

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

**C. 418. M. 184.** 1923. XI.

GENEVA,  
August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1923.

League of Nations.

---

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND  
OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

---

MINUTES

OF THE

FIFTH SESSION

HELD AT

GENEVA, FROM MAY 24<sup>th</sup> TO JUNE 7<sup>th</sup>, 1923.

---

## CONTENTS.

Page

### FIRST MEETING, May 24th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

1. Amendments to Article 2 of the Rules of Procedure . . . . .	5
2. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman . . . . .	7
3. Vote of thanks to the retiring Chairman . . . . .	7
4. Publicity of Meetings . . . . .	7
5. Participation of the United States in the Work of the Committee . . . . .	8

### SECOND MEETING, May 25th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

6. Statement on the Committee's Activities . . . . .	8
7. Proposals of the United States of America . . . . .	10

### THIRD MEETING, May 25th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

8. Discussion on the Proposals of the United States of America ( <i>continued</i> ). . . . .	16
--	----

### FOURTH MEETING, May 26th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

9. Consideration of Progress Report by the Secretariat . . . . .	24
--	----

### FIFTH MEETING, May 26th, 1923, at 3.45 p.m.

10. Proposal of Sir John Jordan concerning the Communication to the Secretariat of Particulars of Seizures . . . . .	32
11. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright on Turkey's Attitude towards the Ratification of the Hague Convention . . . . .	32
12. Statement by the Japanese Delegate on certain discrepancies between the Japanese Returns and those of other Countries . . . . .	33
13. Resolutions of Voluntary Organisations . . . . .	35
14. Proposal of Sir John Jordan concerning the Communication to the Secretariat of Particulars of Seizures. . . . .	36
15. Approval of the Minutes of the first Meeting . . . . .	36

### SIXTH MEETING, May 28th, 1923, at 10 a.m.

16. Approval of the Minutes of the second Meeting . . . . .	38
17. Application of Part II of the Opium Convention, with special reference to European Possessions and Countries of the Far East. . . . .	38

### SEVENTH MEETING, May 28th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

18. Statement concerning Exports from the United States of America . . . . .	43
19. Application of Part II of the Opium Convention, with special reference to European Possessions and Countries of the Far East ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	43

### EIGHTH MEETING, May 29th, 1923, at 10.45 a.m.

20. Statement by the Portuguese Delegate regarding Macao . . . . .	49
21. Statement by M. Brenier for insertion in the Minutes of the third Meeting . . . . .	49
22. Statement by Bishop Brent regarding the Philippines. . . . .	50
23. Proposals of the British Government regarding the Consumption of Opium for Smoking in the Far East . . . . .	54

### NINTH MEETING, May 29th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

24. Statement by the Japanese Delegate on the Opium Situation in Formosa and Japan proper . . . . .	56
25. Approximate Consumption of Prepared Opium per head of the Chinese population in the European and Japanese Colonies of the Far East and in Siam, in 1921 . . . . .	57
26. Note by the British Delegate on the Legitimate Opium Requirements in Hong-Kong. . . . .	59

<b>TENTH MEETING, May 30th, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		<b>Page</b>
27. Approval of the Minutes of the fourth and fifth Meetings . . . . .		62
28. Proposals of the British Government regarding the Consumption of Opium for Smoking in the Far East . . . . .		62
<b>ELEVENTH MEETING, May 31st, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		
29. Approval of the Minutes of the sixth Meeting . . . . .		67
30. Limitation of the Manufacture of Morphia, other Opium Derivatives and Cocaine . . . . .		67
<b>TWELFTH MEETING, May 31st, 1923, at 3.45 p.m.</b>		
31. Limitation of the Manufacture of Morphia, other Opium Derivatives and Cocaine (continued) . . . . .		74
32. Supply of Figures concerning the production of Narcotics . . . . .		76
33. Limitation of the Manufacture of Cocaine and other Drugs . . . . .		77
<b>THIRTEENTH MEETING, June 1st, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		
34. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued) . . . . .		81
<b>FOURTEENTH MEETING, June 1st, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.</b>		
35. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued). — Proposals of the British Representative . . . . .		88
<b>FIFTEENTH MEETING, June 2nd, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		
36. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America. — Proposals of the British Representative (continued). . . . .		95
<b>SIXTEENTH MEETING, June 2nd, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.</b>		
37. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued). — Text of a new paragraph by Sir John Jordan in place of Paragraph 1 of the Proposal of the British Representative . . . . .		98
38. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America. — Paragraph 4 of the Proposal of the British Representative . . . . .		101
39. Telegram from the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland . . . . .		105
40. Covering Letter to the American Delegation to accompany the Resolution adopted by the Committee . . . . .		105
<b>SEVENTEENTH MEETING, June 4th, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		
41. Replacement of M. Ferreira (Portugal) . . . . .		105
42. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued) . . . . .		105
43. Minutes of Approval of Meetings of the Committee. . . . .		105
44. World Cultivation and Production of Opium . . . . .		106
45. Consideration of Article 14 of the Convention. Memorandum on Exemptions submitted by the Siamese Delegate. . . . .		108
46. Consideration of the Report of the International Missionary Council . . . . .		109
47. Consideration of the Report by Dr. Knaff-Lenz on the Enquiries of the Health Section with regard to the World Requirement of Drugs . . . . .		109
<b>EIGHTEENTH MEETING, June 4th, 1923, at 3 p.m.</b>		
48. Proposal of the French Government regarding Increased Penalties . . . . .		109
49. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued) . . . . .		111
<b>NINETEENTH MEETING, June 5th, 1923, at 10 a.m.</b>		
50. Approval of the Minutes of the twelfth Meeting . . . . .		116
51. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued) . . . . .		116
<b>TWENTIETH MEETING, June 5th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.</b>		
52. Discussion on the Proposals of the Delegation of the United States of America (continued) . . . . .		117
53. Statement by Bishop Brent . . . . .		119
54. Position of Bonded Warehouses. . . . .		119
55. Assembly Resolution regarding countries failing to ratify the Convention or to adopt the Export and Import Certificate System . . . . .		120
56. Proposal by the Portuguese Delegate regarding the use of Heroin. . . . .		121

	Page
TWENTY-FIRST MEETING, June 6th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.	
57. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee . . . . .	122
58. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright on the Situation in Persia and Turkey . . . . .	122
TWENTY-SECOND MEETING, June 8th, 1923, at 2.30 p.m.	
59. Discussion of the Committee's Report to the Council . . . . .	122
60. Vote of Thanks to the Chairman . . . . .	122

LIST OF ANNEXES.

1. Letter from the Delegation of the United States of America to the Secretary-General submitting to the Advisory Committee certain proposals concerning the traffic in narcotic drugs . . . . .	123
2. Reply of the Secretary-General to the Delegation of the United States . . . . .	123
3. Progress Report by the Secretary of the Advisory Committee. . . . .	124
4. Memorandum by the Secretary-General on the application of Part II of the Opium Convention . . . . .	135
5. Statement by the Secretary-General on the manufacture of morphia, other opium derivatives and cocaine . . . . .	153
6. Note by the British Representative on the legitimate opium requirements of Hong-Kong. . . . .	166
7. Letter from the Japanese Government concerning the discrepancies between the Japanese returns and those of other countries . . . . .	169
8. Letter and memorandum from the British Government on discrepancies existing between statistics submitted by Japan and other States . . . . .	171
9. Information communicated by the British Government on opium production in China in 1922. . . . .	172
9a. Memorandum by the British Delegate on production of opium and its export from the Chinese province of Yunnan . . . . .	176
10. Statement on the approximative consumption of prepared opium and morphine equivalents per head of the Chinese population in European and Japanese colonies of the Far East and in Siam for the year 1921 . . . . .	177
11. Memorandum prepared at the request of the British Delegation on the world cultivation and production of opium. . . . .	178
12. Letter to the Secretary-General from the Swiss Government regarding the International Opium Convention . . . . .	192
13. Memorandum from Mrs. Hamilton Wright on the Persian and Turkish situation . . . . .	193
14. Report to the Council on the Work of the Advisory Committee during its fifth session . . . . .	201

*Note by the Secretary.* — Certain of the above documents though not formally adopted, were discussed by the Committee and are therefore annexed as explanatory to the Minutes.

NOTE

A list of the Members of the Committee and the Assessors will be found in annex 14, p. 201.



LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

**Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium.**

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SESSION  
HELD AT GENEVA FROM MAY 24th TO JUNE 7th, 1923.

FIRST MEETING

*held on Thursday, May 24th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee, with the exception of the Delegation of the United States of America, and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Brenier and Sir John Jordan, were present.

I. AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 2 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE.

(a) *Proposal by the Representative of Portugal.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) submitted the following proposal:

“That the assessors:

(a) shall be accorded the right to vote;

(b) shall be accorded the right of election as Chairman or Vice-Chairman.”

and said, in explanation, that the principal quality needed in the Chairman of a committee of the nature of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium was competence in the various technical questions which were considered.

The assessors were of recognised ability and were all fully competent to take the Chair. Further, it naturally followed that, if they were competent to take the Chair, they were competent to vote.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that, while fully appreciating M. Ferreira's proposal, in her own opinion, which was shared by M. Brenier and Sir John Jordan, the assessors would be of greater value to the Committee if they did not take the Chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he did not agree with M. Ferreira's proposal, mainly for the reasons already stated by the assessors at the previous session, and also because, if an assessor were declared eligible for the position of Chairman and were given the right to vote, he would cease to be an assessor, since there would then be no difference in status between him and an ordinary member of the Committee. The idea that an assessor did not possess the right to vote was implicit in the composition of the Committee. An assessor was an expert adviser, while a member represented his Government, and his vote bound his Government. An assessor was completely independent.

M. BOURGOIS (France), while agreeing with M. Ferreira as to the personal abilities of the assessors, took the same view as Mr. Campbell for the same reasons. To place the members of the Committee and the assessors on the same basis would be to modify its actual composition.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) suggested that, if the Committee did not desire to grant the right to vote to the assessors, it should only adopt the second part of his proposal, regarding their election as Chairman.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) was in favour of the second part of the proposal. The Chairman of the Committee should be a person possessing complete freedom to express any opinion he wished on any point. A Chairman who was not at the same time a government representative would be able to devote all his time to the work of the Committee in the intervals between its sessions.

He was not in favour of the first part of the proposal, because it might occur that the assessors would be changed and others take their place who might hold a biased view regarding certain questions, and thus a country might find itself in the possession of two votes.

