farmilo about the possibility of determining the origin of opium in every case. Such divergencies of view between scientists should convince the Commission of the need for caution.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of France, noted that the modesty of a scientist did not diminish the value of his findings. Anyone with any experience in scientific research knew that a researcher would never say that his work had been conclusive. Research was a process that went on indefinitely.

(The Chairman)

The discussion had revealed substantially divergent views on the texts before the Commission. The only way to reconcile the United States draft resolution with the Indian amendment, for instance, was to vote on the principles set forth in them rather than on the texts themselves. He asked the Commission to signify by its vote approval of the procedure he was suggesting.

It was decided, by 13 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, that the Commission should vote on the principles set forth in the various texts.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the principles stated in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the preamble of the United States draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.103).

The principles were adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had not participated in the voting because he did not agree with the procedure that was being followed.

The CHAIRMAN observed that paragraph (c) stated two principles for the Commission to decide upon on the understanding that the Secretariat would redraft them.

The principles stated in paragraph (c) of the preamble were adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The statements in paragraphs (d) and (e) of the preamble were endorsed.

The principle stated in paragraph (f) was adopted by 14 votes to none.

The substance of paragraph (g) was approved by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to decide on the principle of convening the Committee of Chemical Experts, as recommended in the Indian amendment (E/CN.7/L.110).

The principle was rejected by 7 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to take a decision whether the chemical experts should report their conclusions by 31 December 1955, as requested in the Greek amendment (E/CN.7/L.114).

The recommendation made in paragraph 1 of the Greek amendment was adopted in principle by 7 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission if it wished to invite Governments, as proposed in operative paragraph 1 of the Canadian draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.107), to transmit samples of opium seized in illicit traffic to the Secretariat, it being understood that, in order to satisfy the Chinese representative, the invitation would be extended to all Governments, not only those which did not have adequate facilities for determining the origin of the seized opium.

The principle stated in operative paragraph 1 of the Canadian draft resolution, thus amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. SALDANHA (India) requested that when the States parties to the 1931 Convention informed the other parties of the origin of the opium seized in illicit traffic, as recommended in paragraph 2 of the Canadian draft, they should substantiate their statements by giving a brief report of the methods used in determining origin.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the recommendation requested by the Indian representative should be voted on separately. It would doubtless be unnecessary because the findings of scientific research were always accompanied by an account of the method used to reach them, without which they would be meaningless. However, there was nothing to prevent such a recommendation from being made, and to satisfy the Mexican representative it could be added that standard samples should be used when methods were developed.

The proposal was adopted by 14 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the principle stated in operative paragraph 2 of the Canadian draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.107).

The principle of the recommendation was adopted by 14 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to approve in principle the authorization given to the Secretary-General under operative paragraph 3 of the Canadian draft.

The principle was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to take a decision on the report to the Commission requested under operative paragraph 4 of the Canadian draft resolution. It was understood, as the Indian representative had requested, that the determination of the origin of the opium would have to be acceptable to the Governments concerned.

The principle contained in the paragraph was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Replying to a question from Mr. WEI (China), the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission's decisions necessarily meant the rejection of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the United States draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.103). He called for a vote on the principles stated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of that draft.

The principles in paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN asked for a decision on the recommendation contained in the United Kingdom amendment (E/CN.7/L.117) to the Canadian draft resolution.

The recommendation was adopted in principle by 14 votes to none.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) again stated that he had not taken part in the voting because he did not approve of the procedure followed.

PROTOCOL FOR LIMITING AND REGULATING THE CULTIVATION OF THE POPPY PLANT, THE PRODUCTION OF, INTERNATIONAL AND WHOLESALE TRADE IN, AND USE OF OPIUM: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL RESOLUTION 548 C (XVIII) (E/CN.7/285 and Corr.2; E/CN.7/113, Rev.1)(continued)

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to consider the new draft (E/CN.7/113/Rev.1) of paragraphs 90 to 98 of the draft model code for the application of the 1953 Protocol (E/CN.7/285).

