

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



E/CN.7/SR.132
15 May 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 1 May 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Illicit traffic (E/CN.7/222, E/CN.7/223, E/CN.7/223/Add.1,
E/CN.7/224, E/CN.7/226) (continued)

Draft interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical
and scientific needs: Report of the Committee appointed to consider
the draft protocol to adapt the provisions of the 1931 Convention
for the limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs to opium
(Conference Room Papers Nos.8 and 9) (continued)

_____:	Mr. SATTANATHAN	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SHARMAN	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. FAHMY	Egypt
	Mr. BOURGOIS)	France
	Mr. VAILLE)	
	Mr. AMINI	Iran
	Mr. LAVALLE	Mexico
	Mr. KRUYSSSE	Netherlands

Members (continued):

Mr. CABADA	Peru
Mr. OR	Turkey
Mr. ZAKUSOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. ANSLINGER	United States of America
Mr. NIKOLIC	Yugoslavia

Observers:

Mr. BARRINGTON	Burma
Mr. SCHNEIDER	Switzerland
Mr. SUPHAMONGKHON	Thailand

Also present: Mr. MAY Chairman of the Permanent Central Opium Board

Secretariat: Mr. STEINIG Director, Division of Narcotic Drugs
Mr. BOLTON Secretary of the Commission

ILLICIT TRAFFIC (E/CN.7/222, E/CN.7/223, E/CN.7/223/Add.1, E/CN.7/224, E/CN.7/226)
Communication from the Government of Burma (E/CN.7/222)(continued)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Suphamongkhon (Thailand) took their seats at the Commission table.

The CHAIRMAN read the following draft resolution which had been prepared by the United States representative:

"The Commission on Narcotic Drugs

"Recommends the appointment of an expert acceptable to the Governments of Burma, Indo-China and Thailand to arrange the best method of co-ordinating the efforts of the enforcement authorities to suppress the illicit traffic in their respective countries. Such expert to be selected by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs from the names submitted at its next session. The expenses of such expert to be paid by the United Nations. Such expert to submit a quarterly report to the Secretary-General for transmission to members of the Commission and to the three Governments concerned."

Mr. VAILLE

Mr. VAILLE (France) and Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) supported that proposal.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. AMINI (Iran), Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) explained that the expert to be appointed would not be vested with any enforcement powers of his own. His task would be purely one of co-ordination. As for the length of the appointment, that could be settled later by the Commission in consultation with the Governments concerned.

Mr. AMINI (Iran) pointed out that the United States draft resolution did not provide for exactly what had been requested by the Government of Burma and wondered whether the representative of Burma would find the proposal satisfactory.

Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) wondered whether the words "illicit traffic" would also cover illicit cultivation, because if they did not the proposal would fail to attack the problem at its source. In any event the draft resolution did not seem to provide for any real investigation, which was what his Government had requested.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America), replying to the first point raised by the representative of Burma, explained that he had intended the draft resolution to cover illicit cultivation as well as illicit traffic. The text could easily be amended to make that clear.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that the statement just made by the representative of Burma did not exactly coincide with the original request submitted in writing by the Burmese Government (E/CN.7/222). He therefore felt that the oral proposal should be treated separately.

/Mr. SUPHAMONGKHON

Mr. SUPHAMONGKHON (Thailand) said that his Government had made no request for the appointment of an expert. He would therefore have to reserve his position with regard to the United States draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as the United States proposal did not quite meet the wishes of the Government of Burma, the Commission should transmit that Government's original communication together with the records of the Commission's discussion on the subject to the other Governments concerned with a request for their comments. The Commission could then take a final decision later. If members would agree to that suggestion in principle the Secretariat could be asked to draft a resolution to that effect.

After some discussion, the Chairman's suggestion was accepted.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) objected to the procedure of adopting proposals without a written text and reserved his position with regard to the Chairman's proposal.

Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Suphamongkhon (Thailand) withdrew.

Chapter V of annual reports of governments for the year 1950 made in pursuance of article 21 of the 1931 Convention, as amended by the 1946 Protocol (E/CN.7/223, E/CN.7/223/Add.1)

Memorandum on the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs during 1950 (E/CN.7/224)

Memorandum by the International Bureau of the International Criminal Police Commission on the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs (E/CN.7/226)

Mr. FAEMY (Egypt) wished to amplify the information already submitted by his Government. In spite of the great efforts being made by the Egyptian authorities there was still unfortunately a large contraband trade in narcotic drugs in the country. One of the reasons for that situation was that the efforts of the authorities tended in some respects to defeat their own ends. With the introduction of stricter control measures the retail prices of drugs on the illicit market rose providing an added incentive to traffickers. Thus the increase in the number of seizures in Egypt during 1950 as compared with previous years was due to stricter supervision rather than to increased addiction. The stricter control measures which forced the retail prices to rise were valuable in that they brought about an automatic decrease in the number of addicts.