M. BOURGOIS (France) recognised the force of the Chinese representative's argument, but considered that the assessors were purely technical experts, whereas the Chairman might be called upon to fulfil a part which was not only that of a technical expert.

*The second part of the proposal was rejected, two members voting in favour and five against.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) withdrew the first part of his proposal.

(b) *Proposals by the British and Indian Delegates.*

Mr. CAMPBELL<sup>1</sup> (India) said that the only object of his proposal was to remove the practical difficulty of changing the Chairman at every session of the Committee. Originally the Committee had decided to meet only once a year. Circumstances, however, had compelled it to meet two or three times, and it was absurd to change the Chairman at each session. He thought that the Chairman should hold office from one Assembly to the next, in order that he should be able to explain to the Assembly the decisions and recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

He was quite ready to accept Sir Malcolm Delevingne's second amendment<sup>2</sup>, provided that the Committee found means to tide over the period from the present session to the end of the next Assembly.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain)<sup>2</sup> said that the Committee had to decide whether the term of office of the Chairman should extend from one spring meeting to the next, or from one Assembly to the next. There were advantages in either course. If the first were adopted, the Chairman would begin by presiding over the most important session of the year, and would therefore be able to deal with any question arising during the year as the result of the Committee's action. If the second were adopted, the Chairman would have the advantage, when dealing with the business of the Committee at the meeting of the Assembly, of having presided over all the meetings during the preceding year. The difficulty on the present occasion caused by having an interval between the present session of the Committee and the next session of the Assembly could be met by the Committee deciding either to appoint a Chairman until the end of the next Assembly, or to extend his period of office to cover the Assembly of 1924. He was himself inclined to the opinion that the period should be from one spring meeting to the next.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that Mr. Campbell's proposal, by which the Committee could appoint the Chairman for a shorter period than one year, or for a longer period not exceeding eighteen months, would meet both difficulties.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that it was desirable that the Committee should establish a definite rule for its future guidance. His proposal fixed a definite period for the term of office of the Chairman, while that of Mr. Campbell left the Committee free to appoint Chairmen for periods differing in length.

He withdrew his second amendment in order to leave the Committee free to choose between his first amendment and that of Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) inclined to the view that it was better for the term of office of the Chairman to extend from Assembly to Assembly, because, in practice, all the Committee's decisions were accepted or rejected by that body.

M. BOURGOIS (France), M. POENSGEN (Germany), Dr. UCHINO (Japan), Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) and Prince CHAROON (Siam) were in favour of the period extending from spring session to spring session, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) and M. FERREIRA (Portugal) from Assembly to Assembly.

*The Committee therefore decided that the term of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should extend from one spring session to the next.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) withdrew his amendment, and the Committee adopted the first amendment of Sir Malcolm Delevingne in the following terms:

"The Committee shall at its spring meeting elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman from among its members. Unless the Committee shall direct otherwise, the term of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall begin with the spring meeting, and shall continue until the opening of the spring meeting of the following year."

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Campbell's proposal was as follows:

"That the Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall ordinarily hold office for one year from the date of their election, provided that the Committee may appoint a Chairman and Vice-Chairman for a shorter period than one year, or for a longer period not exceeding eighteen months in all, if that appears to them desirable in order that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman may vacate office at a suitable time.

"The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed on the same date and shall vacate office on the same date."

<sup>2</sup> Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendments were as follows:

"The Committee shall, at its spring meeting, elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman from among its members. Unless the Committee shall direct otherwise, the term of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall begin with the spring meeting, and shall continue until the opening of the spring meeting of the following year."

*Alternative amendment.*

"The Committee shall, at the spring meeting, elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman from among its members. Unless the Committee shall direct otherwise, the term of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall begin as from the close of the annual session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, and shall continue until the close of the meeting of the Assembly in the following year."

## 2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN.

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India), seconded by Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), M. FERREIRA (Portugal) and M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), M. BOURGOIS (France) was unanimously elected Chairman.

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain), Prince CHAROON (Siam) was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.

## 3. VOTE OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING CHAIRMAN.

On the proposal of Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), seconded by M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), the Committee unanimously passed a vote of thanks to Sir Malcolm Delevingne, the retiring Chairman, for his services during the three previous sessions of the Committee.

## 4. PUBLICITY OF MEETINGS.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Council, at its session in February 1923, had discussed the question of the publicity of the Advisory Committee's meetings, and had been of opinion that the right to decide this matter lay with the Advisory Committee itself.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) and Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT desired to see the widest possible publicity given to the meetings of the Advisory Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) repeated the reasons against publicity which he had put forward at the last session of the Committee.

The Committee was an advisory one, and to make any of its recommendations public before presenting them to the Council and to the Assembly might place those bodies in a position of some embarrassment, should they wish to modify or alter them.

The usual custom followed by advisory committees of the League was for the committee to hold its meetings in private and to hold a public meeting at the end of the session when discussing the report containing its various decisions.

It was extraordinarily difficult for a full and frank discussion to take place in public. The Committee discussed various questions touching the *amour-propre* of Governments and the discussions in the past had, in some instances, proved somewhat heated. In practice, it was impossible to depend on the discretion of journalists, who tore sentences and phrases from their context and published them, thus endangering both international relations and the general work of the Advisory Committee itself.

The situation, however, with regard to publicity had lately undergone a change. There had been a definite campaign of misrepresentation, for instance, in the Press concerning India, which could, perhaps, best be combated by putting the true facts of the case before the general public. Despite his opinion, therefore, that in the long run the holding of its meetings in public might prove contrary to the best interests of the Committee, Mr. Campbell was no longer opposed to this procedure being adopted, provided that the right to discuss any question at any moment in private was reserved. By a public presentation of the facts, the outside world would be afforded the necessary material for forming an accurate judgment on the various questions dealt with by the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with Mr. Campbell. For the present session, he thought the Committee should hold its meetings in public, unless it should decide otherwise when discussing certain questions. The Committee should not, however, lay down a general rule binding its future activities. He wished to say two things. The first was that if at any time one or more of its members desired to discuss any particular question in private, the Committee should accord great weight to this desire. It was further of great importance that very full Minutes of the meetings of the Committee should be published so that, if any garbled account appeared in the newspapers, there might be an authoritative record to which reference could be made.

He accordingly submitted the following proposal:

"The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs decides that the meetings of this session of the Committee should be held in public, unless the Committee should decide that any part of its proceedings should be held in private."

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that the principle of publicity contained in Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal should apply not only to the present session, but to all future sessions.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. At the previous session, Sir John Jordan and himself had fought hard to obtain publicity. No secrecy was necessary, and there could be no danger that the *amour-propre* of any government would be wounded, since the Committee could always decide to discuss certain questions in private.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that it would be wiser for the Committee to confine its decision regarding the publicity to be given to its meetings to the present session only. It might be necessary for the Committee to hold future sessions in private. By adopting his proposal, a new principle, which went a very long way towards meeting the desire for publicity, was established and a very important precedent created. It would always be possible to renew his proposal at the beginning of each session.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT desired the Committee to decide whether Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal should be amended to cover all future sessions of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in his view, there were objections to giving undue publicity to the meetings of the Advisory Committee. Public opinion, which was eager to see its ideal realised, always demanded radical and immediate measures, while the experts, who were more prudent, knew that progressive solutions of any problem were sometimes the best or the only ones possible. Publicity for the meetings might change the nature of the Committee's discussions. It might become necessary for members to speak for the public and no longer to confine themselves to their role of experts. The public discussions which took place in the Council and in the Assembly gave sufficient publicity to the work of the Committee.

He accordingly proposed that the Committee should adopt the same procedure as that followed by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Children during its last session, and that publicity should be given to the meetings during which the report on the work of the Advisory Committee would be discussed.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the Committee must take into account public opinion. The League's prestige was suffering from the fact that the Advisory Committee thought fit to discuss problems of such world-wide interest in private. The League stood in need of the utmost publicity.

The Committee could always hold meetings in private if it were necessary, but it should establish the general principle of holding its meetings in public.

She accordingly proposed as an amendment that all meetings of the Committee should be held in public, unless the Committee should decide that any part of its proceedings should be held in private.

*Mrs. Hamilton Wright's amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 3.*

*The Chairman's amendment was rejected and the Committee adopted Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal, 4 voting in favour.*

#### 5. PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE,

The Committee took note of a letter (Annex 1) from the Hon. Stephen G. Porter to the Secretary-General, together with the Secretary-General's reply (Annex 2), and requested the Chairman to address a letter to the American Delegation welcoming the collaboration of the United States and inviting Mr. Porter to attend the meetings of the Committee.

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India), the Committee further asked the Chairman to request Mr. Porter to be good enough to send to the Secretariat for circulation to the members of the Committee any proposals which he might desire to formulate.

---

### SECOND MEETING

*held Friday, May 25th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

---

All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors were present.

#### 6. STATEMENT ON THE COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES.

The CHAIRMAN, in welcoming the American Delegation, said that the Committee much appreciated their collaboration.

He asked Sir Malcolm Delevingne to make a statement on the past work of the Committee and on the results so far achieved by it.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain), in explaining the course pursued and the results obtained by the Committee, said that it had been at work for two years and had been originally appointed by the Council and the Assembly to assist those bodies in the supervision of the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs, in accordance with the provisions of such international agreements as had been, or might be, concluded. The Committee had further to assist the League to establish the greatest measure of international co-operation in regard to the traffic.

It had started necessarily from the standpoint of the International Opium Convention of 1912, and had regarded its principal task as being to assist the League to give the fullest effect to the humanitarian aims expressed in the preamble to that Convention and in all its provisions. It had invariably been recognised by the framers of the Convention and by those who strove to put it into execution that its success depended on its universal adoption. This principle the Committee had always borne in mind, and its first task had been to obtain the ratification and

enforcement of the Convention by all the countries of the world. At each of its sessions, the Committee had urged the Council and the Assembly to press this matter. The Progress Report now before the Committee showed what measure of success had so far been obtained. Forty-two out of the fifty-two countries Members of the League, and several important countries outside the League, had ratified the Convention. It was a matter for regret that there were still some important countries which had not done so, and the Committee's task in this direction was, therefore, not yet completed.

Apart from obtaining the ratification of the Convention, the Committee had two main tasks: to secure information for the use of the Council and the Assembly to enable them to supervise the execution of the Convention, and to consider what measures were necessary to give it full effect.

He emphasised the fact that the League possessed no independent sources of information with regard to opium and the traffic in opium, but depended entirely upon the information supplied by its Members, and by the Governments of those States not Members of the League which had adhered to the Convention.

