

[Distributed to the Council
and to the Members of the League.]

C. 72. M. 27. 1923. XI.

Geneva,
January 21st, 1923.

League of Nations

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES

OF THE

THIRD (EMERGENCY) SESSION

Held at Geneva on September 1st, 1922.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LIST OF MEMBERS	3
AGENDA	3
FIRST MEETING (September 1st, 1922—10 a.m.):	
1. Modifications in the Report of the Committee proposed by the Council	4
2. Present position with regard to the Ratification of the International Opium Convention	6
3. Adherence to the System of Importation Certificates proposed by the League, and Recommendation relating to the date of the coming into force of this System: Present position:	6
4. Report on the progress of the Enquiry regarding the Production, Distribution, etc., of Cocaine.	8
SECOND MEETING (September 1st, 1922—3 p.m.):	
5. The question of the application of the Convention to what is known as Artificial Cocaine	10
6. The arrangements to be made for the Mutual Exchange of Information concerning Seizures made by the Customs, which was recommended by the Advisory Committee at its last Session	11
7. The compilation of a Black List	12
8. Prepared Opium: Can this at any time be considered legitimate?	13
9. Communication from the Medical Secretary of the Health Section	14
10. Draft Report by the Chairman	14
11. Draft Resolution submitted by Mr. Campbell	15
12. Letter from the Canadian Government	15
13. Letter from the Secretary of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade	15

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

THIRD (EMERGENCY) SESSION
held at Geneva on September 1st, 1922.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Government Representatives:

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, Chairman	British Empire.
M. BOURGOIS (acting for M. KAHN), Vice-Chairman	France.
M. CHAO-HSIN CHU	China.
Dr. ANSELMINO	Germany.
Mr. J. CAMPBELL	India.
His Excellency M. A. ARIYOSHI	Japan.
M. van WETTUM	Netherlands.
His Excellency M. FERREIRA	Portugal.
His Excellency Prince CHAROON.	Siam.

Assessors:

M. BRENIER.
Sir John JORDAN.
Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT.

Secretary: Dame Rachel CROWDY.

AGENDA.

1. Examination of the modifications of the Report of the Committee proposed by the Council.
2. Progress Report :
 - (a) The present position as to the ratification of the Opium Convention.
 - (b) The present position as to the acceptance of the proposal of the League of the Import Certificate system, and the recommendation as to the date of its introduction.
 - (c) The position of the enquiry into the production, distribution, etc., of cocaine.

NEW QUESTIONS.

3. The question of the application of the Convention to what is known as artificial cocaine.
 4. The arrangements to be made for the mutual exchange of information concerning seizures made by the Customs, which was recommended by the Advisory Committee at its last Session.
 5. The compilation of a Black List.
 6. Prepared Opium : Can this at any time be considered legitimate ?
-

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES OF THE THIRD (EMERGENCY) SESSION

held at Geneva on September 1st, 1922.

FIRST MEETING

held on September 1st, 1922, at 10 a.m.

All the Members of the Committee (with the exception of M. Brenier and Mrs. Hamilton-Wright, Assessors) were present.

The CHAIRMAN said it was suggested by the Secretariat that the session should be regarded as a continuation of the preceding session, and with the consent of members he would take the Chair.

He then read the letter addressed to him by the Secretary-General, at the request of the Council, on August 22nd, 1922.

A letter from M. BRENIER (Assessor) was read in which he excused himself for his inability to be present and in which he expressed his views with regard to the various matters on the agenda.

I. Modifications in the Report of the Committee proposed by the Council.

The CHAIRMAN had tried to arrange a compromise which would give satisfaction both to the Council and to the Members of the Committee. He had unfortunately been unsuccessful and the Council had referred the question back to the Committee. He expressed appreciation of the help given by M. Chao-Hsin Chu.

The Council had referred back to the Committee a passage of its report relating to the situation in China. The Committee might either reconsider the whole question—but he did not think it would get any further than it did last April—or it might merely consider the situation created by the decision of the Council. He pointed out that the latter body had now, with the consent of the Committee, published the report of the Committee, with the omission of the passage in question.

The Chairman proposed that the latter of the two methods of procedure which he had mentioned should be adopted.

He recalled that there were two main points raised by the Council. The first was the statement in the report that the situation which had been found by the Committee to exist in China was in contravention to the Opium Convention. The Council appeared to think that criticism had been directed against the Government of the Chinese Republic, but, as he had explained in his letter to the Secretary-General, that was not in the least the intention of the Committee. He did not think, however, that the Committee need take the matter any further. The Council had been informed of the view of the Committee, and it rested with the Council to decide whether that view should be made public or not.

The second point was the proposal of the Council to substitute, for the action suggested by the Committee, action of a different kind, consisting in the appointment of a representative of the International Anti-Opium Association to collaborate with the Commission of the Chinese Government in its investigation of the opium situation in China and to report, through the medium of the Chinese Government, to the League of Nations. That proposal had been accepted by the Chinese Government.

After careful reflection, the Chairman had come to the conclusion that nothing would be gained in present circumstances by the Committee returning its proposal to the Council. His own feeling was that the best thing to do was to report to the Council that the Committee had considered its suggestion and that it was prepared to recommend its adoption as the best that could be done in the present circumstances ; and that it hoped that the result of the further enquiries to be undertaken by the delegates of the Chinese Government and of the International Anti-Opium Association would be available at the next meeting of the Committee. His only fear was that the solution might be considered in China as a weakening on the part of the League of Nations and of the Advisory Committee.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) agreed with the Chairman's view.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked whether the Council's recommendation would be considered as a whole or point by point.