At the request of the representative of the Permanent Central Opium Board, it was decided that paragraph (a) should request a determination of the quantity of morphine contained not only in the opium delivered and exported or in stock, but also in the opium consumed and seized. It was understood that "consumption" would be defined as in the 1925 and 1931 Conventions.

At the request of the representative of the Permanent Central Opium Board, it was decided that paragraph (b) should state that, when a producing country based its control on determination of the morphine content, it should consistently use that method. Similarly, if it based its control on determination of the moisture content, it should apply that method uniformly.

The new text of paragraphs 90 to 98 as set forth in document E/CN.7/L.113/Rev.1 was adopted as amended by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Commission had completed its consideration of the draft model code for the application of the Protocol. On its behalf, he again thanked Mr. May and Mr. Atzenwiler for their valuable assistance. The Commission had still to decide whether it wished a commentary on the Protocol to be prepared for its eleventh session, or whether the commentary should not be prepared until the Protocol had come into force.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC: (a) REPORTS ON THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN 1954 (E/CN.7/292 and 293; E/CN.7/R.4 and Add.1 to 7; E/CN.1954/Summaries 2 to 10; E/NS.1955/Summaries 1 and 2; E/CN.7/L.106 and 111)(continued)

Replying to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Committee on Seizures, said that the Committee had not formally considered the note of the representative of Greece (E/CN.7/L.111), but that the latter had referred to it during a meeting of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the observers from Lebanon and Israel, and called on the observer from Lebanon.

Mr. GEBARA (Observer for Lebanon) called the Commission's attention to the statement in paragraph 207 of the Commission's report on its ninth session (E/2606) that in the documentation on illicit traffic before the Commission there had been a considerable number of references to the Lebanon as a country of origin of the various drugs seized, particularly opium and heroin.

The Lebanese Government was amazed by the remark. In fact, Lebanon produced neither opium nor heroin. Like cocaine and morphine those drugs were all imported from foreign countries, particularly certain countries of the Middle East which were not members of the League of Arab States. The most that might be said was that Lebanon was on the route used by smugglers. The raw opium probably came from Turkey, and the cocaine, heroin and morphine were usually brought in by sea.

With respect to hashish, Lebanon had for several years waged an unremitting campaign against the cultivation of the cannabis plant which was prohibited by law. Each year the Government organized an extensive campaign to destroy the plant in which the army, police force and customs authorities took part. The annual cost of the campaign was nearly one million dollars. While some clandestine plantations in inaccessible areas might have escaped destruction, the remark in the report of the Permanent Office of the League of Arab States that a large number of farmers had been authorized to cultivate the cannabis plant was completely unfounded. The Office further claimed that the farmers in remote areas had been able to harvest the crop before the start of the campaign to destroy the plant. In point of fact, however, the remote areas concerned were situated in the mountains where the plant ripened late. It could therefore not have been harvested before the start of the campaign.

The Lebanese Government was also taking extensive action to suppress the illicit traffic in hashish, as indicated by the scale of the seizures in Lebanon. It should be pointed out, in that connexion, that in documents E/NS/1954/Summary 8, 9 and 10 Lebanon was often mentioned arbitrarily as a country of origin of the drug in connexion with seizures effected in some areas of the Sinai Desert.

(Mr. Gebara, Observer
for Lebanon)

Lebanon's action to suppress the illicit traffic had recently resulted in the arrest of a dangerous international gang and the United States Embassy in Lebanon had warmly congratulated the Lebanese Government on behalf of the United States Commissioner of Narcotics.

Contrary to certain absurd or tendentious reports, the number of drug addicts in Lebanon represented less than one per thousand of the population. Most of them were aliens or refugees from adjacent countries. In 1954 the following seizures of narcotic drugs had been made: 434 kg. of raw opium, 1,160 kg. of hashish, 124 grammes of heroin and 3 grammes of cocaine. It would appear from his remarks that the Lebanese authorities should be commended and encouraged instead of being criticized.