The Committee had begun by asking the Governments what steps they had taken to put the Convention into force, and what the position was, in general, concerning the traffic. A large mass of important information had thus been obtained by means of the replies to the questionnaire sent out by the League, and from the annual reports requested from all Governments. It must be noted with regret that progress in the matter of collecting information had neither been as rapid nor as great as could have been desired. The reports received, moreover, did not always give the information wanted, but, despite this fact, a larger amount of information on the various problems with which the Committee was dealing had been collected than ever before, and the world in general possessed a much more thorough grasp of the position than had previously been the case. From the information in the possession of the Committee, it would be enabled to ascertain what steps each country had taken regarding the Convention.

The Committee had had next to consider what should be done to give full effect to the Convention and to secure the fullest possible international co-operation. The International Opium Convention dealt with four subjects — raw opium, prepared opium, manufactured drugs and the special case of China.

With regard to the first three subjects with which the Convention dealt, the control of the export and import of raw and prepared opium and their manufactured products, which occupied so important a place in the Hague Convention, had been considered. To make this control effective, the Committee had recommended the system of Import Certificates, which was based on arrangements previously in existence between Great Britain, the United States, France, Canada and some other countries. The Committee had considered that the universal adoption of this system was the most effective means of controlling export and import. Between twenty and thirty countries had accepted the system, but there still remained some important countries which had not yet put it into force. The Committee had always been of the opinion that, unless the Import Certificate System were adopted, the control of imports and exports could never be properly effected.

Further, the Committee had considered from the outset that in the last resort the limitation of production constituted the most effective measure of control. The Import Certificate System itself though it would always be necessary in order to secure that the drugs produced for legitimate purposes would not be diverted to improper uses could not put an end to the illicit traffic, although it had been supplemented by various recommendations for the taking of concerted measures between countries, which had in many cases met with great success. The control of production was, therefore, the only effective method of attaining the full realisation of the objects of the Convention. The third Assembly had passed the following resolution to that effect:

“The Assembly again desires to emphasise the view expressed in the report of the Advisory Committee that, so long as the drugs to which Part III, particularly Article 9, of the International Opium Convention applies are produced in quantities exceeding the legitimate requirements, there is a great danger that the surplus will find its way into illegitimate channels, and that the control of production, so as to limit it to the amount required for medical and legitimate purposes, is the most effective method of putting a stop to the illicit traffic. It recommends that the enquiry now proceeding into the world's legitimate requirements should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible, and expresses the hope that a provisional estimate and scheme will be submitted to the Assembly next year.”

The enquiry referred to in the Assembly's resolution, on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, had been set on foot by the Council two years previously, by means of the Health Committee of the League, and had for its object the ascertaining of the world's legitimate requirements of the drugs mentioned in Part III of the Convention. Very interesting and important results had been obtained from this enquiry which would now enable the Committee to make some sort of approximate forecast as to the legitimate requirements of the world.

In connection with the question of raw opium, the Committee was faced with a position of extraordinary difficulty, since the amount of opium required to be produced in the world would have to depend on the conclusions reached by the Committee regarding the world's legitimate requirements of the manufactured drugs, and regarding what action the Committee might take concerning the production of opium for smoking purposes, which was still permissible under Part II of the Convention, pending its complete abolition.

The Committee had anxiously considered the increase in the use of habit-forming drugs and had made a number of recommendations.

The position in China, where there had been a great revival in the production of opium, had also caused the Committee great anxiety. The Committee felt that this was largely the key to the Far Eastern situation.

Both these matters would come up for further consideration at the present session.

Finally, while the Committee regretted that the information at its disposal was still so incomplete, and that a great amount of vital information from important countries was still lacking, sufficient had been obtained for it to take decisions of far-reaching importance.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, thanked and congratulated the Secretariat very warmly for the preparatory work which it had accomplished. In view of its scope, its clarity and the conscientiousness with which it had been prepared, this work would afford the most valuable assistance to the Committee.

#### 7. PROPOSALS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Mr. PORTER (United States) asked leave of the Committee to call upon Bishop Brent to make a statement on the proposals which the United States desired to lay before it.

Bishop BRENT (United States) spoke as follows:

It is a pleasure to recognise among the members of this Committee and among the assessors those who served their respective Governments in the first International Opium Commission. One face I miss, that of my colleague, Mr. Hamilton Wright, whose dogged purpose, steady industry and accurate knowledge place all of us under permanent obligation to him. I speak especially of him because, were he still with us, it would rightly be he rather than I who would represent the United States in your presence to-day.

In his absence, I am honoured with the task, as a representative of my Government and nation, of urging upon you consideration of the immediate necessity of limiting the production of habit-forming narcotic drugs and the raw materials from which they are made to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes. Though it is my special duty to present the subject from the humanitarian and moral standpoint, it will be impossible to do so without also bringing in its scientific, medical and economic aspects.

Science and medicine are indispensable factors in determining the moral and humanitarian position. Economic considerations can enter the field at all only on such terms and in such manner as scientific, medical, moral and humanitarian facts and findings may permit. In this or any other matter pertaining to human welfare, if the question of revenue or financial profit is allowed to play any part whatever except that of the lowly servant of science, morals and religion, it becomes a debauching influence, corrupting men's minds and perverting their morals. I say this thus early, not only because it is indisputable but also because in the history of human affairs there has never been any trade more lucrative or more indifferent to human welfare than that in opium and its derivatives. Governments and individuals alike have made the fruit of the poppy, which is the most conspicuous of narcotic products and which I shall consider as illustrative of all others, a source of revenue by degrading their customers. The legitimate trade is confined to so limited a figure that, though we may not be able to determine to the ounce the amount necessary, we are aware that there is produced and distributed annually not less than ten times the amount capable of being consumed to the advantage of mankind. In other words, nine-tenths of the world's production is used for purposes of gain or revenue and the corruption attendant upon it. There are Governments engaged in this traffic which regret it. They find themselves caught in a snare set for unborn generations two centuries ago. It falls upon them to extricate themselves from the sins of their fathers, so that future generations may be free from the burden and shame which is our noxious heritage.

In what I purpose to say, I shall be moved by the single motive of discovering what will best promote the morals and health of mankind, without distinction or difference between nation and nation, or man and man. I shall be bold in stating the facts of the case, as I am informed of them and as my Government has received them, under the conviction that the truth must not be hidden from the public but given in its entirety to the world at large. We have reached a day when enlightened public opinion is counted the chief determining force in national and international affairs, and it behoves us who happen to have full information in the matter before us to share it with mankind. If the people are to play a real part in "undertaking to direct the business of diplomacy," they must be furnished with ample opportunity to "learn the business."

The United States states for its own part and without any attempt at self-justification, that for the period between 1915 and 1921 much was left to be desired in the character and administration of her legislation in restraint of narcotics, especially as touching export. The Harrison Narcotic Act of December 14th, 1914, inadequate by itself, was reinforced by the Jones-Miller Act of 1922. To-day our house is in order legislatively, and progressively so, administratively.

Though in what I shall further say I speak on behalf of my own nation, I do so seeking nothing for her benefit which is not also for the benefit of the entire human race. Our watchword must be mutual helpfulness. The strong nations must aid the weak by example and precept. The obligation is not solely one of contract. It is inherent in any conception of world-wide society. The League of Nations, with whom through you we are treating in this matter, represents the greatest association of nations in all history, solemnly bound by agreement to think and act in terms of mankind. To quote from the Covenant which binds you (Covenant of the League of Nations, Article 22):

"To those colonies and territories which, as a consequence of the late war, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them, and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such



peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant."

But the obligation is wider than that expressed. The "well-being and development" of all dependent peoples, whether in Java, Borneo, the Philippines, French Indo-China, or Macao, "form a sacred trust of civilisation."

The earliest and greatest mandate we strong nations can assume, without which all other mandates will be ineffective, is the moral mandate by which we honestly protect the higher welfare of weak or small nations by demanding for, rather than conceding to, them the same safeguards and privileges that we demand for ourselves. "Give us this day our daily bread," interpreted for other nationals than our own, cannot read, "Give them this day their daily opium."

Moral questions have no boundaries. The world of to-day is steadily revealing itself to be a world of identical moral interests. If we exploit abroad where we defend at home, the downfall of the exploited will eventually become our downfall. Why a Jones-Miller Act in America or a Dangerous Drug Act in England or similar legislation in Japan, and not also in all dependencies and colonies? Why in a colony one law in matters of science and morals for the citizens of the mother country and another for natives?<sup>1</sup> The International Opium Convention of 1912 has branded prepared opium as an unmixed evil, so that I am speaking in terms of that document. Warren Hastings laid down a sinister principle in 1735 which every decent man would repudiate as Machiavellian and conscienceless. And yet is not that the principle that is determining the policy of some nations? Listen to it:

"Opium is not a necessary of life but a pernicious article of luxury which ought not to be permitted, except for purposes of foreign commerce only, and which the wisdom of the Government should carefully restrain from internal consumption."

In 1903, in Singapore, I had an interview with one of the former partners of the Opium Farm. He agreed to answer my questions truthfully provided that I would not disclose his name. I quote from the official record (Report of the Philippine Opium Investigating Committee, pp. 94, 95):

Question: What in your judgment is the effect of the laws, regulations and ordinances in force in Singapore?

Answer: It is bad. At least, so say those who do not smoke. Smokers say that it is good. The Government says the same thing. As a business man, I say that the laws give a good opportunity for making money. Speaking from my conscience, I am dead against the opium business. I should be glad to see other and better legislation. But if the law calls for tenders, I will take advantage of the law. In the Philippine Islands, if it were made a legitimate business, I would try to make money by bidding for the monopoly. I know in my own conscience that the use of opium is bad, but it is a paying business.

Question: Do you think that the effect of the use of opium is different on the Chinese and Europeans?

Answer: It has the same effect on everyone, no matter to what nation he belongs. If you take a poison, it is bound to act on you as a poison.

Money is indeed a root of all evil. As with individuals, so with Governments. The crux is that narcotics are wealth as well as vice-producing. Eliminate revenue and what Government would have further interest in the cultivation of the poppy? Governments would industriously proceed to help their nationals to the production of, and a market for, desirable commodities — cotton, of which the mills are short; silk, for which there is always a demand; or some crop that would not impoverish souls and bodies as well as soil, which the innocent, pretty poppy does.