The CHAIRMAN did not think it necessary to take it point by point. He proposed that the Committee should simply report to the Council that it accepted its suggestion of requesting the Chinese Government to make further enquiries, in which the Chinese commissioners would be assisted by a representative of the International Anti-Opium Association.

The need for a further discussion of the question by the Council would thus be avoided.

He wished particularly to emphasise the fact that, with the Committee's consent, the Council had already published the Committee's report with the omission of the passage under consideration. A fresh report, therefore, had to be made by the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, in point of fact, the Council had returned an amended report to the Committee. That amended report would, he presumed, in view of the opinions already expressed, be accepted by the Committee. He was also prepared to accept that report in the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN said that the important point was that the Committee, as he gathered, was prepared to agree with the Council's proposal in regard to the further enquiries.

The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL enquired if one representative only of the International Anti-Opium Association had to be appointed. The representative would have to visit an enormous tract of country ; it might perhaps be the only action which it was possible to take at the moment ; but it was an impossible task for one man, and he suggested that the Committee, in accepting the Council's proposal as regards this, should point this out and should guard itself against endorsing as valuable a suggestion which could clearly have only a very limited practical result.

Sir John JORDAN proposed that the Chinese Government should make use of the local branches of the International Anti-Opium Association in China ; he suggested that the words "one representative" should be replaced by the word "representatives".

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether that was not implied in the Council's suggestion. He himself had read it in that way, namely, that there would be a delegate of the International Anti-Opium Association on each Government Commission of Investigation.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed that that would be a reasonable interpretation.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) enquired whether the principle of employing members of the International Anti-Opium Association was not open to criticism. Was it possible to find five or six gentlemen in China who were capable of undertaking such a task without prejudice ?

Sir John JORDAN expressed the view that as a rule the Committees of Enquiry were fairly well constituted. It would be best to co-opt a member of the Anti-Opium Association.

The CHAIRMAN said that if members of the Association might exaggerate, they would not do so in the sense of concealing anything objectionable.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU said that he thought that those details relating to enquiries were administrative details which should be left to the Chinese Government and to the headquarters of the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking.

If the report on the enquiry were drawn up by one person, he himself would be the first to refuse to adopt it. He considered that the Council's suggestion was sufficient.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was in agreement with M. Chao-Hsin Chu, but he thought that the resolution proposed by the Council was not happily worded. It might be possible to express the Committee's point of view.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to prepare a short draft report, to be ready by the afternoon or the following day.

This suggestion was adopted.

2. *Present Position with regard to the Ratification of the International Opium Convention.*

The SECRETARY read her report (O. C. 60).

The CHAIRMAN said that a very serious situation had arisen through the increase of exports of Persian and Turkish opium to the Far East due to the reduction of the exports of the countries which had ratified the Convention.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Committee would find interesting details in the summary prepared for the last meeting; for instance, the exports from India to Formosa had been almost entirely replaced within the last two years by exports of Turkish and Persian opium.

Sir John JORDAN asked for information on the importation of morphine and opium into Japan. He believed that it had very largely increased during 1921, and that the situation in the Far East was very serious.

The CHAIRMAN said that Turkey and Persia were the source of a very large illicit trade. Ships left Busrah in ballast or with innocent cargoes and loaded opium at Persian ports.

Mr. CAMPBELL said that there were three important exporting countries—India, Persia and Turkey—only one of which exercised a strict control over the opium trade. The result of controlling one-third of the production was that all the illicit trade, and probably some of the licit trade, was driven to the countries producing the other two-thirds. There were no physical conditions to prevent Persia and Turkey from growing as much opium as the world required.

The only result of India's self-denial hitherto had been to reduce her revenue and to render the effective control of the opium trade even more difficult.

The CHAIRMAN said that something must be done. A representative of Persia had been present at the last session of the Assembly and had taken part in the work of the Assembly Committee which considered the subject. Possibly something might be done at the approaching meeting of the Assembly to secure the co-operation of Persia.

The question should be placed on the agenda of the next session of the Advisory Committee; it was one of capital importance.

Mr. CAMPBELL, in reply to a question, said that importation overland from Persia into China was only possible, commercially speaking, when prices in China were very high. The price of opium in parts of China recently had been below the Indian cost of production.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that this question should be placed on the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

This suggestion was adopted.

3. *Adherence to the System of Importation Certificates proposed by the League, and Recommendation relating to the Date of the Coming into Force of this System: Present Position.*

The SECRETARY read her report (O. C. 60) and a supplementary report.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether Belgium would adopt the system proposed by the League of Nations, and, if not, in what respects her own system differed from it.

The SECRETARY said that, according to a letter just received, Belgium would adopt the League system.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Bourgois whether he could give any information with regard to France's attitude.

M. BOURGOIS (France) stated that the Ministry of the Colonies had already taken certain steps. The system was in process of elaboration by the Ministries concerned and the Secretariat would be notified as soon as a definite decision was reached. The system would only be put into force, however, as far as other countries also put it into force; the earliest possible date would be January 1st, 1923.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's efforts to have the system of importation certificates put into force by a fixed date had failed.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) stated that the Japanese Government had adopted the system of importation certificates.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Germany also had adopted the system.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that, in practice, importing countries found it more convenient to import from countries which required no formalities; the British Government, which had adopted the importation certificate, had received complaints to that effect from British exporters, and he read to the Committee extracts from letters sent to the Government on the subject. The present situation was unfair to the countries which had adopted the certificate system. The system could only work if it were generally adopted.

Sir John JORDAN said that its adoption in principle only, or by certain countries alone, would render the work of the Committee ineffectual.

