

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL
E/CN.7/SR.209
28 April 1953
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Eighth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 14 April 1953, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

Illicit traffic:

- (a) Reports on the illicit traffic (E/CN.7/252 and 257,
E/CN.7/L.21 and Add.2, E/NR.1951/Summary - chapter on
illicit traffic) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. RABASA	Mexico
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. NIKOLIC	Yugoslavia
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SHARMAN	Canada
	Mr. LIANG	China
	Mr. EZZAT	Egypt
	Mr. VAILLE	France
	Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY	India
	Mr. ARDALAN	Iran
	Mr. KRUYSSSE	Netherlands
	Mrs. KOWALCZYK	Poland
	Mr. OR	Turkey
	Mr. ZONOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. WALKER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. ANSLINGER	United States of America
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. MAY	Permanent Central Opium Board
<u>Representative of a specialized agency:</u>		
	Mr. WOLFF	World Health Organization (WHO)
<u>Observers:</u>	Mr. CANAPERIA	Italy
	Mr. VAN MUYDEN*	Switzerland
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. HUANG	Division of Narcotic Drugs
	Mr. CELINSKI	Secretary of the Commission

* Alternate

ILLICIT TRAFFIC: REPORTS ON THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC (E/CN.7/252 and 257,
E/CN.7/L.21 and Add.2, E/NR.1951/Summary - CHAPTER ON ILLICIT TRAFFIC)

(continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission would begin its examination of the annual reports of Governments for the year 1952 (chapter V, illicit traffic), transmitted under the 1951 Convention.

Some representatives wished first to make general statements.

Mr. EZZAT (Egypt) gave a summary of two reports from the permanent Anti-Narcotics Bureau of the Arab League which had just been received by the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations.

The reports had been drawn up by Brigadier Abdel Aziz Safwat, the Director of the permanent Bureau, who had visited the various States of the Arab League during the first months of 1952 and 1953, before the annual crops of poppy and Indian hemp had been planted.

During his visit to Lebanon at the beginning of 1952, the Director of the Bureau had observed that the cultivation of Indian hemp, in particular, had not diminished in relation to previous years, although the Lebanese Government had warned the population in January and March 1952 that it would apply systematically and strictly the Act of June 1946 on the limitation of the cultivation of the opium poppy and Indian hemp and on combatting narcotic drugs in general. Many landowners were cultivating Indian hemp, which still gave them considerable profits. Nevertheless, by the end of August 1952, the competent authorities had destroyed approximately 300 hectares of Indian hemp. The political situation had prevented them from continuing the campaign throughout the agricultural year. The Director of the Bureau had at that time thought that the new Lebanese Government was going to apply energetic measures against illicit cultivation and that it would obtain even more encouraging results. Since his most recent visit to Lebanon, in January 1953, he did not take such an optimistic view of the situation. He had learned that some big landowners and other influential people were going in for the cultivation of

Indian hemp in spite of the warnings of the Government, which had gone so far as to threaten illicit growers with deprivation of civil rights. In his opinion, the situation was due to the constant increase in the cost of living. White drugs, which were illicitly introduced into Lebanon by the northern frontier, were found throughout the territory of the country and especially in the large towns.

The Director of the Bureau considered that the situation in Syria was improving. When he had visited the country in 1952, the authorities had managed to restrict the cultivation of the opium poppy and of Indian hemp. Indian hemp was cultivated in the Cabal El Derouz region, on the Lebanese-Syrian frontier, over an area of approximately four and a half hectares. In spite of the efforts of the authorities, large-scale smuggling was still practised on the Syrian-Lebanese frontier. Black drugs, especially opium, were brought illicitly into Syria in large quantities; the smuggling of white drugs was much greater than in the past, especially in the village of Izaz.

In his reports, the Director of the Bureau congratulated the Syrian drug control administration on its constant efforts and on the satisfactory results obtained. He had learned in March 1952 that it had seized 10.093 kg. of hashish and 4.811 kg. of opium. The situation had improved still further by January 1953 but smugglers were still extremely active in the northern part of the country, especially in the vicinity of Aleppo.

The Director of the Bureau had been satisfied by what he had seen and learned during his visits to Jordan at the beginning of 1952 and of 1953. Drug control officials had assured him that the Government of Jordan was making every effort to combat the illicit traffic and had seized approximately four tons of hashish and opium in 1952. Jordan was not a producing country but was merely a transit point for smugglers on the way to Egypt and Palestine.