I speak not as a visionary moralist or as a stranger to the Orient. For twenty years I have been identified with the narcotic problem, in its every phase. For sixteen years my home was in Manila and the life of the Orient became my life. Filipino, Malay, Burman, Formosan, Chinese, Japanese — I came to know each in his own home. I honour and respect them all. Forced to a practical conclusion as to the best way of dealing with opium in the Philippines, I agreed with my colleagues on the Philippine Opium Investigating Committee of 1903-1904, after a comprehensive survey of the administrative measures in operation in every country and colony of the Orient, on a policy of progressive prohibition:

- "1. That opium and the traffic therein be made a strict government monopoly immediately;
- "2. That three years after that shall have been done, no opium shall be imported, bought or introduced into these islands, except by the Government and for medical purposes only."

Our recommendation as to the Government monopoly was not carried out, but restrictive and remedial measures were at once put into force, preparatory to prohibition, and by Act of Congress in 1908, opium became contraband in the Philippines, except for medicinal purposes.

<sup>1</sup> See Document 1. O. C. 12, Statement of Action taken by British Government, 1922; and Document O. C. 13 (Y. 2), Summary of Opium and Chandu Enactment.

Then smuggling, always busy, quickened its nefarious trade. As early as 1906, experience had taught me that in this complex problem salvation for the one could come only through the salvation of all, and I proposed to the American Government international action, with what result you know.

To-day, if the opium-producing nations protected the interests of their neighbours as they protect their own, the Philippines would be rid of any serious drug addiction. But Macao and British North Borneo are the chief sources of constant reinfection. It is only a matter of equity to add that, so far as the Straits Settlements and Hong-Kong are concerned, there has been sincere and careful effort on the part of these Crown colonies to leave nothing undone to prevent smuggling at the ports of export.

This brings me to the matter of controlling the cultivation of the poppy within the limits demanded by medicinal and scientific needs as the only rational and effective means of closing the door at home and abroad to opium addiction. Now, the scientific uses of opium are such a slight extension of its medicinal uses that the word "medicinal," generously construed, covers all legitimate needs. This I say, not as a personal opinion but as the certain finding of science. In 1892, as Dr. Wu Lien-Teh pointed out at the Hague International Opium Conference, "there was a public declaration on opium by 5,000 medical men in Great Britain that:

- "1. The habit of opium-smoking or of opium eating is morally and physically debasing;
- "2. That opium ought in India, as in England, to be classed as a poison."<sup>1</sup>

This conclusion has been consistently endorsed by expert opinion from then till now.

The latest scientific judgment coincides with the earliest. It was given under the auspices of the League of Nations. The unequivocal opinion of the Health Committee of the League is that: "After a full discussion, and in view of the fact that the Sub-Committee was instructed to draw up its report solely from the health and medical points of view, it was decided that medical use should be considered the only legitimate use and that all non-medical use should be recognised as abuse, and also that in the opinion of doctors the use of opium as a stimulant could not be considered legitimate even in tropical countries." Granted the possibility of one exception — I grant it only for the sake of argument — it is the exception which proves the rule. Therefore no meddling with scientific definition can be tolerated. The exception must be dealt with as a purely internal and domestic problem by those who are immediately responsible. It is within the sovereign rights of any people to disregard the proofs and warnings of science, that great international guardian of human welfare, which has no favourites and is humane to all alike. But the moment a country interferes, directly or indirectly, with the policy of those nations which hold to the findings of science, it is their business to use every measure to defeat the intrusion.

There are three principal opium-producing countries in which trade in the drug is legitimatised by Government and involves large revenues — Turkey, Persia and India. Turkey and Persia give us, from their high-grade product (10% morphia content and upwards), an amount more than equal to the entire medical supply for the world; but they greatly over-produce and their over-production, which eventually takes the form of morphine, heroin and codein, is employed in debauching mankind. India, with her low-grade opium (8 1/2 % morphia content and downward) does not pretend to provide the market with a medicinal product. If poppy cultivation in India were to be confined at once within the limits of excise opium, there would be no difference whatever in the world supply of medicinal opium.

It is obvious, without argument, that, if we are to derive the use of opium within its proper boundaries, it is necessary to check the supply at its sources, confining, by some just *prorata* allotment, the opium required to the ascertained world need. As I have already pointed out, we have enough knowledge now to justify the reduction of opium by nine-tenths and run no risk of there being an opium famine.

Were drug addiction put on the list of diseases the causes of which have been ascertained, as indeed it should be, the method of science in dealing with it would be precisely the method by which we deal with malaria or yellow fever. The destruction of the mosquito prevents malaria or yellow fever. Therefore we do not waste our efforts merely by segregating and treating the infected. We go like sensible people to the source of infection and eliminate it. The over-cultivation of the poppy is a proven and grave cause of infection in the disease of morphia addiction. Let us then go after it and deal with it with the same expedition with which we would spray all standing water with kerosine if malaria or yellow fever threatened. It is estimated that in the United States alone there are not less than one million drug addicts. The severest domestic legislation is unable single-handed to cope with the problem. As in other health matters, so here, there must be world-wide concerted action. Drug addiction is not only a disease, but a disease far more terrible than that which attacks the body only. I would choose for myself, or for anyone I loved, malaria, or smallpox, or yellow fever, which kill the body, in preference to drug addiction, which kills both body and soul. To you who, like myself, stand for the well-being of every child of man, it is just as horrible to contemplate the short-lived rickshaw coolie, with his emaciated body punctured and scarred by the use of the hypodermic needle, as the secretive cunning victim of the same needle in our homes of refinement and culture.

Thus far I have made no mention of China. Opium-producing she is to an alarming degree. But not by law. The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. Edicts of Imperial days forbidding the importation and use of opium were systematically beaten down by outside trade. No nation but China has ever deliberately destroyed great stores of opium and the paraphernalia connected with it. To-day China is the victim of former exploitation and her own present weakness. The

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of the International Opium Conference, p. 14.



Republic has the most drastic laws ever enacted, but the old enemy of local tyranny and gainful production makes them of no effect. China is sick from head to foot of her body politic. We must figure out how we can best help her in her weakness and abjure any temptation to make profit out of her misfortune, as well as how we can defend ourselves from the effect of her backsliding. Peking is under temptation to establish a government monopoly of opium on the specious ground of creating revenue. All around her she sees conspicuous examples of it. As I have already observed, I did recommend a three-year term of Government monopoly for the Philippines. I am glad the recommendation failed to carry, for I have come to see its peril. When it is discovered how lucrative a method it is for purposes of revenue, Governments easily dissemble with themselves and postpone reform indefinitely. In 1903 we were assured by responsible Japanese that by degrees the Government control in Formosa would yield to prohibition. After twenty years, it remains a revenue-producing trade. It is playing with fire to establish a Government monopoly, unless perhaps as a temporary expedient leading up to prohibition and to be ended at a definite date, the nearer the wiser.

The greatest service we can render China is to induce her Government to resist all temptation to establish a monopoly, and ourselves to set an example how to suppress over-production and production other than for medicinal purpose. It is monstrous to argue that because a country is willing to be debauched, therefore it is justifiable to debauch it; or to maintain that if we do not reap a golden harvest from a nefarious trade, somebody else will and therefore we are foolish not to do it; or for a nation to think it possible to build up an honourable and righteous commonwealth with revenue gained from the exploitation of the weakness and vice of human beings, whether its own nationals or not. In the dawning day of co-operation and protection of the weak, we are for ever done with such sophistries as these.

In all that I have said, I have kept in mind the fact that the principles for which my nation stands, and which I have endeavoured faithfully and in accord with my conscience to present to you, must, if carried out, involve grave administrative difficulties and problems. This is a consideration which, however much it may make us shiver on the brink of action, must not deter us from taking the plunge courageously and promptly. Our course must be shaped on definite irrefutable principles of science, morality and religion. I am addressing representatives of nations which but recently held it of so great moment to be true to an ideal that they did not even try to count the cost as they plunged into the hell of war. The wisest of us little dreamed what lay beyond martial victory. I recall, when I came to preach in Paris the Sunday after Armistice Day, the text that I chose was: "The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." My sole comfort then and now is that "the spirit of God is moving" with ordering hand over our wrecked world.

There is such a thing as a penalty for right action, a penalty which reached its classic height in a certain Crucifixion, under whose stern beneficence the nations stand to-day in this our valley of decision. The United States of America, my own country, is here and is responsible for the policy of her dependencies — the United States, who, with her many faults and errors, stands honestly and firmly for the might of right and the commonwealth of mankind. England, whose blood flows in my veins, is here and is responsible for the moral policies of her colonies — England, who inspired me from earliest childhood by the high lights of her career, as, for instance, when her conscience bade her abolish the slave trade and she obeyed at enormous cost to her exchequer. France is here and is responsible for the moral policies of her colonies — France, with her romance and chivalry, who has never hesitated to "follow the gleam". Holland is here and is responsible for her colonies — the Netherlands, whose hospitable bosom has been the safe harbour and depository of international hopes and enterprises, and whose record for loyalty to conviction is one of history's most precious treasures. Portugal is here and is responsible for the moral policies of her colonies — Portugal, the adventurous, who, in other days, was unafraid to sail uncharted seas for God and country. Japan, the premier nation of the vast Orient, is here and is responsible for the moral policies of her colonies — Japan who, to protect her sacred traditions of the centuries, not long since lived a life so self-contained as to exclude all foreign touch, but who now walks hand-in-hand with the family of nations. Fifty-two nations, large and small, are here solemnly associated together to use concerted action for the building up of a new world on principles of equity and justice and mutual helpfulness. The time has come for action on one of the great moral questions of our times and the tide of opportunity runs high. The right is the right, and brooks no trifling or quibbling or standing on technicalities, except at the cost of penalties so black that by their side the penalties of doing right are white and inviting. We are in the valley of decision. There are but two alternatives. As Lord Grey has said: "The nations must learn or perish."

The CHAIRMAN said that the members of the Committee, who knew the part played by Bishop Brent, as promoter of the campaign against opium and as Chairman of the Conferences held at Shanghai and The Hague, had listened to his speech with the keenest interest. His presence in the Committee was a proof of the importance of the work of the Committee and was the greatest possible encouragement to the members.