M. BOURGOIS (France) proposed that a new date should be fixed for the introduction of the system, and suggested January 1st, 1923.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) had been informed that the Netherlands had raised objections to the wording of the proposed form of certificate but he did not know what these objections were.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he thought these objections had already been disposed of.

M. van WETTUM pointed out that these objections were of another kind.

M. BOURGOIS confirmed the statement that France would only put the system into force if the other countries did the same.

Sir John JORDAN said that this attitude made it impossible to reach any result.

M. BOURGOIS said he would like at least to know which countries would introduce the system; in any case the most important producing countries, such as Switzerland, would have to adopt it.

The SECRETARY stated that Switzerland hoped to ratify the Convention in December and that Switzerland had said that her first action then would be to adopt the certificate system.

The CHAIRMAN said that this question would come before the Assembly, which might take some action on the subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL said that, owing to the possibility of obtaining raw opium freely from Turkey and Persia, the universal acceptance and honest administration of the importation certificate system was now probably the only practical way of controlling the opium traffic. As it was impossible at present to control exports from the source, the only alternative was for each consuming country to control imports.

With reference to the proposal to fix January 1st as the date, the CHAIRMAN asked whether it would be possible to prevail upon the countries which had adopted the system to put it into force before January 1st with regard to the countries which had also adopted the principle of importation certificates.

Sir John JORDAN said that a few countries must set an example; he agreed that no precise date should be fixed for the introduction of the certificates.

M. BOURGOIS said that France had already entered into an agreement with Great Britain concerning these importation certificates.

The CHAIRMAN said it was the case that France was now applying the system in practice with regard to Great Britain, and it was also in operation between Great Britain and a number of other countries with whom the British Government had entered into individual negotiations.

Dr. ANSELMINO said that he hoped that Germany would adopt the system generally on January 1st, 1923.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he saw no actual objection to the Chairman's proposal with reference to the principle of reciprocity. Certain countries, however, might consider it to their advantage to remain detached from the system, and the Committee might thus fail to obtain the universality which it desired.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the introduction of the system piecemeal on a reciprocity basis could only be considered as a temporary and provisional arrangement.

The discussion continued on the dangers of reciprocity.

Sir John JORDAN and Mr. CAMPBELL agreed with the views expressed by the Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL thought that the Committee should press as strongly as possible for the general adoption of the system of importation certificates, as this was its only means of controlling the consumption of opium.

On the CHAIRMAN's proposal, it was agreed that Mr. Campbell should draft a resolution to be submitted to the Committee at the afternoon meeting.

4. *Report on the Progress of the Enquiry regarding the Production, Distribution, etc., of Cocaine.*

The SECRETARY read the third part of her report (O. C. 60).

Mr. CAMPBELL stated that there was no manufacturing or production of cocaine in India. Importation was only authorised for medical purposes.

The total consumption was about 140 ounces per year for a population of 320,000,000 inhabitants, which was very little. In fact, it might be said that there was no local cocaine problem in India; what smuggling there was, was by sea.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the particulars of seizure communicated by the Indian Government showed that there was a fairly widespread illicit traffic in cocaine in India.

Sir John JORDAN asked where cocaine was manufactured.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the four principal manufacturing countries were the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland and France. A certain amount was also manufactured, he believed, in the Japanese Empire. He was not aware whether any was made in the United States of America.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) stated that he knew of an exchange of correspondence concerning the proposed building of a cocaine factory in Latvia. The export from Germany into Latvia of a considerable quantity of raw cocaine had been asked for, but the German Government had refused to grant it.

The illicit use of cocaine was increasing in every country in the world. To combat this practice it would be necessary, first of all, to persuade the medical profession that the medicinal use of cocaine was indispensable only in very rare cases, and that, in general, it could be replaced by other non-injurious drugs. The small quantities actually needed could be supplied by a central official authority to the few doctors who might require them.

A second preventive method would be to add a colouring matter which would immediately betray the consumer of cocaine, but it would have to be ensured that all manufacturers treated cocaine with this colouring matter.

He begged the Committee to consider his suggestions at its next session.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Dr. Anselmino should send to the Secretariat a note setting out his suggestions, which would then be circulated.

M. BOURGOIS (France) requested further particulars regarding the very interesting suggestions of Dr. Anselmino, and asked whether coloured cocaine had already been used in medicine.

Dr. ANSELMINO replied that the experiments made hitherto had chiefly been in the laboratory, but that, in any case, colouring in cocaine was not injurious to sick persons.

The CHAIRMAN expressed regret that the replies to the enquiry were coming in so slowly. The Committee could do no useful work as long as the necessary information regarding cocaine production was lacking.

Sir John JORDAN and M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) supported this statement.

M. BOURGOIS stated that France's reply would very shortly be forthcoming.

Dr. ANSELMINO stated that he could not fix a date for the German reply.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether the Committee, at its last meeting, requested the Dutch Government to supply information regarding cocaine traffic in 1921.

The SECRETARY said that on June 1st all the Governments had been asked to communicate any figures which might be available, but that no year had been specified.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as it was essential for the progress of the Committee's work to have figures of cocaine production, the Secretary-General should be asked to send a communication to the Governments of the chief manufacturing and producing countries concerned, requesting them to provide this information as soon as possible.

M. BOURGOIS (France) requested that if Document O. C. 60 were placed before the Council or the Assembly, mention should be made of the fact that France's reply was only lacking owing to an unavoidable delay, and that it would be forwarded immediately.

This proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether anyone wished to make any observations on the resolutions passed by the Committee in April last.