Mr. NEPOTE (International Criminal Police Commission) said that in 1954 his organization had warmly welcomed the Council's adoption of the Commission's resolution concerning the ICPC. He thanked the Commission and the Committee on Seizures for having allowed him to express his organization's views. He also thanked the Secretariat and the Division of Narcotic Drugs for their commendable spirit of co-operation.

While he considered it unnecessary to describe again the ICPC's activities with which members of the Commission were quite familiar, their interest in the ICPC prompted him to inform them that it had further expanded since 1954. Three more States - Libya, Mexico and New Zealand - had joined the ICPC in 1954. In that connexion, he thanked the Mexican representative for the part he must have played encouraging his country to join. As a means of extending its activities the ICPC had decided to establish a new wireless station in Paris through which it could keep in touch with every section of the world and thus improve the liaison between the police authorities in different countries.

He did not intend for the moment to repeat some of the statements he had made in the Committee on Seizures, summarized in its report, on the subject of illicit traffic.

The Committee on Seizures had considered the ICPC's report to the Commission for the year 1954 (E/CN.7/293) and had suggested a few drafting changes which would be taken into account. Two points in the report were particularly important.

(Mr. Nepote, ICPC)

First, the number of cases dealt with by the ICPC had increased by 30 per cent as compared with the preceding year. The reason for the increase was not so much that traffickers had become more active but that the police had co-operated more closely with the ICPC in view of the moral support it had received in the Council's resolution. Secondly, the final section of the report included a summary of cases of illicit traffic in which the ICPC had intervened with remarkable results. The success it had achieved could be attributed to direct co-operation, strongly encouraged, among the police authorities of various countries. The ICPC's action might seem modest in view of the magnitude of the problem of illicit traffic. However, action on the international level called for patience and perseverance and the ICPC appeared to be on the right road. The ICPC intended therefore to continue its activities along the lines it had adopted, determined as it was to wage a campaign against traffickers and to rid society of them.

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) pointed out that, in the statement made by the observer for Lebanon, Turkey had been mentioned twice as a country of origin of narcotic drugs seized, once directly by name and the second time in a reference to countries which were not members of the League of Arab States. The observer for Lebanon had no right to mention Turkey unless he had irrefutable evidence as to the origin of the narcotic drugs concerned. He could not have obtained such evidence without consulting the Turkish authorities.

Mr. KIDRON (Observer for Israel) reserved his delegation's position with respect to the remarks of the observer for Lebanon concerning countries which were not members of the League of Arab States.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Seizures, said that a special section on Lebanon had been included in the Committee's report. He hoped that Mr. Gebara would be present when the matter was considered.

Mr. GEBARA (Observer for Lebanon) explained that he had not intended to level any charges against Turkey. He had merely referred to a probability based on statements made by arrested traffickers.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Seizures, thanked the ICPC and Mr. Nepote for their extremely valuable co-operation.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) also thanked the ICPC. He hoped that the General Assembly of the ICPC, scheduled to meet shortly at Istanbul, would give particular attention to the situation in the Middle East and succeed in eliciting the support of every country with a view to perfecting a system for the suppression of the illicit traffic in that part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking on behalf of the Commission, congratulated the ICPC on its work.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. PANOPOULOS (Greece) and Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) thanked the ICPC on its excellent work and the remarkable results it had achieved.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Turkish representative to introduce his draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.106).

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) explained why he considered it desirable to present his resolution. Very often a country was mentioned as the origin of narcotic drugs seized without any proof whatsoever and without the Government concerned having been consulted. Disagreeable incidents resulted which in no way helped to remedy the situation. A Government should therefore not mention a country in an official document unless it had previously consulted the authorities of the country concerned. If such consultation were made, the fact should be mentioned. He thanked the members of the Committee on Seizures for having unanimously adopted his proposal.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that he would support the Turkish draft resolution providing that, if a Government attempted to consult another country but failed to receive a reply it would be entitled to mention the country of origin of the narcotic drug. The Government could then refer to the country of origin by name, pointing out that it had not received a reply.