Mr. PORTER (United States) began by thanking the Committee for the welcome which it had accorded to the American Delegation. He desired to assure the Committee that that delegation was attending the session in no spirit of criticism, but in the hope of establishing a common strategy for the suppression of a common evil. He then made the following statement:

The United States is of the opinion that there should be complete acceptance of, and compliance with, the terms and spirit of the Hague Opium Convention in dealing with the traffic in narcotic drugs. That Convention defines raw opium, prepared opium and medicinal opium, as well as morphine, cocaine and heroin. The Convention further binds the contracting parties

(Chapter I) to control the production and distribution of raw opium, to limit the number of ports through which the importation and exportation shall be permitted, to prevent the exportation of raw opium to countries which shall have limited the importation thereof, to mark packages containing more than five kilos of opium and not to permit the importation and exportation except through duly authorised persons. The Convention binds the contracting Powers (Chapter II) to take measures for the gradual and efficacious suppression of the manufacture, the internal traffic in, and the use of, prepared opium so far as conditions allow, and to prohibit the importation and exportation of prepared opium as soon as possible; (Chapter III) to limit the manufacture, sale and use of medicinal opium, cocaine and their alkaloids and derivatives to medical and legitimate uses only; (Chapter IV) to co-operate with the Chinese Government to prevent the smuggling of opium, cocaine or their derivatives, to adopt necessary measures for the restraint and control of the opium-smoking habit in their leased territories, settlements and concessions in China and to prohibit the illegal importation into China of opium and cocaine or their derivatives through the post. China is bound to enact pharmacy laws regulating the sale or distribution of opium, cocaine or their derivatives which the contracting Powers will, if acceptable, make applicable to their nationals residing in China. Finally, (Chapter V) the contracting Powers are bound to examine the possibility of enacting laws and regulations making the illegal possession of opium, cocaine, their salts and derivatives liable to penalties; and to communicate to each other: (a) the text of laws and administrative regulations which concern matters referred to in the Convention, and (b) statistical information in respect of that which concerns the traffic in raw opium, prepared opium, morphine, cocaine and their respective salts, as well as other drugs or their salts or preparations aimed at by the Convention.

It has seemed necessary to set forth the provisions of the Hague Convention at some length, in so far as they call for legislation by the adhering Powers, in order to demonstrate how far the United States has gone in putting the Convention into effect.

Under Chapters I, III and V the United States has legislation which controls the manufacture, distribution and sale of narcotic drugs and renders illegal the possession of narcotic drugs by an unregistered or unlicensed person except upon prescription from a physician, or other practitioner, written for legitimate medicinal uses. Raw opium and coca leaves are not produced in the United States, but there is legislation which prohibits the importation of all narcotic drugs except such quantities of crude opium or coca leaves as the Federal Narcotics Control Board shall find necessary. By regulation, it is provided that only manufacturers actually engaged in manufacturing may import — and then only through the ports of New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Detroit and Indianapolis. Exports of narcotic drugs may be made with the permission of the Federal Narcotic Control Board to a country which has ratified and become a party to the Hague Opium Convention and its final protocol, and then only when such country has instituted and maintains in conformity with that Convention a system (which the Federal Narcotics Control Board deems adequate) of permits or licences for the control of imports of such narcotic drugs.

Under Chapter II the United States prohibits absolutely the importation and exportation of prepared opium and, by means of prohibitory taxation, makes it impossible to conduct establishments for the manufacture, sale or use of this type of opium.

Under Chapter IV the United States has a treaty with China, supplemented by domestic legislation, antedating the Convention, which prohibits American citizens from importing opium into China or engaging in the opium traffic in China. Copies of the legislation, regulations and statistical material available have been transmitted to the signatory Powers through the Netherlands Government (Chapter V).

The United States makes this statement in order to demonstrate that it has endeavoured to carry out its obligations under the Hague Opium Convention.

The United States has no wish to enter into a discussion of the powers and duties of this Committee, but feels that it is due to itself and to the Governments here assembled to state clearly what it understands the Hague Convention to mean. The United States condemns, and understands the Hague Opium Convention to bind the contracting Powers to suppress, the traffic in and use of prepared or smoking opium in any form. Further, the United States regards the manufacture and use of narcotic drugs, *i. e.*, alkaloids or other narcotic derivatives of opium or coca leaves, for other than medicinal or scientific purposes as an abusive use under the Convention. In regard to raw opium, the production, distribution, importation and exportation of which the Convention binds the adhering Powers to control, the attitude of the United States, as shown by its legislation, is that it is a dangerous drug and that its use for other than strictly medicinal or scientific purposes is unlawful. The United States feels that the unrestricted production of raw opium inevitably results in a surplus of the drug over and above that required for medicinal and scientific purposes and the diversion of it or its derivatives — morphine, heroin and codeine — into illicit channels of international traffic, thereby creating a problem of universal international concern, and making impossible the execution of laws adopted by the several Governments under the terms of the Convention. The United States believes, therefore, that the unrestricted production of opium should not be permitted, and that the cultivation of the opium poppy should be limited to a point where there is no danger that the product will be available for other than medicinal and scientific purposes.

The production of coca leaves presents a problem similar to that of raw opium, and the attitude of the United States in this respect is the same as that stated in regard to the production of opium.

The United States has made a sincere effort to comply with the terms of the Hague Opium Convention, and is prepared to consider seriously any further measures which may be suggested for stricter control of the traffic in narcotic drugs. It feels, however, that the adoption of the foregoing principles, and their realisation in legislative measures that will prevent the international traffic in raw opium and coca leaves (as well as their derivatives) for non-medicinal or non-scientific

tific purposes, constitute a minimum of what can be considered as compliance with the spirit of the Convention.

Recently the Congress of the United States adopted by unanimous vote in both Houses, a resolution, which was approved by the Secretary of State and signed by the President, reading in part as follows:

“That the effective control of these drugs can be obtained only by limiting the production thereof to the quantity required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes, thus eradicating the source or root of the present conditions, which are solely due to production many times greater than is necessary for such purposes.”

The United States trusts that the principles set forth above will commend themselves to the Powers which are parties to the Hague Opium Convention.

The United States suggests, therefore, that the Committee adopt the principles set forth and embody them in its report and recommendations, as the basis upon which effective international co-operation can be established.

As a concrete expression of these principles so far as concerns opium and its derivatives, the following propositions are submitted to the Opium Advisory Committee in the earnest hope that they will be agreed to and their adoption recommended to the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations, in order that the doubts, if any, which now exist as to the true intent and meaning of the Hague Opium Convention shall be permanently removed:

1. If the purpose of the Hague Opium Convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent, it must be recognised that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate.

2. In order to prevent the abuse of these products, it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medicinal and non-scientific purposes.

In support of the first proposition it is necessary only to refer to Chapters II and III of the Hague Convention. These two chapters are the heart of that instrument and embody in concrete form the purposes which the Contracting Powers intended to accomplish when they entered into the Convention. Other portions of the Convention must be regarded in the light of ancillary or accessory provisions which will enable the Contracting Powers to attain the objects set forth in the second and third chapters. Chapter II binds the Contracting Powers to attain the objects set forth in the second and third chapters. Chapter II binds the Contracting Powers, among other things, to suppress the use of prepared opium. The use of this drug is clearly condemned and there is nowhere in the language of the Convention any phrase which can be construed as condoning the use of this narcotic. Chapter III deals with medicinal opium and its derivatives. It implies that the unlimited production of this class of drugs without restrictions on their use is causing irreparable injury to the health and morality of the people of the world. Specifically, it binds the Contracting Powers, *inter alia*, “to limit the manufacture, the sale, and the use of morphine and its salts to medical and legitimate uses only.” There can be no doubt that these provisions were written into the Convention because the Contracting Powers believed that the traffic in opium derivatives was an international evil of great magnitude which must be suppressed. There would appear to be no reasonable grounds for disputing this interpretation, especially in view of the language of the preamble to the Convention, where the Contracting Powers resolve to pursue progressive suppression of the abuse of opium, morphine, cocaine, as well as drugs prepared or derived from these substances, giving rise, or which may give rise, to analogous abuses, taking into consideration the necessity and the mutual profit of an international understanding on this point, being convinced that they will meet in this humanitarian effort the unanimous adherence of all the nations interested.

In support of the second proposition, a study of the Convention as a whole leaves no doubt of the fact that the signatories were of the opinion that the only effective method for carrying out the humane provisions of Chapters II and III was by the establishment of an efficacious control over production, and therefore the Convention provides in Article I that:

“The Contracting Powers shall enact effective laws or regulations for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium”.

The use of the word “control” fully bears out this construction, as the Courts have uniformly held that the word “control” means to exercise restraining or governing influence over, to check, counteract, to restrain, to regulate, to govern, to overpower, and used as either a verb or a noun its significance is the same.

It is an accepted legal maxim that an instrument must be considered as a whole and that its various divisions are merely sections of one document. It is further an ordinary legal principle that one section of an instrument cannot be so construed as to defeat the purpose of the whole document.

Oppenheim, in the third edition of his “International Law”, Volume I, page 701, states:

“All treaties must be interpreted according to their reasonable, in contradistinction to their literal, sense...”

“It is to be taken for granted that the parties intend the stipulations of a treaty to have a certain effect, and not to be meaningless. Therefore, an interpretation is not admissible which would make a stipulation meaningless, or ineffective.”

In "Moore's International Law Digest", Volume V, page 249 *et seq.*, the following statements appear:

"A treaty is not only a law, but also a contract between two nations, and, under familiar rules, it must, if possible, be so construed as to give full force and effect to all its parts."

"Vattel says that the interpretation which would render a treaty null and inefficient cannot be admitted: that it ought to be interpreted in such a manner as that it may have its effect, and not prove vain and nugatory."

"It is a rule in construing treaties as well as laws, to give a sensible meaning to all their provisions, if that be practicable."

"*The reason of the law, or of the treaty* — that is to say the motive which led to the making of it, and the object in contemplation at the time, is the most certain clue to lead us to the discovery of its true meaning; and great attention should be paid to this circumstance, whenever there is question either of explaining an obscure, ambiguous, indeterminate passage in a law or treaty, or of applying it to a particular case. *When once we certainly know the reason which alone has determined the will of the person speaking, we ought to interpret and apply his words in a manner suitable to that reason alone; otherwise, he will be made to speak and act contrary to his intention and in opposition to his own views.*"

There can be no doubt that, bearing these principles in mind, the signatories to the Hague Convention were called upon to "enact effective laws or regulations for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium" in such a manner that the execution of the provisions of the second and third chapters would be assured. Large production of opium means in actual practice the manufacture and consumption of large quantities of opium products, regardless of laws restricting their use to strictly medicinal and scientific purposes.