There being none, the meeting rose at 12.45 p. m.

SECOND MEETING

Held on September 1st, 1922, at 3 p.m.

All the members of the Committee, Sir John Jordan (Assessor) and Dr. Miyajima were present.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were four new questions on the agenda, the first three being proposed by himself and the fourth by M. van Wettum.

According to Article 5 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, the agenda had to be circulated to the members three months in advance, but a member could raise new questions if the Committee approved. The Committee would then decide whether to discuss them. He suggested that members who had proposed new questions should make a brief statement about them and the Committee could then decide whether it would consider them. He had prepared notes on the three subjects proposed by himself, which had been circulated (Document O. C. 64).

5. The Question of the Application of the Convention to what is known as Artificial Cocaine.

The CHAIRMAN read the relevant document (O. C. 64) and mentioned that in England ecgonine and its derivatives had been included in the legislation relating to dangerous drugs as well as cocaine.

He asked M. Bourgois to state what the French Government had in mind when it included artificial cocaine in the list of drugs communicated to the League in its letter of April 12th, 1922.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government thought that, in conformity with the Council's decision of October 12th, 1921, the Advisory Committee should consider whether the provisions of the 1912 Convention should not be extended to the products mentioned in his letter. The French Government was examining the memorandum on this subject forwarded to the Committee by Dr. Anselmino.

The question placed on the agenda of the meeting only concerned one of the products on this list: "artificial or semi-artificial cocaine." It would be advisable to point out that the definition of cocaine given by the 1912 Convention applied to "artificial or semi-artificial cocaine" as well as to "natural cocaine."

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that for the German Government and for himself, semi-artificial and artificial cocaine were to be assimilated to ordinary or natural cocaine as far as the prohibition was concerned. He pointed out that the cocaine prepared in Germany was semi-artificial.

Dr. MIYAJIMA said that in Japan they considered that there was no difference under the Convention between the various kinds of cocaine.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) remarked that there seemed to be no doubt about it, as the definition in the Convention gave a chemical formula for cocaine, which is understood to be the same for both natural and for artificial cocaine; the reference to "coca leaves" in the Convention was a mere explanation; the formula was the substantial thing.

Dr. ANSELMINO explained that the difference between the coca leaves of Peru and Java was the same as between Indian and Turkish opium. The European opium contained much morphia and little codeine, whereas the Indian opium contained little morphia and much codeine. The coca leaves of Peru contained benzoylmethylecgonine, whereas the Java leaves contained cinnamylmethylecgonine.

M. BOURGOIS pointed out that these explanations, and especially the fact of the similarity of chemical formulas for "artificial cocaine" and for "natural cocaine" proved that the 1912 Convention applied in its entirety to the two cocaines.

The Committee agreed that the definition of cocaine given in the 1912 Convention applies both to natural cocaine obtained by extraction from coca leaves and to semi-artificial and artificial cocaine obtained through chemical synthesis.

6. *The Arrangements to be made for the Mutual Exchange of Information concerning Seizures made by the Customs, which was recommended by the Advisory Committee at its last Session.*

The CHAIRMAN referred to the note which he had circulated and stated that in England seizures had been made by the Customs, and the British authorities wished to know whether they should communicate the particulars direct to the competent authorities of the Governments concerned or whether they should do that through the Secretariat. It would involve much unnecessary correspondence and loss of time to use the diplomatic channel. The Secretary-General, when consulted by him, was of opinion that the Committee should decide.

The Chairman thought that perhaps the best way would be for the various Governments to send the information to the Secretariat which would transmit it to the responsible Departments of the Governments concerned.

As the question was very urgent, he asked the Committee to give a ruling on the matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the best way, perhaps, would be for the Governments or Departments which made the seizures to communicate direct with the police and Customs authorities in the second country, as, if the Secretariat of the League had to do it, it would delay transmission and put a heavy and perhaps unnecessary burden on the Secretariat.

M. BOURGOIS (France) pointed out that a similar question had been discussed in the course of the last session of the Committee on Traffic in Women and Children, and that it had been decided that there should be a direct interchange of information between the Central Bureaux of the various countries. In France the Central Bureau was attached to the Service de Sûreté générale.

The SECRETARY added that it had also been decided that information should be communicated at the same time to the Secretariat.

M. BOURGOIS replied that the Secretariat had at its disposal only general statistics, and this represented the limit set for its activities. It would be going far beyond this limit if it received and communicated detailed and complete information on technical points or practical questions required by the central authorities. It was for these bodies to enter into direct communication with each other.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that such central authorities were already in existence for the traffic in women and children, but not for the traffic in opium. He raised no objection regarding the matter under discussion, but it should be intimated which authorities were competent as far as the traffic in opium was concerned.

M. BOURGOIS stated that the Service de la Sûreté générale also dealt with narcotics, which simplified matters. The intermediary of the Ministries for Foreign Affairs was unnecessary.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he preferred the diplomatic channels, as certain countries such as the Netherlands did not have a central office. There was also the question of languages; the information being transmitted in foreign languages, the Ministries for Foreign Affairs had a competent staff to deal with them, whereas some of the offices might not have the staff.

The CHAIRMAN said he imagined that each country would have a special department dealing with traffic in drugs, but one or two members had said that in their countries more than one department was concerned.

M. BOURGOIS thought that communication through the diplomatic channels would be too slow. On the other hand, he did not consider it necessary to forward all information to the Secretariat, which would receive news from time to time by means of a general report. The question concerned rather the police authorities.

Sir John JORDAN was of the opinion that the various Governments should be asked to send monthly or quarterly reports to the Secretariat.