The Director had given the Jordan authorities information on a certain Wadie **Asaad**, who was well known in trafficking circles in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan and practised smuggling on a large scale round the Gulf of Akaba.

Wadie **Asaad** was a contractor supplying the British troops stationed in the Suez Canal Zone and it was known that he had organized the illicit export of drugs to Egypt through the Canal Zone.

The Director of the Bureau had ascertained that Lebanese traffickers were introducing considerable quantities of opium and hashish into Saudi Arabia, where smuggling had previously been practised only during pilgrimages. In his opinion, it was the new Egyptian Act on narcotic drugs that had led Lebanese traffickers to direct their activities towards Saudi Arabia.

He did not think that the other Arab countries, Iraq and Yemen, either produced or consumed narcotic drugs. Small quantities of opium were sometimes introduced illicitly into Iraq by the northern frontier and a narcotic plant called "el katt" was still widely grown in Yemen.

The Director-General of the Permanent Bureau stated that the situation in all the Arab countries was improving considerably. Nevertheless, the Lebanese Government might achieve better results if it showed firmness and carried on a more active campaign against the illicit traffic. It was also disturbing to note the increase of illicit traffic in white drugs in Syria and Lebanon, coming from certain European countries.

Mr. **ANSLINGER** (United States of America) had been very favourably impressed by the Egyptian representative's statement. He proposed that the Commission should send its congratulations to the permanent Anti-Narcotics Bureau of the Arab League.

Mr. **WALKER** (United Kingdom) said that since the summary of the report read by the delegate of Egypt had contained a reference to the British troops stationed in the Suez Canal Zone, the purport of which was not clear, he must reserve comment until he had made a detailed study of the full report.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the permanent Bureau and its Director deserved hearty congratulations. He put the United States representative's proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. EZZAT (Egypt) thanked his colleagues for their decision. He would gladly communicate the Commission's congratulations to the Governments of the Arab League countries.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) noted with regret that, at the outset of the discussion of the question of the illicit traffic in 1952, the Commission had no material for study except document E/CN.7/L.21, which contained the annual reports of thirteen countries, and addendum 2 to that document, which concerned Thailand. Two additional reports had been communicated orally but, interesting as they had been, they could not replace written reports which members could study at leisure. The Commission was therefore obliged to consider the position of the illicit traffic in 1952 on the basis of very incomplete documentation. It was, of course, extremely difficult for governments to send in their annual reports on the illicit traffic within the short time-limit provided. The Government of the United Kingdom, for its part, had been hard-pressed to submit its report in time and had been obliged to quote provisional figures in some cases.

The Commission was also to consider the section entitled "Illicit Traffic" of the summary of annual reports of governments for 1951 (E/NR.1951/Summary), although at its previous session it had devoted some time to the consideration of some annual reports on the illicit traffic in 1951. Similarly, in 1954 it would have to study in detail the illicit traffic in 1953 and to return to many of the 1952 reports. Such a procedure was irrational and it was essential to avoid such regrettable overlapping in the future. The main point was to realize that if the Commission met in March every year, it could not have complete documentation on the illicit traffic of the preceding year. It was necessary, therefore, to abandon once and for all the request that governments should submit chapter V of their annual reports within such a short time-limit.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), commenting on the report of seizure No. 727 effected in Israel (E/NS.1952/Summary 6), said that his delegation could not accept the document in question unless the Secretariat would agree to delete several words from the second paragraph concerning that seizure. The amended paragraph should read as follows:

"The drug was in the form of slabs, some of which were wrapped in linen sacks and some in cellophane paper. The packages bore different markings. Although the origin was unknown, it was presumed that the hashish came from the Lebanon, being smuggled across the border."

The CHAIRMAN said that it was for the Commission itself to decide on the USSR representative's request. If the proposal were adopted, the Secretariat would issue the necessary corrigendum.

Mrs. KOWALCZYK (Poland) and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) supported the USSR representative's proposal.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) did not wish to give an opinion on the substance of the question. The text concerned had been communicated by a State which was not represented in the Commission and it was based on a statement of fact. The Commission did not therefore seem to be competent to alter the text.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) pointed out that they were not discussing a text transmitted by a government but a summary prepared by the Secretariat. The Commission could therefore amend it if it so wished.