Many nations, including the United States, have elaborate and carefully administered systems of control of habit-forming narcotic drugs, which have proven partially, if not wholly, ineffective by reason of the fact that the great commercial value of these drugs, the large financial gains derived from handling them, the smallness of their bulk — which renders detection in transportation and sale exceedingly difficult — have induced and encouraged the unscrupulous to divert the enormous over-production into the channel of illicit international traffic to such an extent that the abusive use of them has become an international affliction. This illicit traffic consists of every narcotic derived from the poppy, including raw opium, prepared opium, and practically every known derivative. These drugs by reason of their extraordinary nature overcome all barriers, even the bars of prisons, and the effective suppression of their abusive use can only be achieved by the drastic enforcement of the extraordinary remedy fully provided for in the Convention, which was adopted for the sole purpose of creating a control of production whereby the signatories would be free from danger from opium or its derivatives produced in another's territory.

To assume or to argue that Article I, providing for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium, means anything but such control as will prevent a surplus available for abusive uses is plainly a construction that defeats the very purpose of the Convention itself and is in this instance repugnant to natural and divine precepts. "Good faith requires", as Cicero observes, "that a man should consider as well what he intends as what he says."

---

### THIRD MEETING

*held on Friday, May 25th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

#### 8. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (*continued*)

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had been much impressed by the speeches of Bishop Brent and Mr. Porter at the previous meeting, and that he wished to endorse the American attitude towards the solution of the opium problem, which was inspiring in the fight against this evil of world-wide concern. Mr. Porter had taken a practical standpoint, while Bishop Brent had dealt with the subject from the aspect of an idealist, and both of them were spokesmen of American principle and doctrine.

The opium question was indisputably international, and no effective solution was possible without the co-operative support of all countries. Therefore production, distribution and consumption had to be considered simultaneously, since it would be useless to try to stop the traffic while the production of opium was unlimited. The Committee's efforts must be directed towards the source of the drugs. Cultivation must be controlled, and the manufacture of morphia and other dangerous drugs must be limited to legitimate requirements. He entirely agreed with Mr. Porter's

definition of the words "legitimate purposes" as meaning medicinal and scientific purposes, and he pointed out that Dr. Wellington Koo had previously expressed the same opinion.

He wished to draw the attention of the American Delegation to the reports of the Committee of the last two or three years, and he referred to the resolution proposed by himself and adopted at the last Assembly, which Sir Malcolm Delevingne had quoted at the previous meeting.<sup>1</sup>

He had been struck by the view expressed by the American Delegation regarding the question of an opium monopoly. A monopoly was not a source of permanent revenue to a State which adopted it with the object of carrying out the gradual and effective suppression of the traffic. The American Delegation had stated that a number of Far Eastern colonies were still dependent upon the large revenues which they obtained from the opium monopoly. This was not in accordance with the Hague Convention, Article 6 of which read as follows:

"The Contracting Powers shall take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in, and use of prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence."

He wished to refer the Committee to the statistics sent in by various countries,<sup>2</sup> from which it was evident that consumption had steadily increased year by year since the drawing up of the International Opium Convention in 1912. From a comparison of the figures contained in this document, it was apparent that most countries were not carrying out the provisions of the Convention and, therefore, he saw no reason why China alone should be criticised for her inability to do so.

He asked the Committee not to confine its criticisms to China, which, owing to the present political situation, was, at the moment, in the position of a sick person. So long as the law prohibiting the traffic in opium remained in existence, opium production and smoking would never be legally permissible in China. In 1918, a large quantity of opium, worth several million dollars, had been burned in Shanghai. This showed the good-will of the Chinese Government.

The rumour that China contemplated the establishment of an opium monopoly was quite unfounded, and he had been authorised by his Government to state that the possibility and advisability of legalising the opium traffic in China had never been considered. China was endeavouring to carry out the Hague Convention and would continue to do her utmost with the help of the Committee's criticism and good-will.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were two questions raised in the proposals submitted by the American Delegation, the first concerning the definition of legitimate requirements, the second the limitation of production. These two questions figured as item 7 on the agenda. He proposed, therefore, that the discussion on the substance and details connected with them should be postponed until that item was considered, and that the members of the Committee should confine themselves to making a general statement on the principles involved. The importance of the questions raised would seem to justify their being discussed twice over.

*The Committee agreed to this procedure.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he much appreciated the manner in which the American Delegation had put forward their case. Mr. Porter had dealt with it dispassionately, and without using a single term to which exception could reasonably be taken by anyone; and if Bishop Brent had had some unpleasant things to say he had said them in the pleasantest possible manner. This rendered his own task very much easier than it would otherwise have been. At the outset, he desired to point out that he was speaking as the representative of his Government; he had a mandate, and he had to keep within its terms. This possessed advantages as well as disadvantages. One disadvantage was that he could not give the Committee a definitive decision on the part of his Government at the moment; one advantage was that if the view he might put forward on behalf of his Government should not meet with the Committee's approval, or should not go as far as it thought it possible to go, that matter could be corrected by it later.

There was another preliminary point of some importance. He assumed that the two resolutions put forward by Mr. Porter were not necessarily definitive and in their final form; and he hoped that the wording of these resolutions might, if that appeared desirable, be modified, if a form of words acceptable to Mr. Porter could be agreed on.

He thought it advisable to give, as briefly as possible, a résumé of the actual facts of the case as regarded India's position as a consumer and exporter of opium. It was necessary that these facts should be understood, as they had an important bearing on the questions before the Committee for decision.

In India, the Government was concerned both with internal consumption and with export. The quantities used for these two purposes might be taken very roughly as equal. The Government controlled the production, distribution, sale, possession — every possible practical question

<sup>1</sup> The resolution was as follows:

"The Assembly again desires to emphasise the view expressed in the report of the Advisory Committee that so long as the drugs to which Part III, particularly Article 9, of the International Opium Convention applies are produced in quantities exceeding the legitimate requirements, there is a great danger that the surplus will find its way into illegitimate channels, and that the control of production, so as to limit it to the amount required for medical and legitimate purposes, is the most effective method of putting a stop to the illicit traffic. It recommends that the enquiry now proceeding into the world's legitimate requirements should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible, and expresses the hope that a provisional estimate and scheme will be submitted to the Assembly next year."

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 4.



which could arise in connection with opium — in the strictest possible manner, and had done so for over 60 years. They had built up a complicated and highly efficient administrative system which started from the time the poppy-seed was put into the ground, and did not relinquish control of the drug until it was finally in the hands of the consumers, or till it was actually exported. As a result of many years of steady effort and of sound administration, the Indian Government had been able to hold the consumption in India steady at a figure which compared favourably with the official figures recorded for various European and other countries. That, in his view, demonstrated conclusively the honesty and sincerity of purpose with which the Government of India had addressed itself to its extremely difficult task.

Over 100 years ago, the East India Company had attempted to prohibit the consumption of opium in India. They had failed. The Government of India had, in 1873, submitted its whole policy and practice, in the greatest possible detail, to the searching scrutiny of an able and impartial Royal Commission. One member of that Commission had been Mr. Arthur Pease, an influential member of the Council of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Traffic. His brother was, Mr. Campbell thought, the President of that society, and Mr. Pease himself had for years been identified with the view that opium was a dangerous and an accursed thing, and that it was being abused in India. He had gone to India, had examined the question in detail for two years; had learned the facts for himself, and had signed the report of the Royal Commission without dissent. That seemed to Mr. Campbell more important than any quantity of theoretical discussion. An honest man with nothing to gain, who had examined the question in the fullest possible way, had had the courage to reverse the opinions of a lifetime, and had accepted the Royal Commission's view that the policy and the practice of the Government of India were alike sound and sensible and conceived solely in the best interests of the people in their charge.

The Government of India had at no time, either as regards internal or external consumption, allowed revenue considerations to determine its policy. He desired to lay stress on that point.

As regarded internal consumption, when the Indian Government had taken over Burmah — which was about the year 1886 — it had at once prohibited the consumption of opium throughout Upper Burmah. As regards Lower Burmah, it had a very complete system of registration, which still continued in force, and which practically prevented Burmah from obtaining the drug. Out of 13 million inhabitants, he thought only 5,000 registered smokers existed. The policy of prohibition and restriction in Burmah had been carried out regardless of the cost involved; various circumstances rendered that cost very heavy. The Government of India's internal policy had, in fact, been framed solely in the interests of the people in their charge. It had prohibited opium in Burmah because it had considered it was bad for Burmans; it allowed opium in India, and would continue to allow it, because it was firmly convinced — having formed its opinion after the most elaborate enquiry — that it would be unfair, unwise and unjust to do otherwise. He quoted the official opinion of his Government that

“To prevent the sale of opium, except under regular medical prescription, would be a mockery; to many millions it would be sheer inhumanity.”

These were strong words, but they represented the considered opinion of the Government of India on the subject.

As regarded the Indian Government's external trade, that Government did not allow financial considerations to dictate its policy in this case either. When it became a question of making arrangements with China, the Government of India had voluntarily sacrificed their revenue from the Chinese traffic. The amount had been approximately £4,000,000 a year — a recurring sum, which constituted about 8½% of the total net revenue of India at the time. That amount was sacrificed in the hope that China's effort would be successful; and in estimating the importance of this sacrifice it should be added that, to the best of his knowledge, no one in India believed that the effort made by China could possibly succeed as a permanent measure.

Further, in order to guard China against certain possibilities of smuggling, the Indian Government had reduced the amount of opium which they sent to other Far Eastern countries.

Grossly exaggerated statements had been made on the subject of the revenue derived by the Government of India from opium. The facts, which were easily verifiable, as the Government of India had for very many years published all statistics relating to the opium traffic, were that the revenue from the export of opium was approximately £2,000,000 a year, and the gross revenue from the internal consumption of opium was just under £2,000,000 a year. The revenue derived by the Government of India from the internal consumption of opium was less than 2d. per head per annum of the population of India. The annual revenue derived from the export of opium was, again, under 2d. per head of the population. He thought that these figures would put in their true light the financial aspect, so far as the Government of India was concerned. The total opium revenue was less than 8 cents per head a year in American money, or 4d. per head in English money; and the total revenue at the moment was approximately equal to the amount which the Indian Government had given up voluntarily in 1911 when it had made its agreement with China.

The total revenue of India for the last year for which Mr. Campbell had figures before him was something over £126,000,000. The opium revenue he had quoted represented something like 3% of that sum.

As regarded its export trade, the Government of India had followed a consistent, logical and perfectly sound policy. It did not send any opium to any country which did not require it, and it had made administrative arrangements, the efficiency of which had never been challenged, to secure that this policy was in fact effective. Its total exports for the last year for which he had figures (1922) had been 8,128 chests. The exports had fallen year by year. When the agree-

ment with China was concluded, the exports from India to the countries in the Far East other than China were 16,000 chests a year. This figure had now been reduced by half.