The SECRETARY pointed out that the Secretariat needed full statistics to carry out its work.

The Committee adopted the second alternative, i.e. that the particulars of seizures should be sent direct to the competent Departments of the Governments concerned. It also decided that summary reports of the seizures made should be sent by each Government to the Secretariat for purposes of correlation.

The SECRETARY pointed out that the Chinese Government already sent reports on seizures, which were very useful to the Committee and to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the Secretariat could ask the various Governments to intimate which were the responsible departments to receive such information without a formal resolution from the Committee that would have to go to the Council, which meant a loss of time.

The SECRETARY answered in the affirmative.

The Committee adopted this procedure.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) stated that the Chairman had sent him a list of seizures made in Great Britain. He had asked his Government's permission to reply to communications of the Chairman, Secretariat, members and Assessors of the Committee. This permission had been granted him.

He explained that the French police authorities had seized at Saint-Nazaire three cases, each containing 5 kilos of cocaine, and bearing the label of a Darmstadt factory. The boat on which the seizure had been made came from Mexico and touched at Santander, where the cocaine had been loaded. The German firm concerned said that the labels should be carefully examined, because they were often falsified. It was also discovered that a firm in Hongkong had ordered 1,500,000 falsified labels.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he had received information concerning this particularly interesting case. The French police authorities had seized cocaine in quantities which were sometimes so considerable that it wondered whether the trafficker had not obtained his stocks directly from the firm.

He asked Dr. Anselmino if the sale of cocaine was unrestricted in Germany.

Dr. ANSELMINO answered that it was controlled.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British authorities had also seized cocaine on ships that had touched at Santander.

Dr. ANSELMINO said that the authorities at Santander had seized cocaine that was marked as sent by the firm Scherin in Berlin. This firm had never exported to Spain, only to Portugal; from examination of the labels, the routes followed could be recognised from the letters and figures inscribed thereon. German manufacturers demanded that, in the case of the seizure of an entire bottle, or less, a label should be shown.

The CHAIRMAN asked Dr. Anselmino if he could give this information to the Governments concerned.

Dr. ANSELMINO replied in the affirmative.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that such falsifications were common in the Far East. English labels had also been falsified.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee if it would not be advisable for the Secretariat to communicate with the Spanish Government as to the seizures on ships from Santander.

The Committee agreed.

7. *The Compilation of a Black List (Document O.C. 64).*

The CHAIRMAN said that he found that there had been a misunderstanding as to the meaning of this suggestion.

He read the relevant document and suggested that the Secretariat should communicate the particulars in the "black list" to the various competent authorities to which it would be useful.

Sir John JORDAN stated that it would be an excellent thing if the names of traders were published. In Northern China, such a procedure had an excellent result and diminished the traffic.

The CHAIRMAN said that it might not be advisable to let the illicit traders know that their names were known.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) was of opinion that this would mean a heavy burden on the Secretariat. Chinamen and Laskars employed on ships plying between Europe and the East were largely concerned in the illicit trade, but it would be difficult to transcribe their names properly. In the case of Indians, a man's name alone would usually be insufficient to identify him. Names could also easily be changed.

He thought the local police authorities, in direct communication with the police of the second country, could perhaps best deal with such cases.

M. BOURGOIS (France) wished to know whether the list was to be confidential.

Sir John JORDAN did not think it necessary.

The CHAIRMAN said he had in view, not the Chinese and Laskar sailors who mostly smuggled in a small way, but the traders who practised the traffic on an international scale, for which a big capital was needed. As each one of these was discovered, it was desirable that the Governments should be informed so that they could be on their guard.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that if the list were limited in such a way, the system was worth trying.

Sir John JORDAN was of the opinion that publicity would do much good in the case stated in Document O. C. 64. There had been some years ago a Chinese syndicate in Liverpool that introduced large quantities of drugs without the police being able to discover the culprits. Publicity would have helped the police in that case. It had already stopped the traffic organised by large associations which could not have been stopped before.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Secretariat should be asked to prepare the black list without any formal resolution of the Committee. It should request the various Governments to communicate the relevant cases. The results should be examined at the next session of the Committee, which would then be in a position to judge the usefulness of the procedure.

Publicity might have served the fight against the traffic in China, but the situation was not the same in Europe.

In any case the Secretariat should communicate the list to the Governments concerned.

Sir John JORDAN asked by which channel this communication should be made, as the diplomatic channel was slow.

The SECRETARY thought that, as there was no other channel, it should use the diplomatic channel to begin with.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the smugglers were foreigners as well as Chinese, for nine out of ten traders condemned were not Chinese.

M. BOURGOIS (France) stated that the system of black lists appeared to him to involve certain dangers, as it caused suspicion to rest indefinitely upon traders who might only have offended once. The public list appeared to him to be inadmissible, contrary to custom and even to law. The Committee could perhaps recommend an exchange in certain cases of confidential communications between the police authorities. The question was very interesting but extremely delicate, and required thorough consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL was of opinion that it might be advisable to postpone this question to the next session in view of the divergence of opinion, as some of the members of the Committee might like to receive further instructions from their Governments.

The CHAIRMAN agreed.

Sir John JORDAN said that there should be more co-ordination in that matter between the various Governments.

On the CHAIRMAN'S proposal, the Committee decided to ask the Secretary to draft a report on the basis of the discussion; this report would be considered at the next session.

8. Prepared Opium—Can this at any time be considered legitimate?

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) explained that he wanted to know the exact meaning of the words "legitimate" and "illegitimate" as given on page 51 (English text) of the minutes of the last session.