Mr. EZZAT (Egypt) could see no reason why the Commission should not meet the USSR representative's request, since the passage to be deleted related only to unimportant details.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) thought that the Commission would be creating a dangerous precedent if it took the liberty of amending a text which was based on a government's report.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR representative's proposal to the vote.
The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Mexico, explained that he had voted in favour of the proposed alteration only because it concerned a summary prepared by the Secretariat, which did not reproduce the exact text of the Israel Government's report. He would have taken a different view if there had been any question of amending the text of the report itself.

Mr. ARDAIAN (Iran) associated himself with the Chairman's remarks.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of his proposal. He felt that action should be taken whenever United Nations documents were found to contain details which might give offence to a Member State and which, moreover, were entirely pointless. He associated himself with the United Kingdom representative's remarks concerning the incomplete documentary material on illicit traffic. Moreover, there were no Russian texts of the documents which had been distributed. The Commission was about to examine the situation regarding illicit traffic in Italy and the Far East and the question of smuggling by seamen, without having received any documentary material on the subject. In the circumstances, it would have great difficulty in performing its task properly.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) did not agree. In his opinion, the Secretariat deserved praise for having accomplished the impossible by distributing all the relevant documents in good time. There was no cause for surprise in the Commission's present difficulties. Formerly, a sub-committee used to study the question of illicit traffic for five days and then submit its conclusions to the Commission, which devoted a further two days to the question. At the current session, however, the Commission would devote only two days to the question of illicit traffic. It might perhaps be better to revert to the old procedure and establish a sub-committee on illicit traffic at future sessions.

Mr. VAILLE (France) took the same view. It was essential that the members of the Commission should be able to obtain some idea of the present situation with regard to illicit traffic. Statements such as those just made by the Mexican and Egyptian representatives were of great and immediate interest. If they had been drafted in the form of reports they could not have been studied until the following session and they would have lost much of their topical interest. Thus, the procedure that was being followed also had certain advantages.

With regard to Italy, much information was contained in the documents which had been distributed, and especially in the report of the Permanent Central Opium Board (E/OB.8). The reason for placing the question of the illicit traffic in Italy on the agenda as a separate item had been to enable the Italian Government's observer to take an active part in the discussion.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) explained that he had no intention of blaming the Secretariat in any way. The Commission itself was alone responsible for the existing situation.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also disclaimed any desire to criticize the Secretariat. He asked how the Commission was to discuss items (b), (c) and (d).

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Commission would examine separately each of the four items constituting item 7.

He shared the view of the United States and French representatives, fully appreciating how comprehensive and diverse were the tasks which the Secretariat had to perform and which it carried out with such efficiency and devotion. There was no way out of the present difficulty. The Commission had only three to four weeks at most in which to exhaust a very heavy agenda. That being so, the procedure it had adopted was the only possible procedure.

Mr. HUANG (Secretariat), replying to a question by Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explained that no special documentary material on items (b), (c) and (d) would be distributed. A considerable body of information on those questions was contained in the reports and other documents. He further pointed out that the Commission had itself added some of those questions to its agenda.

All the annual reports by governments on illicit traffic for 1952 (chapter V) received by 31 March had been included in document E/CN.7/L.21. Reports from a number of countries which the Secretariat had received after that date would be issued in document E/CN.7/L.21/Add.1, which would probably be distributed that same day.

Mr. KRISHNAMCORTHY (India) wished to supplement the information which his Government had already communicated in its report (chapter V) concerning the suppression of illicit traffic in 1952, a summary of which was contained in document E/CN.7/L.21. The Central Government and the twenty-eight states constituting the Republic of India were co-operating in the suppression of illicit traffic. In the case of opium, the Central Government determined how much land each farmer was authorized to cultivate, thus exercising permanent preventive control over the cultivation of the opium poppy and the export of opium. The preventive action taken was intensified at harvest time, in March and April, when there was a danger that the raw opium might find its way to the illicit markets. The customs and excise and police authorities of each state co-operated closely with the Central Government in the campaign of suppression. The Government of India had also introduced a plan whereby the quantity of opium allocated for quasi-medical use was to be reduced by 10 per cent each year, to become a negligible factor by 1959. Those combined efforts attacking the very root of the evil had brought about a reduction of the quantities offered on the illicit market, the result of which could be seen in the sharp rise in the price of opium and other narcotic drugs in illicit transactions. The control of narcotic drugs other than opium was the responsibility of the individual states and was duly exercised by them.