It had often been alleged that India was a danger to the world as regarded its exports of opium. The amounts exported were usually grotesquely exaggerated. He had given the net figure above. No opium was sent to any country which prohibited imports; none was sent in excess of any country's stated requirements; and the Indian Government demanded, before a country could obtain a single pound of Indian opium, a certificate from the Government of that country stating that the opium was required for legitimate purposes. It seemed to the Government of India that it was impossible to go further in practice in controlling the traffic. He thought their practice was wholly in accord with the principles for which Mr. Porter contended. His object was to show that what the Government of India had actually done and what it guaranteed to continue to do was entirely in accord with Mr. Porter's views.

As regarded the interpretation of the Hague Convention, he could not agree with Mr. Porter. It seemed to him that the plain wording of the Convention bound the producing Governments to control their production effectively in accordance with the requirements of Chapters II and III and with the object of securing the ends which the Convention was stated to be designed to attain. To give a specific instance: India could under the Convention produce raw opium destined for the production of prepared opium for consumption under, and in accordance with the terms of, the Convention; but India could not legally produce raw opium destined for the illicit production of morphine, nor would the Government of India allow such production. If, as he understood, it was contended that the meaning of the Convention was that the Government of India could not allow the production of any opium unless that opium was destined solely for scientific or medical requirements, then he was afraid that his Government could not accept that interpretation — though, of course, it might possibly be prepared to go further than he could in accordance with the terms of his present instructions. That interpretation seemed to him contrary to the terms of the Convention. There was one point in that connection he would like to emphasise. If Mr. Porter's contention that a Government could not produce opium not destined for definite scientific or medical requirements were accepted, this would at once stultify the whole of Chapter II of the Convention. The Committee would find that Chapter II, while requiring the gradual suppression of the use of prepared opium, definitely provided a procedure under which the use of this prepared opium could continue pending suppression. If Mr. Porter's argument were accepted, it would follow that opium could not be produced for a purpose for which the Convention itself made provision. He could see no answer to that argument, if the Committee accepted Mr. Porter's contention. If Mr. Porter's interpretation of the first chapter of the Convention were accepted, it would be impossible to provide for the requirements of the second chapter. On the other hand, if the interpretation which the Governments and this Committee had hitherto accepted and acted on without challenge were adopted, the whole Convention became logical, consistent and effective. By the first chapter, a Government had to control production effectively and that control must be such as to enable the whole of the Convention's articles to be applied. Control was the essential point. Under the second chapter, Governments were required to make arrangements for the progressive suppression of the use of prepared opium, and that progressive suppression would, of course, be reflected back upon the production of opium.

The consuming government had to control consumption; the producing government had to control production, and also the export of that production to the consuming country. They had to make the best arrangements they could to carry out these purposes. That was done effectively — provided honesty on the part of all was assured — by the Export and Import Certificate System. Patagonia, to take the favourite example, could not obtain a single pound of opium unless she certified that it was required for a legitimate purpose. It was for Patagonia to state what was legitimate — no one else could decide for her. If Patagonia was prepared to give an incorrect certificate, there was nothing in *any* system which would prevent misuse of opium. It could give an incorrect certificate that the opium was required for "scientific and medical purposes" just as easily as an incorrect certificate that it was required for "legitimate" purposes. It was impossible to go further than the only Government which was in a position to ascertain the facts of the case, and impossible to place the responsibility upon any other Government.

When the matter had been discussed at The Hague — India's position had been explained in detail by the late Sir William Meyer. He had stated the special difficulties in India, which had been authoritatively dealt with in the report of the Royal Commission. A reasoned memorandum had been presented, and it had been made clear that a Convention acceptable to India could not be attained unless these special difficulties were met. The Hague Convention had in fact been framed in such a manner as to meet those difficulties, and this interpretation of it had never been challenged until that moment.

It seemed to him that, for the reasons he had stated, very grave doubt existed as to whether the contention of Mr. Porter was in fact correct. If grave doubt did exist on this subject, and if the Committee, and, following the Committee, the Council and the Assembly, should authoritatively adopt an interpretation as to the correctness of which there was doubt, then it seemed to him that the League of Nations would be laying itself open to very serious criticism. He had been present at two Assemblies, and nothing had impressed him more than the jealous manner in which the Governments regarded any attempt to interfere with their sovereign rights. The League of Nations' present mandate in this matter was to supervise the execution of the Hague Convention, and it followed therefore that this was also the mandate of the Advisory Committee. If it now adopted authoritatively an interpretation which would be disputed, not only by his own but also by other Governments, then it seemed to him that the Committee would be acting inadvisedly and would be giving some show of colour to the criticism that the League was setting up as a Super-State,

and was attempting to draw into its own hands all the power it could. That was an objection which might possibly have peculiar importance as regarded some countries at the present time.

He earnestly hoped that an agreement would be reached on this matter. His main object had been to show that the Government of India's practice, and the policy behind that practice, were in accord with the spirit which actuated America. If that was so, then he did not see why the Committee should not be able to agree upon a form of wording which might meet the peculiar difficulties that existed.

Bishop Brent had, he thought, suggested that, as regarded the internal use of opium in India, there might be a possibility of coming to some sort of understanding relative to America's acceptance of the meaning of the Hague Convention. The difficulty felt was that the Government of India could not, he considered, accept for its own nationals a different (and *ex hypothesi* a lower) principle than that which it was urged that the Convention required it to apply in the case of the nationals of other countries. Bishop Brent had quoted Warren Hastings, who had been a distinguished Governor-General of India, but Warren Hastings' standard of morality, as quoted, was not likely to commend itself to the Government of India of the present time. It could hardly apply to its nationals in India regulations based upon a different and a lower principle from that adopted in dealing with the nationals of other countries. He hoped Mr. Porter would appreciate the difficulty on that point. If, as the Government of India held, the population of India must continue to be supplied with opium, for other than strictly medical and scientific purposes, it would be difficult for it to agree that this usage was contrary to the obligations it had undertaken under the Hague Convention, both in respect of its own nationals and others.

He did not know whether it would be possible to come to an agreement as regarded the form of the wording of the resolutions. He was most anxious to do so. He did not know whether the Government of India would be prepared to go further than his present instructions permitted him to go. He sincerely hoped, however, that it would be possible to arrive at some arrangement by which the effective co-operation of the United States of America in the matter could be secured. His own view, based on long experience in India, and a fairly complete knowledge of the position generally, was that the Hague Convention as it stood at the moment — and it had only been in force for two years — had only to be honestly, efficiently and universally enforced for the opium problem to be solved immediately.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Campbell could obtain the opinion of his Government on the American proposals before the end of the session.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he thought that this would be somewhat difficult. Two kinds of authorities would have to be consulted. The Secretary of State would have to telegraph to the Government of India, and the Government of India would have to send a reply, which would reach him through the Secretary of State. He thought the matter somewhat complicated to be dealt with by telegram. He could telegraph the substance, but doubted very much whether it would be possible to put the case adequately before his Government by this means or to receive a reply within the time during which the Committee would sit. He was, however, entirely in the Committee's hands in the matter.

M. POENSGEN (Germany) said that in Germany the only legitimate use of the drugs in question was medical and scientific. The only use considered medical was the taking of drugs in medicinal form under the unceasing supervision of a doctor. Any use of drugs in the form of stimulants was strictly forbidden. Germany would raise no objection to the limitation of production on condition that limitation would not only be recognised and adopted by all countries, but would also be generally carried out.

He desired to reserve the question of the amount of drugs which should be exported. In his opinion, the question of the limitation of the production of the raw material should first be discussed and, when that was effected, an automatic reduction of the production of pure alkaloids would follow.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had listened with the greatest sympathy to the eloquent and moving address of Bishop Brent, and with the greatest interest to the reasoned statement of Mr. Porter. As the representative of Great Britain, he had very little, or nothing, to say in general, either against Mr. Porter's argument, if he had understood it rightly, or against the principles, as principles, which he had enunciated in the letter addressed to the Committee.

He thought that the Committee agreed that the control provided for in Article I of the Convention was control with a view, as Mr. Campbell had said, to making the provisions of the Convention effective. Control which allowed of any production for purposes inconsistent with the Convention would obviously fall short of its intention. An examination of the provisions of the Convention showed that it dealt with two uses to which opium was put: first, the preparation of opium for smoking, and secondly, the use of opium for the manufacture of drugs. On both these questions the Convention laid down a distinct policy: in the one case, the suppression of the use of prepared opium, while recognising that this suppression might have to be gradual; in the other case, a limitation of the manufacture to that required for scientific and medical uses. It followed that the control of production stipulated by Article I should be exercised so as not to be inconsistent in any way with the principles laid down by the Convention of 1912, and accepted by the Governments of all the countries which had adhered to that Convention. When Part II had been given full effect, and the use of prepared opium was finally suppressed, then the provisions as to the control of the production of raw opium in Article I would require that the control must be such as to



prevent the production of opium for that purpose. He had not understood Mr. Porter to express any different view. It was worth noting that the Convention did not deal with the use of raw opium for other purposes, such as the semi-medical use which was common in some Oriental countries. The Convention had made no provision in regard to this use, and said nothing about it. He did not understand Mr. Porter to express any opinion on this point, and it was unnecessary for him to dwell upon it. Mr. Porter's argument, which had been based on the intention and spirit of the Convention, did not appear to him to rule it out.

On both matters dealt with in the Convention, the suppression of the use of prepared opium and the limitation of the production of manufactured drugs was the policy of the British Government.

He referred to Bishop Brent's remarks with regard to the influence of financial considerations on the policy of governments. So far as the British Government was concerned, its policy had been expressed in regard to the use of prepared opium in a memorandum which had been issued in the previous year by the Home Office, and from which he read the following extract:

"Hong-Kong is ready and willing to co-operate in the suppression of the traffic and it will have no hesitation in accepting any financial sacrifice that may be entailed in making suppression effective; but suppression is impracticable except *pari passu* with similar suppression in the neighbouring territories."

On behalf of the British Government, he had certain proposals to put forward in regard to both these matters; that was to say, the effective application of Part II of the Convention, which dealt with the use of opium for smoking and for measures to be taken for restricting the production of drugs. Along both lines, the British Government looked for an effective diminution of the demand, and consequently of the supply of raw opium which the American Delegation was so earnest in desiring. The desires of the British Government were the same.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that personally he supported the American proposals, all the more so since a Bill, presented by the Government of the Republic, was before the Portuguese Chamber concerning the import of dangerous drugs into both continental and insular Portugal. In this Bill it was laid down that the import of those products was only permissible when they were for legitimate medical and scientific purposes.