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) accepted the United States representative's interpretation.

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) and Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) supported the Turkish draft resolution and the United States representative's proposal.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) was in general agreement with the Turkish draft resolution. As regards paragraph 2, however, it was often preferable for two Governments to exchange information directly, when possible, rather than through the ICPC. Paragraph 2 seemed to exclude the possibility of such a direct exchange. He was not in any way criticizing the ICPC, which was doing excellent work. Indeed, by joining the ICPC, Mexico had demonstrated its respect and esteem for that body. Governments, however, should be allowed to correspond with each other directly. It could be provided, for example, that the ICPC and the United Nations Secretariat would be kept informed by receiving copies of such correspondence.

Mr. NEPOTE (International Criminal Police Commission) thought that that proposal was acceptable. Communication between Governments by the diplomatic channel, however, was sometimes slow; one of the reasons for the establishment of agencies like the ICPC was to facilitate direct contact between competent services in the various countries. The ICPC encouraged such direct contact by the use of a radio network, among other methods. Thus the term "direct communication between Governments" and the term "communication through the ICPC" were not mutually exclusive. The system which had been carefully organized by the ICPC did not oblige police services in the various countries to communicate with each other through the ICPC Secretariat. In Europe, particularly, many matters were dealt with daily directly between the countries concerned with the intervention of the ICPC Secretariat, which was merely informed of any action taken.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Commission could agree that direct communication between countries was preferable in some cases, for example between the United States and Mexico. Countries could communicate with each other in three ways: through the diplomatic channel, by direct contact between the services concerned, and through the ICPC - the latter method being particularly advisable when several countries were involved.

Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) stated that it had certainly never been his intention to prevent two Governments from communicating with each other directly. It had seemed to him that such communication would be accelerated if countries used the machinery of the ICPC, but that did not, of course, preclude a direct exchange of information between Governments, and he had no objection to such an interpretation of his draft resolution.

Mr. HOSSICK (Canada) supported the Turkish draft resolution. Referring to paragraph 3, he said that there was a great difference between "certain origin" and "suspected origin". Absolute certainty was rarely possible. The Commission's discussion of scientific research had made it clear that even scientific methods were not designed to achieve the impossible; that was why the term "a reasonable degree of certainty" had been used. "Suspected origin" was a rather vague term; it could, for example, be suspected that a narcotic drug had come from a certain country simply because it had been wrapped in a newspaper published in that country. Hence when tangible proof existed of the origin of a narcotic drug the fact should be stated to show that it was not a mere supposition.

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) was convinced that the Turkish representative had not wished to prevent Governments from communicating with each other directly, but the present text of the draft resolution did not make that entirely clear. He proposed that the relevant part of paragraph 2 should be amended to provide that, in addition to direct communications between the Governments concerned, the competent authorities should make use of the machinery elaborated

by the International Criminal Police Commission. In that way countries could continue to exchange information quickly by direct communication. He would be able to vote for the draft resolution if it were so amended.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Turkish draft resolution should be replaced by the following text:

- "1. Recalls that the exchange of information on illicit traffic, should be effected by the quickest possible means and recommends that, for that purpose, the competent authorities should make use of the machinery for co-operation elaborated by the International Criminal Police Commission,
- "2. Recommends Governments to communicate, either directly or through the International Criminal Police Commission, to the countries from which the seized narcotic drugs would seem to come, all such information as would enable those countries to conduct an enquiry into the origin of the narcotic drugs."

Mr. RABASA (Mexico) and Mr. OZKOL (Turkey) agreed with that text.

Mr. NEPOTE (International Criminal Police Commission) stated that the draft resolution, as amended, would satisfy his organization.

The draft resolution (E/CN.7/L.106), as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. NEPOTE (International Criminal Police Commission) thanked the Commission for once again mentioning the ICPC in one of its resolutions. He would transmit the United States representative's observations on illicit traffic in the Middle East to the ICPC Secretariat, which would undoubtedly take the question up with the countries concerned.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.