A Central Narcotics Information Office, under the Narcotics Commissioner, maintained liaison between the Central Narcotics Administration and the customs and police authorities of the States. That Office co-operated with the Customs Administration and the Narcotics Administration in the vigilant control exercised at the great ports, such as Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, through which opium from India sought to find its way to the illicit markets supplying the international traffic. The customs authorities at the airports were also in close touch with the Narcotics Commissioner and the Central Information Office and with the corresponding authorities in adjoining states.

In India, drug addicts did not use morphine or heroin, or, with the exception of a few cases in the large towns, cocaine. The use of opium for smoking had never been widespread in India and had almost entirely disappeared.

The small quantities of Indian opium seized abroad in 1952 - 19 kilogrammes, of which 18.5 had been seized at Hongkong - showed how effective were the measures taken by India to prevent international illicit traffic. It was unlikely that the international market obtained supplies of cocaine and heroin from India, since the manufacture of those drugs was prohibited under Indian law.

Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that the annual report furnished by Iran under article 21 of the 1931 Convention demonstrated the efforts the Iranian Government was making to limit the cultivation of the poppy and to control the use of and illicit traffic in narcotic drugs in general and opium in particular. He described the administrative bodies whose combined action ensured the prevention and punishment of illicit traffic and smuggling and, as an illustration of the effectiveness of the control exercised by the opium export services and their central and provincial organs on the one hand, and the Ministry of Public Health and the military authorities on the other, he pointed out that in 1951 approximately 8,563 kg. of opium in various forms and 37 kg. of hashish had been discovered and seized. Proceedings had been instituted in 11,200 cases

and fines totalling US\$ 274,000 had been imposed. A recent Act amending article 275 of the Iranian Penal Code had increased the penalties to which persons guilty of the use in public of grilled opium, cocaine, heroin, morphine and hashish, as well as the intermediaries who supplied them, were liable.

A Bill which had been passed in February 1953 under the pressure of public opinion and of the majority of deputies prohibited the use of alcoholic beverages and especially the cultivation of the opium poppy, subject to certain conditions. The Bill's final enactment would deprive the Treasury of large revenues and would place a heavy burden on the Iranian Government and people. The text of the sole article and the two additional paragraphs of the new Bill was as follows:

"Sole Article. Within the six months following the promulgation of this Act, the Government shall prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase and consumption of all alcoholic beverages, as well as the manufacture, sale and purchase of opium and its derivatives, and shall prohibit as from 21 March 1954 the cultivation of the poppy throughout the national territory, except for medical and industrial use. Offenders shall be punished as prescribed under an Act to be drafted within two months by the Ministry of Justice and to be submitted to Parliament for approval.

"Paragraph 1. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to the quantity of opium which the Government deems it necessary to export each year for medical and industrial needs and in respect of which it issues a permit to cultivate the poppy and a licence to manufacture opium.

"Paragraph 2. The provisions of this Act... shall not apply to the sale of opium against a medical prescription for the treatment of opium addiction, or to the official permit. The Ministry of Health and the municipal authorities are required to do everything possible to provide treatment for all cases of opium addiction."

Thus paragraph 1 of that Act permitted the export of the quantity of opium which the Government deemed necessary for medical and industrial use. In general, the Government was instructed to study the methods of applying the Act and to submit its conclusions to Parliament within the following six months.

In conclusion, he referred to the exchange of correspondence between his Government and the Permanent Central Opium Board with regard to stock estimates and hoped that the clarification his Government had furnished would satisfy the Board.

Mr. MAY (Permanent Central Opium Board) said that a difference in the methods of stock estimation had led to an apparent contradiction between the Board's estimates and those of the Iranian Government. He hoped that the missing stock figures for 1949 and 1950 would enable identical figures to be obtained.

In reply to a question by Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) explained that by "industrial use" the Iranian legal text meant the uses which in the international conventions at present in force were generally referred to as "scientific" uses.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to take up the examination of the annual reports of Governments for the year 1952 (chapter V), furnished under the 1931 Convention (E/CN.7/L.21).

The report by Cambodia did not call for comment.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) and the CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Mexico, paid a tribute to the Canadian Government for the severity of the penalties imposed on persons found guilty of inciting minors to commit offences under the laws relating to narcotic drugs.

Mr. VAILLE (France) wished to supplement the report of France by furnishing information concerning illicit traffic in the Overseas Territories, and especially in North Africa. In Algeria, 214 persons had been arrested in cases involving kif, shira and Indian hemp, 7 in cases involving heroin (including 3 large-scale traffickers) and 9 in cases involving cocaine. 1.245 kg. of heroin and 370 grammes of cocaine had been seized. In Morocco, proceedings had been instituted in 55 cases and 100 persons had been convicted. In Tunisia, proceedings had been instituted in 119 cases, 3 of which had involved heroin and had led to the seizure of 2 kg. of that drug.