He said that, according to page 51 of the Minutes of the Committee's second session (English text), the Chairman had said that the Second Assembly had deleted from Dr. Wellington Koo's resolution the reference to prepared opium, precisely on the grounds that prepared opium had been declared *illegitimate* by the Opium Convention and that that Convention had made provision for its gradual suppression.

The speaker referred to pages 506 and 507 of the Assembly Records—Meetings of Committees. There one saw, with regard to Dr. Wellington Koo's resolution (page 506), that the word "legitimate" was to be substituted for "medicinal and scientific" and that the reference to opium prepared for purposes of smoking was to be omitted, the complete suppression of which was provided for in Chapter II of the Convention.

In consequence of these alterations, the word "legitimate" in the amended resolution was only used with regard to raw opium and had the special meaning (see page 507) of medical in rather a broad and scientific sense.

He opposed, therefore, the use of the word "illegitimate" as the Chairman had done and declared that, so long as a country did not prohibit the use of prepared opium, that use was, under the restrictions of the local law, to be considered as legitimate.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Opium Convention of 1912 provided for the entire suppression of opium for smoking, but the application of this stipulation was to be suspended in countries which could not suppress it at once.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked if prepared opium included opium for chewing.

The CHAIRMAN answered that it only meant opium for smoking.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) pointed out that the use of prepared opium was illegal in China.

9. *Communication from the Medical Secretary of the Health Section* (Document O. C. 66).

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the letter from the Medical Secretary (Document O. C. 66), asked if the Committee agreed that it should establish a joint sub-committee with the Health Committee or whether it should postpone the question until its next session, when information had been received from the Governments as to their requirements of the drugs.

The SECRETARY thought that the sub-committee should be constituted at once in order to be able to start work as soon as information became available.

The Committee decided that Doctor Anselmino and Mr. Campbell would sit on the sub-committee if its appointment were approved by the Council.

Dr. MIYAJIMA pointed out that the Health Committee had in view the appointment of three members from the Opium Committee.

The SECRETARY said that the Medical Director's letter only referred to the constitution of the mixed Committee.

The CHAIRMAN asked how the expense of the Sub-Committee would be covered.

The SECRETARY suggested that it might be charged equally to the two Sections, Health and Opium, but she would consult the Secretariat.

10. *Draft Report of the Chairman* (Document O. C. 68).

The CHAIRMAN read his draft report on the reference to the Committee from the Council, and asked the members whether they wished to suggest any amendments to it.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) stated that he thought that the Committee had decided at its previous meeting that the number of representatives of the Anti-Opium Association who would accompany the commissions of enquiry would be decided in Peking between the Chinese Government and the Association, as a single member of the Association would not himself alone be able to accompany the Commissions of Enquiry.

The CHAIRMAN replied that he had understood that the Committee wished to have the point mentioned.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU said that he personally agreed with the Chairman, but that he had consulted the Chinese Member on the Council of the League, who was of the opinion that the number of the members of the Commission should be left aside, and that the Council resolution should be adopted *en bloc* without adding this report. But, personally, M. Chao-Hsin Chu would be willing to do his best to induce the Chinese Member on the Council to withdraw his objection.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Chao-Hsin Chu and said that this report would be published as a supplement to the previous report.

On M. CHAO-HSIN CHU's proposal, the words "this year" in the sentence "in the different provinces as was done this year" were altered to "last season."

On Sir John JORDAN's proposal, seconded by M. CHAO-HSIN CHU, the following words were added after "than was forthcoming this year": "to include on the Commission of Investigation representatives of organisations such as chambers of commerce and educational associations; and . . . etc."

The report, as amended above, was adopted by the Committee.

11. *Draft Resolution submitted by Mr. Campbell (Document O. C. 68).*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) read his draft resolution.

After an exchange of views, the Committee decided, on the CHAIRMAN's proposal, to suppress the sentence starting with "Owing to the fact" down to "outside producing countries", and to delete the opening sentence of the new paragraph "In these circumstances" as well as the sentence in the same paragraph which runs "which import raw opium (either for consumption as such or as prepared opium, or as the raw material for the manufacture of opium)".

The resolution, as amended above, was adopted by the Committee.

It was decided that the Committee's report to the Council should consist of the Chairman's report, Mr. Campbell's resolution and the recommendation to appoint a sub-committee consisting of members of the Health and Opium Committees to deal with such medical questions as might be referred to it by the Opium Advisory Committee.

12. *Letter from the Canadian Government (Document O. C. 59).*

The CHAIRMAN said that this letter did not raise any discussion, as it was a mere explanation of what the Canadian Government meant by "collecting statistics on stocks in trade."

13. *Letter from the Secretary of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade (Document O. C. 62 a).*

Sir John JORDAN called the attention of the Committee to the importance of this letter, which had been circulated to the members of the Committee. He asked if it might be considered and discussed by the Committee, though not figuring on the agenda, as he had a similar communication from the International Anti-Opium Association in Peking.

This was agreed to.

Sir John JORDAN said that the increase requested by the Government of Hongkong in the supply of opium by the Indian Government would mean doubling the amount of opium sent from India to Hongkong and increasing the consumption of opium by Chinese in Hongkong, which would produce a bad effect in China. He hoped that the Indian Government would not deliver the consignment, as the present import of opium to Hongkong (122 chests a year) was quite sufficient for the requirements of the Colony.