/Egypt was

Egypt was in a very vulnerable position for the smuggling of narcotic drugs. Its borders were either adjoining or very near those of the producing countries and it was often very difficult to prevent smuggling through the Sinai desert or by means of small coasting vessels. His country was grateful for the efficient collaboration it had received from the Division of Narcotic Drugs and for the useful documents published.

Because of the difficulties encountered by several Arab countries in controlling the illicit traffic, the Arab League was considering setting up a narcotics bureau to co-ordinate efforts to suppress the smuggling of opium and hashish. He had no further information on the plan at the present time, but hoped to be able to give further details at a later date.

In conclusion he informed the Commission that his Government would like to see the international control measures extended to cover Indian hemp as well as opium.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) recalled that the illicit traffic in heroin was a very serious problem in his country. Supplies of the drug were smuggled into the United States and came mainly from four other countries -- Italy, Turkey, Greece and China. Developments in those countries therefore affected the consumption of heroin in the United States.

Following the arrests in Trieste which had been reported to the Commission at its previous session, the Italian authorities had taken energetic steps to attempt to halt the traffic. They had reduced heroin estimates from 190 kg. to 50 kg. as a result of the disclosures of large-scale diversions of heroin from factories and wholesale drug houses. Subsequently, as a result of further arrests and seizures, the estimates had again been reduced to 30 kg. a year. However there apparently existed stocks in Italy in the hands of dealers amounting to over 200 kg. of heroin, which was approximately enough to meet legitimate needs for a period of ten years. Those stocks constituted a great danger for many countries, particularly the United States, where large quantities of heroin had been smuggled in from Italy. He proposed that the Secretary-General should send a letter to the Italian Government requesting that immediate steps should be taken to safeguard the stocks and to cease the manufacture of heroin for ten years or until the stocks were exhausted. The Italian Government should also

/be asked

be asked to prosecute those who had been responsible for the enormous diversion of heroin which had been going on for five years and had reached adolescent addicts in several countries.

He wished to congratulate the Italian police authorities for their recent arrest of a United States citizen who had been found upon his arrival in Rome to have 3 kg. of heroin diverted from Italian stocks. He also wished to thank the Department of Health in Rome for its vigilance in causing the manufacture of heroin to be reduced. At the same time he appealed to the Department to prohibit the manufacture of heroin in order to protect the youth of the United States and other countries which were suffering as a result of the traffic.

From information received, it appeared that the greatest quantities of heroin seized during the last three months of 1950 and the first three months of 1951 had been in Turkey. At the previous session, the Turkish representative had announced that his Government had placed control restrictions on the importation of acetic anhydride which was used in the manufacture of heroin. Those measures seemed to be having some effect on the smuggling of heroin from Turkey although there still appeared to be considerable quantities of raw opium and morphine base available to smugglers in Istanbul. He hoped that the Turkish Government would place more severe restrictions on the internal distribution of opium.

The police authorities of Turkey deserved congratulations for the excellent results they had achieved but they were obviously handicapped in their efforts as a result of large-scale opium diversion by farmers.

It was also interesting to note that heroin addiction among adolescents was not confined to the United States and Canada. Turkey was one of the first of the other countries to admit the existence of the problem on its territory and to take steps to eliminate it. The Sanitary Administration of the Asylum of Bakirkoy had furnished data showing that of 1,534 addicts treated during a period of several years, 7 per cent had been between the ages of 15 and 20. The percentage was thus approximately the same as in the United States. Other countries which admitted to little or no addiction would do well to study the question more carefully, as the evidence which had reached the United States authorities showed that no country was immune to the problem of adolescent addiction.

/With regard

With regard to Greece, Mr. Anslinger pointed out that that country was rapidly becoming a major source of illicit heroin. Recent investigations in Greece had resulted in seizures of large quantities of heroin and the arrests of a number of extremely important international traffickers of long standing. Most of the opium used in the manufacture of that heroin came from Turkey via the Greek islands in the Aegean, but some was also produced from opium grown in Greece. He asked that the Secretary-General should send a communication to the Greek Government congratulating it on its efforts to suppress the traffic and asking for increased vigilance.