In the metropolitan country, while the number of addicts showed a downward trend, the transit traffic and the manufacture of heroin had increased in 1951 and 1952. With the exception of opium, larger quantities of drugs had been seized in 1952 than in 1951:

17 kg. of morphine in 1952 as against 3 in 1951;
11 kg. of heroin in 1952 as against 1.6 in 1951; and
2,944 kg. of Indian hemp in 1952 as against 84 in 1951.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) was gratified to note that the Tribunal de la Seine, in ruling on a case involving heroin and opium handled by the Central Bureau in co-operation with agents of the Bureau of Narcotics of the United States of America, had recognized the legal character, as far as French law was concerned, of the co-operation of the French police with foreign police under international conventions.

Mr. VAILLE (France) asked the Indian representative whether he could provide details regarding the use of the 19.514 kg. of opium referred to in the Indian report (E/CN.7/L.21, page 21).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) said that he had no precise information, but as far as he could recall, the reference to that small quantity was probably in respect of those cases in which specific information had not been received from the individual state governments. The quantity included that used up in sampling by the government chemical examiners of the states in which the seizures were made.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the Italian and Japanese reports should be postponed until the Committee took up the question of the illicit traffic in Italy and the Far East.

It was so decided.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands), referring to his country's report, pointed out that the situation in the Netherlands was practically unchanged, although the number of opium seizures had decreased somewhat during the past year. On the other hand there was a new development: an increase in the number of marijuana cigarettes available on the illicit market. Netherlands law prohibited the import and export, but not the consumption, of Indian hemp. The Netherlands planned to amend certain laws on narcotics when it ratified the 1936 Convention; Indian hemp would then be placed on the same footing as other narcotic drugs.

He agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it was very difficult for governments to submit their reports within the allotted time. His Government had done its best but much data had been lacking when the report had been submitted.

Mr. VAILLE (France) asked Mr. Kruyssse whether the reference to 15,000 ampoules of Boncodal on page 67 of document E/CN.7/L.21 was not a mistake.

Mr. KRUYSSSE (Netherlands) felt that he could safely state that the figure was correct. He drew attention, however, to a mistake in the fourth paragraph of page 62, of the same document (English text), which should read "1,500 florins" instead of "15,000 francs".

Mr. NIKOLIC (Yugoslavia) noted several cases in the Swiss report where the offenders had received suspended prison sentences. He wondered whether the system of penalties applied in Switzerland was sufficiently severe.

Mr. VAN MUYDEN (Switzerland) explained that in his country the law dealt very severely with violations of provisions concerning narcotic drugs but that the application of the penalty in each particular case was left to the discretion of the judge.

Mr. OR (Turkey) asked the Swiss representative for particulars regarding the second case mentioned in the Swiss report. He would like to know where the quantities mentioned had been stolen.

Mr. VAN MUYDEN (Switzerland) replied that he had no information on that particular case but that he would make inquiries and would transmit any information that he might be able to obtain to the Turkish representative.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (India) noted that in one case mentioned in the Swiss report the offender had been committed to a psychiatric institution. He wondered whether that procedure was frequently employed in Switzerland.

Mr. VAN MUYDEN (Switzerland) did not know the details of the case in question but said that it was the general practice in Switzerland to submit an offender to medico-psychiatric examination if he showed symptoms of mental disturbance. If the examination revealed him to be mentally unbalanced, the court could order treatment in a clinic.

Mr. VAILLE (France) pointed out that in his country when an addict asked for treatment he was sent to such an institution. A bill which would make the treatment of addicts in a psychiatric institution compulsory on the order of the judge was at present under study.

Mr. WOLFF (World Health Organization) thought that the offender in question, a nurse, had probably been committed to such an institution because she was a drug addict and had been led to commit a theft by the need to obtain the drug.

Mr. VAILLE (France) drew attention to the Tangiers report, which stated that there had been no intervention by the police or customs authorities in illicit drug traffic. In a number of cases of illicit traffic that had been reported, the origin of the drug had apparently been the city or zone of Tangiers. He proposed that the Secretariat should draw the attention of the Tangiers authorities to the fact that on several occasions that zone had been reported as a source of drug supply.