The Japanese Government had been asked what were its opium requirements for Kiaochao, and, after careful examination of the question, it had replied that 37 chests were sufficient. As the population of Kiaochao is 200,000 inhabitants and that of Hongkong 600,000, 120 chests would be sufficient to meet the need of Hongkong. The great difficulty was the financial question. The Eastern Colonies needed the revenues they drew from opium in order to balance their budget. But this should not be a reason for increasing the import of opium to Hongkong. All the colonies, including the British Colonies, received opium in excess of their actual requirements. The Committee should prevent the Eastern Colonies from importing as much opium as they were pleased to indent for and not to allow a quantity in excess of their actual requirements. There would be a grave danger in allowing an increase of the amount supplied.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) supported Sir John Jordan's statements. Being a Cantonese, he knew the question quite well.

The delivery of opium to Hongkong was excessive, the preparation of opium for smoking being allowed in Hongkong.

He was of the opinion that the policy of the Hongkong Government in establishing a monopoly for opium certainly meant the suppression of opium and not an increase of revenue for the State.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was prepared to deal with the question of the increase if the Committee desired to go into it, but he asked whether it had the data at present to enable to form a judgment on the question. He had been considering whether it might be possible to arrive at an agreed figure of what was a reasonable consumption of prepared opium in the places where it was allowed. He was aware there were great difficulties in the way, and the consumption differed to some extent according to the character of the population. It would be very desirable, however, to obtain such a figure if possible.

He might say that the increase requested by the Hongkong Government did not represent an increase in consumption, and was explained by the fact that up till now it had been drawing on its reserves.

Sir John JORDAN was of the opinion that the import of opium should be rationed in the Far East. British Colonies made money through the opium monopoly and that was a temptation for the Chinese Government to do the same. It would be necessary that an agreement should be concluded on the question between the various Powers in the Far East.

Foreign newspapers published in China that had hitherto always been against the opium monopoly now advocated that China should establish an opium monopoly, as other Governments had done. The Government of Hongkong had fought against opium in a successful way, and the consumption of the drug had been reduced there more than in any other colony.

Without violating the Opium Convention, China could establish the monopoly, but for China there could not be the same half-measures as for India, where consumption could be controlled and carried on moderately. In China either the consumption would have to be abolished entirely or there was no hope for the Committee to attain the aims it had in view.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked why, if foreign countries were allowed to increase their supplies, China should not be allowed to increase hers.

In support of what Sir John Jordan had said, he quoted a Press cutting dated July 1st, 1922, which showed that an Englishman had tried to induce the Chinese Government to institute the monopoly of opium in order to collect enough money for the disbandment of the Chinese troops. He offered 200,000,000 dollars per year. The monopoly would produce 190,000,000 dollars the first year, 154,000,000 the second year and 60,000,000 the third year, as the contract would be for three years. The price of the ounce would be 4 dollars. This proposal had been rejected by the Government and public opinion.

The policy of the Hongkong Government was in favour of abolition, but it must not be forgotten that ten chests a month imported to Hongkong were not only for the town itself but also for the people of the interior going to Hongkong to enjoy legal smoking.

From the financial point of view, an increase of ten chests a month would not mean much for the Indian Government, whereas it would mean the poisoning of many Chinese.

Sir John JORDAN was of the opinion that a motion should be passed on the letter received from the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, recommending that the increase in the imports to Hongkong should not be allowed pending the receipt of information from the various Governments concerning their need of opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, it was for the Committee to decide whether it would consider such a motion, of which notice had not been given at that session; but if it decided to do so, he would have to oppose this motion, as the Committee had not sufficient data to form an opinion on the matter.

Sir John JORDAN said that, as yet, he had proposed no motion. Were he to do so, it would be to the effect that, as the Committee had asked at its last session for information from the various Governments concerning their need in opium, the increased import from Eastern Colonies should be refused until information from the Governments had been received. If this increased amount was granted, then the Committee might as well put an end to its labours, as the granting of such an increase was the very thing which the Committee was there to prevent.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote on the point whether the discussion on the increased demand by Hongkong was in conformity with the Rules of Procedure.

By five votes against two and one abstention, the Committee decided that it was not in order.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the question should be placed on the agenda of the next session.

Sir John JORDAN said he did not think it would be of any use if left until next session, as the matter was one demanding immediate attention, and which would be ineffective if left over. He regretted the result of the vote; as long as the question continued to be considered from the purely financial and national interest point of view, progress would be very difficult in the matter.

Besides, the motion was not specially directed against the Hongkong Government, one of the European Colonies in the Far East where the situation as far as opium was concerned was very good, but against increasing the supplies of raw opium to any of the European Colonies in the Far East.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he wished to reply to the allegations against India made by Sir John Jordan in his speech, as also in the speech made during the last session of the Committee (page 15 of the English text of the Minutes.) Sir John Jordan had said that the Indian Government was partly responsible for China's failure to carry out her engagements under the Opium Convention and the 1911 Agreement. The Indian Government indignantly repudiated such an indictment; it had always helped the Chinese Government in every possible way to carry out its policy of complete prohibition, even though it may have considered that policy impracticable, and it had sacrificed £4,000,000 a year of revenue by giving that assistance. In order to provide further effective assistance, particularly against smuggling, the Indian Government had reduced its opium exports to the Far East; but neither the Chinese Government, nor Sir John Jordan himself, had then advanced the extraordinary proposition that it was necessary for India to stop all exports to the Far East before China could carry out her obligations under the 1911 Agreement.

It was not open to China now, or to Sir John Jordan, speaking on China's behalf, to say that the reason for China's failure to carry out a self-contained agreement (where it had obtained everything it had asked for) was because it had not been given something which neither China nor

Sir John Jordan had then asked for, or had then considered necessary or had even suggested up till then.