With regard to China, he had been concerned to learn of the reported flow of heroin from Tientsin and points in Manchuria into Japan via Hong-kong. It was reported that the former heroin factories in Tientsin, North China, and Manchuria had resumed operations, and there was evidence that some of the heroin was finding its way into the United States and other countries by way of Japan. On 15 February, Japanese narcotic agents had seized 20 pounds of heroin in Kobe and four of the nineteen packages seized had carried labels from a laboratory in Tientsin. The Japanese authorities had reported that previous large seizures of heroin in Japan had probably originated from that factory. Steps should be taken by the Communist authorities in China to suppress that traffic.

The energetic action of the Governments of Italy, Turkey and Greece had already produced a decrease in the illicit heroin traffic in the United States. That trend would probably continue if the Governments concerned continued to tighten their controls and if the Communist authorities in China took steps to close the heroin factories.

Mr. BOURGOIS (France) asked whether the cases of illicit traffic mentioned by the United States representative were due to diversion from legitimate laboratories or to the existence of clandestine laboratories.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) replied that in Italy the traffic was due to diversion from legitimate factories whereas in Greece and Turkey there was no legitimate heroin production, and the supplies all came from clandestine laboratories.

/Mr. OR

Mr. OR (Turkey) thanked the United States representative for his kind remarks and said that his Government was doing its utmost to reduce the illicit traffic. Seizures of heroin had increased as a result of the great efforts made by the authorities. The success of those efforts was shown by the fact that the heroin sold on the retail market was far from pure, containing more quinine and flour than actual heroin. Attempts were being made to amend the penal code in Turkey and he thought the amendments would soon be accepted.

With regard to the number of adolescent addicts mentioned by the United States representative, he explained that the Asylum of Bakirkoy was a Government hospital where about 95 per cent of all addicts in Turkey were treated. He also stated that among the total of all addicts 3 per cent used heroin whereas 91 per cent used hashish. The remaining 6 per cent were about 3 per cent of morphine and other drugs and 3 per cent of opium.

It should be borne in mind that many countries were apt to think that opium was smuggled in from Turkey since it was a producing country, when in fact the supplies might well come from their own clandestine cultivation.

Mr. VAILLE (France) informed the Commission that in 1950 there had for the first time been no licit manufacture of heroin in France. The stocks had been sufficient to meet the consumption needs which had amounted to less than 20 kg.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) confirmed all that the United States representative had said regarding the illicit traffic in heroin in the United States and Canada. He read passages from the information submitted by his Government (E/CN.7/223, page 4). Canada was very much affected by all diversions from the licit production and by clandestine production in Europe. He was therefore very glad to note the measures being taken by various Governments in Europe.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Opium Board) said that the Supervisory Body and the Permanent Central Opium Board had both been in contact with the Italian authorities for the past few years and had pointed out to them how large their estimates of heroin were in comparison with those of neighbouring countries. The large production of heroin in Italy had been due mainly to the carelessness of the authorities in granting licenses to laboratories. There had also

had also been lack of controls and the consumption of heroin had been calculated on the basis of the requests from the laboratories rather than on the actual needs of the country. Technically, it was the Board's function to enter into the necessary negotiations with the Italian Government, but the Board would be very glad to accept any offers of help from the Commission. The Board's missions to Italy had been greatly helped by the work of the United States Government in combatting the excessive production of heroin.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) referred members to pages 14 and 23 of document E/CN.7/223 and pages 20 and 27 of document E/CN.7/223/Add.1, and said that details regarding individual seizures supplied by governments in their annual reports had not been reproduced by the Secretariat, and that these cases were merely mentioned in footnotes as being due for subsequent publication in the Summaries of Seizures. He hoped that the Secretariat would adopt a different procedure in the future.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) associated himself with the wish expressed by the Canadian representative.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) understood the Canadian representative's desire that the Commission should be supplied with full information at the earliest possible date, but pointed out that some of the documents, such as the United Kingdom table mentioned on page 23 of document E/CN.7/223, were unwieldy and could not be rapidly reproduced.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would take note of the statement made by the Canadian representative. It should be remembered, however, that the reports contained in document E/CN.7/223/Add.1 had been received after 31 March 1951, so that the Secretariat had had to act rapidly in having them published at all.

Mr. OR (Turkey) referred members to the first paragraph on page 5 of document E/CN.7/226 and said that the co-operation existing among the Turkish, Egyptian, Italian and French police was a proof of the goodwill of the governments concerned.

/Mr. ANSLINGER

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) thought that future reports of the International Criminal Police Commission should give the names of all traffickers, so that various countries could take appropriate action, such as denying entry visas or seamen's licenses to undesirable individuals.