Mr. OR (Turkey) and Mr. EZZAT (Egypt) supported the French representative's proposal.

The French proposal was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) corrected a statement that he had made a few days earlier regarding the quantities of Indian hemp found on the illicit market in his country. He had inadvertently reported a slight increase in 1952 as against 1951, whereas there had in fact been a slight decrease. He had asked the Secretariat to amend his statement accordingly. In general he did not attach great importance to percentage variations, since the quantities involved were so small that one figure could change the whole picture. The United Kingdom authorities were striving to eliminate illicit traffic in Indian hemp completely.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) stated that a trafficker carrying large quantities of heroin had recently been arrested at Baltimore and sentenced to ten years imprisonment. In order to obtain a reduction of the penalty, the offender had admitted that he had obtained the drug from a certain Nasir Ali. That was probably the trafficker mentioned in the United Kingdom report (E/CN.7/L.21, page 78).

Mr. PRISINAMOORTHY (India) noted that according to the report Nasir Ali was a native of Bengal. As Bengal was divided between India and Pakistan, he would be grateful if the United Kingdom representative would ascertain the nationality of the trafficker as Nasir Ali could equally be probably of Pakistani origin.

Mr. WALKER (United Kingdom) assured the Indian representative that he would do everything possible to clear up the matter.

Mr. VAILLE (France) asked the United States representative whether juvenile delinquency attributed to drug addiction was decreasing in the United States.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) said that drug addiction among juveniles was on the decrease in certain parts of the United States and remained stationary in others; it was greatest in urban areas. A 150-bed hospital, established in New York for the treatment of juvenile delinquent drug addicts, had never been more than one half occupied.

Mr. EZZAT (Egypt) praised the part played in international co-operation by the United States police, particularly in Germany.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) thanked the Egyptian representative and added that those agents were sent only to countries which requested them.

Mr. ZONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had been surprised to hear the United States representative at the present and the foregoing session express his gratitude to countries that had combatted illicit traffic and addiction, while one country, the People's Republic of China, had for several years done a great deal more in that respect than the countries that had been congratulated. The United States report contained false allegations regarding China and the Government of the People's Republic of China. Statements of that kind had been made the previous year in the Economic and Social Council. In reply, the Government of the People's Republic of China had sent a document; he himself had asked for it to be circulated but it had apparently not been published. It contained, however, the replies to the questions raised by the United States representative. It showed how, as soon as it had been established, the Government of the People's Republic of China had

promulgated the necessary laws and decrees to prohibit the use of opium and narcotic drugs and to institute strict control. He emphasized that point, for the same accusations were made against China every year, although the Government of that country had drawn the attention of the United Nations and the Member States to the measures it had taken. It had just been said that the Secretariat and the Commission should make no changes in the reports submitted by Governments. Accordingly, there was no reason why the document submitted by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic should not be included among the reports, particularly since the representatives of that country had no way of making themselves heard. For that reason, the USSR delegation would continue to draw attention to that injustice. Moreover, according to the reports examined, the situation with respect to the illicit traffic in drugs was far from satisfactory in certain countries.

Mr. VAILLE (France) declared that he did not understand the USSR representative's statement. He drew Mr. Zonov's attention to the fact that the function of the members of the Commission was to tell the truth and to establish the facts, without considering the nationality of the traffickers.

He drew attention to the passage in document E/NR.1951/Summary referring to Hong Kong (page 49) which reported eighty-seven cases in connexion with raw opium and 1,114 with prepared opium. There was apparently no doubt about the origin of the drugs seized in Hong Kong. In addition, the passage on page 8 of document E/OB/8 reported that the Permanent Central Opium Board had written to the Government of the People's Republic of China regarding 500 tons of opium at present in China which had been offered for sale at Hong Kong. No reply had been received to the letter.

Decrees prohibiting the cultivation of poppy and the use of opium would not alone suffice to achieve immediate and concrete results. If the USSR representative's claims were true it was miraculous that China, by the simple promulgation of a law, had succeeded in suppressing illicit traffic. Accordingly he remained sceptical in that regard.

Mr. ANSLINGER (United States of America) thought that the USSR representative should have reserved his remarks until the Commission considered the situation in the Far East.

Moreover, Communist China was not the only country mentioned in the United States report and the other countries did not appear to have taken up the remarks made regarding them.

Although the USSR had not submitted a report on chapter V for 1952, it was quite probable that the extensive smuggling activity along the Siberian frontier was still flourishing.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.