Sir John Jordan's contention was that India, although most doubtful whether China's experiment would ever be successful, should at once have set up as the moral mentor of the Far East; should have arbitrarily cut off opium supplies from Indo-China, the Netherlands and the British Possessions there; and should thereby have dislocated the internal administration and the finances of these countries. No one knew better than Sir John that this was an impossible proposition. An examination of the actual quantities involved would also show how negligible the non-China exports from India were as compared with the Chinese production; and, of course, both Turkey and Persia were standing ready, then as now, to fill any gap in Indian exports.

The contention that China had been led to increased cultivation of the poppy owing to increasing imports of India opium was equally untenable. China had grown the poppy long before there were any imports of opium from India; she had always grown poppy far in excess of the Indian imports. In 1893, the Royal Commission took the proportion of home-grown to Indian opium at about 5 to 1; in 1907, the statistics showed that it was twelve times as great. It would be as reasonable to accuse France of stimulating distillation and drunkenness in Scotland because some small quantity of cognac had always been sent there.

Mr. Campbell denied that there was, in fact, any source from which material quantities of Indian opium could have been obtained for smuggling into China; the statistics of export up to and after 1907 made that point clear. He could not understand Sir John Jordan's contention that, because Chinese subjects could obtain opium in Indo-China, the Netherlands and British Possessions, China was therefore at liberty to disregard her solemn undertakings under the 1911 Agreement. That was a contention that had only to be stated for its absurdity to be manifest.

Lastly, he emphasised the effects which attacks of this kind—attacks which were, he thought, unfair and unreasonable—would have on Indian opinion. If something in advance of the Hague Convention were desired, Indian opinion must first be convinced that these new restrictions were necessary; and Indian opinion was at present hardening markedly as against China, owing to her failure to carry out her undertakings and owing to her reiterated denials of obvious facts. The state of mind necessary to convince India that the Hague Convention as it stood was inadequate would not be produced if attacks on the lines now made were constantly being made against India. Sir John was rightly most careful as regards China's susceptibilities; Mr. Campbell's clear duty was to be equally active in protecting India's. India carried out her bargain and did even more. The blame should be put on the country that failed to carry out its engagements. China had even said that it had the right to provide its people with opium, which is a strange proposition on the part of a country party to the Anglo-Chinese Agreement of 1911.

If one wanted to get new concessions from India it was not through attacking India in this way. Popular opinion in India could not be carried further in the direction of a reduction of exports to the Far East at present on the lines suggested by Sir John Jordan.

Sir John JORDAN said that he would reply to the main points of Mr. Campbell's statement. He had never sought to minimise the gravity of the lapse that had taken place in China and had attributed it primarily to the disturbed state of the country. There were, however, he had added, three contributory causes: first, the immense quantity of morphia which was sent to the Far East after the import of opium was stopped; next, the smuggling of foreign opium; and, lastly, the Indian Government's policy of continuing to send opium to the Far Eastern Colonies of European Powers for the consumption of Chinese settlers.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the arrangement concerning the reduction of India's exports to the Far East was negotiated by Sir John Jordan himself, and at that time he did not object to 13,200 chests a year as a suitable limit.

Sir John JORDAN said that he would prove that his assertions were all well founded.

1. The statistics which had been placed before the Committee on previous occasions showed beyond a shadow of a doubt that hundreds of thousands of ounces (in one year as much, probably, as 800,000 ozs.) of morphia had been sent to the Far East for illicit introduction into China. China did not produce an ounce of morphia herself, and morphia had thus taken the place of opium in certain parts of China.

2. The statistics published by the Chinese Customs and the seizures of opium made in Hongkong and Singapore amply attested the magnitude of the smuggling operations in opium that went on during the years in question. Most of it came in steamers from Liverpool and London, one steamer from the latter port arriving with 3,000 pounds of opium.

3. The Indian Government had continued to send opium to Hongkong, the Straits Settlements, etc. This was a fact that was not disputed.

Mr. Campbell had not attempted to controvert the first two statements. He had claimed credit to the Indian Government for having sacrificed £4,000,000 a year of revenue. Sir John Jordan gladly recognised that sacrifice, the credit for which, however, was shared by the British House of Commons, which, responding to the pressure of public opinion, had pronounced the opium trade "morally indefensible".

It was against the third statement that Mr. Campbell had principally directed his criticism. He had pointed out that neither China nor Sir John Jordan had considered it necessary at the

outset of the opium campaign in China to suggest that India should cut off her supplies of opium from Indo-China, the British Possessions in the Far East, etc. That was quite true, and the reason was obvious. The opium campaign in China was a vast undertaking, and until it had proved successful it would have been premature and indeed hopeless to deal with the subsidiary question. But as soon as the British Government was satisfied that China had carried out her part of the programme and when the Chinese Government gave further evidence of its sincerity by destroying all the Indian opium that remained in China, Sir John Jordan had felt that the moment had come when, if the reform was to be successful all round, the export of opium for the consumption of overseas Chinese should likewise be stopped, and he had lost no time in making an urgent and earnest appeal in this sense, which, to his great regret, was not favourably entertained.

Mr. Campbell had thought this an extraordinary proposition. Sir John Jordan saw nothing extraordinary about it. What did seem to him extraordinary was that the Indian or any other Government should have expected China to continue to make a reform which entailed such a loss of revenue and required such sustained self-denial effective in practice, while Western countries maintained opium monopolies in leased territories which formed an integral part of the dominions and financed their own possessions adjacent thereto largely from the opium imported for consumption by Chinese settlers. Opium agreements notwithstanding, this, added to morphia and opium smuggling, was putting too great a strain upon human nature.

The meeting was brought to a close at 8 p.m.