Mr. SHARMAN (Canada) was surprised that the chapter on heroin in the ICPC report did not mention the United States which was undoubtedly the country most affected in that field. He also noted that Annex I only mentioned the seizure reported to the ICPC while Annex II referred only to seizures in countries members of the ICPC. Such information was of necessity incomplete and gave a somewhat distorted picture of the situation.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) pointed out that the ICPC report gave some valuable information on several countries, such as Sweden and Finland, on which no information was available in the Secretariat's report. He thought that since the ICPC and the United Nations approached the problem of illicit traffic from different angles, the ICPC being interested only in the actual seizures and police operations, it would be advisable to establish some co-ordination between the two.

In reply to a question asked by the Chairman, he explained that the ICPC compiled its reports from information supplied by the States members of that organization.

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) thought that steps should be taken to avoid duplication in the transmission of information by States to the ICPC and the United Nations, and to arrange some suitable division of labour between the two bodies.

The CHAIRMAN emphasized that it was the first time that the ICPC had submitted a report to the Commission and that improvements in co-ordinating the work of the two organs would no doubt be made in the future. It should be remembered however that although the two bodies received identical information -- and here he agreed that duplication should be avoided as much as possible -- that information was used for entirely different purposes. The ICPC was interested in police or punitive aspects of narcotics administration whereas the Commission is concerned more with the humanitarian and preventive aspects. Measures should be taken to ensure that the work of the two organizations was truly complementary.

/He referred

He referred members to paragraph 3 on page 4 of document E/CN.7/224, listing the "significant facts" of illicit traffic in 1950, and also drew their attention to paragraphs 6, 7 and 11 of the same document.

Mr. VAILLE (France) said that several important documents on illicit traffic were not yet available in French, and proposed that the discussion on that problem should be adjourned to the following day. In the meantime, the Commission could resume discussion on the draft interim agreement to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific needs.

It was so decided.

DRAFT INTERIM AGREEMENT TO LIMIT THE PRODUCTION OF OPIUM TO MEDICAL AND SCIENTIFIC NEEDS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT PROTOCOL TO ADAPT THE PROVISIONS OF THE 1931 CONVENTION FOR THE LIMITATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF NARCOTIC DRUGS TO OPIUM (Conference Room Paper No. 9) (continued)

Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) speaking as Rapporteur of the Committee, said that the Committee had attempted, to preserve as far as possible the principle of freedom of trade in opium and competition in production.

The main changes proposed by the Committee in the draft protocol originally submitted by the French representative (Conference Room Paper No. 8) related to the proposed system of control. The Committee had tried to simplify that system and to make control depend on two factors: first, estimates, and secondly, the level of stocks as disclosed by estimates and statistics. All countries importing and producing opium were required to supply statistics to the Permanent Central Opium Board on the lines of the 1931 Convention and at the same time. Furthermore, each producing country would have to inform the Board of the areas it intended to sow, the expected total yield, and its export estimates. That information would be sufficient to enable the Board to exercise a general supervision over the production of opium.

Furthermore, a specific limit would be set for the stocks to be held in each producing country; that limit should not be exceeded without special permission from the Board. It had been proposed that the maximum level of stocks in the producing countries should not exceed two years' normal production,

/ and that

and that stocks in excess of two years' normal production at the time of entry into force of the protocol should be gradually reduced by a determined annual percentage. It was also proposed that stocks in consuming countries should not exceed two years' normal requirements, but the representatives of the producing countries had expressed the view that such a figure was too high.

The provisions concerning sanctions and control had been completely redrafted. The protocol as amended listed different kinds of violations which were liable to sanctions. The sanctions had also been arranged in a logical sequence. The Board would first ask for an explanation; if that explanation were not satisfactory or if it were not furnished within a reasonable time, the Board could propose to the government concerned a local inquiry to be conducted, subject to the consent of that government, in collaboration with officials nominated by that government. If the government refused to allow a local inquiry or if the results of that inquiry were not satisfactory, the Board could come to such conclusion as the available information warranted and could, if it so decided, inform the Economic and Social Council and all Members of the United Nations that the State concerned had violated the provisions of the protocol. Finally the Board could impose an export and import embargo; the State concerned, however, could appeal against such a decision to a Committee of three independent persons to be appointed as a permanent body for that purpose by the Economic and Social Council. Such appeal would have the effect of suspending the embargo pending the decision of that body; this provision had been included because it was thought that the body could decide the appeal without delay.

The new proposal also contained two general provisions stating that parties to the protocol would buy opium only from a producing country which exported opium in 1949 and that there would be no cartels either of purchasers or of sellers of opium.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.