He supported the second American proposal because, in his opinion, that was the only way of solving the opium problem.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that he had heard with great interest the statements of Bishop Brent and Mr. Porter. The general situation, as exposed by the former, and the interpretation of the Convention of 1912, by the latter, expressed entirely in principle the views of the Siamese Government; but whether the desire of the Siamese Government to attain the aims as expressed in the motions of Mr. Porter would be realised or not depended upon the co-operation of other Powers, especially those with which Siam was in treaty relations. He would explain later the difficulties she had experienced and was experiencing in carrying out the policy of the suppression of the abuse of opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could easily take a decision on the two questions raised by the American Delegation, if not regarding their application, certainly regarding the principles contained in them. The first question concerned legitimate requirements.

If, in the opinion of doctors, medical use only was considered legitimate, this was also to be concluded from the text and spirit of the Convention, as well as from the discussions of the Advisory Committee, which had maintained that consumption in all its forms was legitimate in any country which had not entirely prohibited it.

He desired to add that the word "legitimate" should be understood in a special sense in this instance, in the sense which had been given to it by the Legal Section of the Secretariat. That Section had given the following opinion:

"The complete and effective suppression of the manufacture of, home trade in, and use of prepared opium constitutes one of the ultimate obligations undertaken by Governments under the 1912 Convention; but it is for each State to decide, according to individual circumstances, as to the precise manner in which its suppression may be brought about."

With regard to the second proposal concerning the control of production, the principle could be easily adopted, but its application was difficult. They were all in agreement regarding the principle. It was the excess production in certain countries which was the fundamental cause of the evil, and therefore the control of this production was necessary. This was laid down by Article 1 of the Convention, but, nevertheless, the Convention did not forbid the cultivation of the poppy and the question of cultivation was a national one, which it would be a very delicate matter to settle by means of an international agreement.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, with regard to the proposals of the American Delegation, he wished to point out that, as long as the local Netherlands Indian law, in compliance with Article 6 of the Convention, permitted the use of prepared opium, he could not declare that use to be illegitimate, as far as the word possessed the same meaning as unlawful.

As the Committee might have deduced from his memorandum on the opium policy in the Netherlands Indies, the endeavours of the Netherlands Indies Government had for their ultimate

object the total suppression of the use of prepared opium; but for the present it could not prohibit it at once, because it might lead to the outbreak of a large-scale contraband traffic. Only in the event of there being no further danger of any extensive contraband traffic could the Government give due consideration to the question as to what more vigorous measures might be taken to attain the end in view. In consequence, every reasonable measure internationally taken that might be likely to check the illicit traffic would, he thought, be supported by his Government.

He had also to repudiate the idea that financial considerations caused the postponement of measures that would decrease consumption. At the Shanghai Commission, the Netherlands Delegation had declared that the Netherlands Government, being convinced of the desirability of restricting the use of opium, would never be prevented by financial considerations from taking such measures as would, in its opinion, genuinely effect a gradual decrease in consumption.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she shared the opinion of the American Delegation and therefore supported both proposals.

Sir John JORDAN desired to express the pleasure he felt at seeing the United States Government so ably and fully represented. He was particularly interested in these problems so far as the Far East was concerned, and he could say without fear of contradiction that the United States Government had always had a spotless record in the Far East and it could therefore speak with undeniable authority. Bishop Brent had made a very moving appeal, and Mr. Porter had followed it up with a very well-reasoned statement based upon the Treaty of 1912. He associated himself whole-heartedly with the two resolutions put forward by the United States Government. He had for the last two years repeatedly urged the same point of view in the Committee, and it was a peculiar pleasure to him to see it now, as he hoped, within measurable distance of being accepted. Mr. Porter had given a very sound reasoned statement of the legal position of the Convention. He had told the Committee that it ought to construe it in the spirit and not in the letter. That is what he had always held. If it were not construed in the spirit it simply would be a useless instrument. Although he was no longer a servant of the British Government, he felt justified in saying that, in his opinion, the British Government in 1912 had accepted that view. In 1912, the Hague Convention was negotiated. For five years previous to 1912, the British Government had been actively engaged in the campaign against opium in China, most earnestly acting in co-operation with the Chinese Government and authorities, whose action he desired to acknowledge. They had been actively engaged for those five years in the suppression of the cultivation of opium in China, and it was inconceivable to him that the British Government, in putting its signature to the Hague Convention, had intended to adopt a different policy from that which it had pursued in China.

He had spent ten years of his life on this question in China, and had been associated entirely with the suppression of the cultivation. From that experience he could say that it was the only method of dealing with this problem; the Committee must strike at the root. In China it had been found quite impossible to deal with it by other means. He knew that this method was said to have been a failure. Cultivation had been largely recrudescing; but he maintained that in the year 1917 opium in China had been practically suppressed. Therefore it could be claimed that a successful experiment on these lines at least in China had been made. He advocated the same procedure now, and therefore entirely agreed with the opinions expressed by the American Delegation.

He desired to speak about public opinion. He had always insisted, and so had Mrs. Hamilton Wright, on publicity. They had asked time after time that the meetings of the Committee should be made public, and he was happy to congratulate the Committee on accepting that proposal at last. In his view public opinion was the great factor in the question. Unless public opinion was roused success was unattainable. He had been in correspondence with Chinese Chambers of Commerce, with the International Missionary Association in Peking, and the National Council. He had received a telegram from the National Council saying they were moving in the matter.

There were many things in Mr. Campbell's statement to which he wished to reply. He would deal with them when the proposals of the United States were discussed in detail. For instance, in his opinion, the import and export certificates so far as they applied to Crown Colonies were not an effective measure. What really happened, and concealment was useless, was that India made an agreement with the British Crown Colonies and with the colonies of the European Powers, by which these colonies imported a certain amount of opium. As Mr. Campbell had said, India was not responsible. India did not sell opium to anybody who did not give a certificate, but everyone knew that opium was being consumed in those colonies far in excess of the requirements. Many of those colonies were deriving 50 % of their whole revenue from it. It was absurd to say, therefore, that financial considerations did not enter into the matter. He did not desire to apportion the share of responsibility between India and the colonies of European Powers, but he maintained that the two combined were engaged in a traffic that could not be defended. In his opinion, the only solution lay in limiting production.

M. BRENIER desired, in the first place, to say how glad he was to find present at the Committee the eminent and eloquent President of the International Commission of Shanghai and the International Conference of the Hague, Bishop Brent, who had whole-heartedly devoted so many years to the opium problem.

He desired, as ex-Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Opium Convention of 1912, to give certain explanations to the Committee. He thought himself able to explain both the spirit and the letter of the Convention and he desired also to recall the circumstances in which it had been drawn up.

As to the spirit of the Convention, it was sufficient to read the preamble:

“The Signatories”.

“Desirous of advancing a step further on the road opened by the International Commission of Shanghai of 1909;

“Determined to bring about the gradual suppression of the abuse of opium, morphine and cocaine; as also of the drugs prepared or derived from these substances which give rise, or might give rise, to similar abuses;

“Taking into account the necessity and the mutual advantage of international agreement on this point,” etc.

The object aimed at was therefore the suppression, but the *gradual* suppression of the *abuse*.

As to the letter of the Convention, M. Brenier thought (and on this point he went further than his colleague Sir John Jordan) that the Convention enabled the goal aimed at to be attained more effectively than it was sometimes thought, if it were completely and sincerely applied.

As to raw opium, Article 1 stipulated:

“The Contracting Powers shall enact effective laws or regulations” — (it was not said “undertake to enact” — the future tense of the verb was more positive; on the other hand, the adjective “effective” had been purposely inserted) — “for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium”, etc.

Articles 2 and 3 defined the limits of this positive obligation. The reserve in Article 2 applied, not to the principle, but to the extent of the obligation simply as concerned the number of towns, ports or other localities through which the export or import of opium should be permitted. Concerning raw opium, what was aimed at was not the suppression (opium would always be necessary for medical uses) but the *control*. It had been asked if “control” meant “reduction”. The answer was, yes, if an abuse was proved, since the Convention provided for the progressive suppression of abuse.

As to prepared opium (he remarked, in passing, that Chapter II did not say simply “opium prepared for smoking”), Article 6 stipulated its suppression (it did not say “its reduction”), an effective but a gradual suppression.

As the Chairman had already reminded the Committee, the Legal Section of the Secretariat had given the following interpretation of Article 6:

“The complete and effective suppression of the manufacture of, home trade in, and use of prepared opium constitutes one of the ultimate obligations undertaken by Government under the 1912 Convention; but it is for each State to decide, according to individual circumstances, as to the precise manner in which its suppression may be brought about.”

In his opinion the Legal Section of the Secretariat had exactly interpreted the thought of the drafters of the article, who had carefully weighed their words.

A word must be said on the circumstances in which the Convention was drawn up, as they constituted a legitimate factor in interpreting it.

Chapter II had been specially drafted to take account of the enormous effort which China had been making, at the time, to suppress, within her boundaries, the opium-smoking habit and to help her in that task.

He wished also to draw attention to Article 7: “The Contracting Powers shall prohibit the importation and exportation of prepared opium.”

As to Chapter III, which concerned drugs, the effect of which was, without the slightest doubt, more deleterious than that of the raw substances from which they were derived, if the real meaning of the Convention was to be obtained, reference would have to be made to the letter and spirit of Article 9:

“The Contracting Powers shall enact pharmacy laws or regulations”, etc.

and not to the much weaker stipulations of Article 10 *et seq.*, which dealt with other circumstances not necessary to explain at the moment.

Such were the explanations which it seemed to him should be made by a person who had been intimately associated with the drawing up of the Convention.

Nothing in what he had said seemed to him to contradict in principle the declarations of the American Delegation, who had insisted especially, if he had rightly understood, on the necessity of the limitation of *production*, whether of the raw materials or of the derivatives. If he were not mistaken, the definition of the words “legitimate uses”, to which his colleagues had also drawn attention, had already been examined and settled by the Assembly.

Dr. UCHINO (Japan) said that he had heard with great interest the statements of the American Delegation, and he appreciated the spirit in which they had made their proposals. As to the interpretation of the text of the Hague Convention, he was sorry to say that he could not agree with the view of the American Delegation. In this respect, he agreed rather with the interpretation of Mr. Campbell. If the Convention did not provide for the complete suppression of the consumption of prepared opium, it would be very difficult to limit the production of opium to medical and scientific uses. This was his personal opinion, but he thought that the Japanese Government also took the same view.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the members for having confined their remarks to questions of principle. The discussion which had taken place would form a valuable basis for the more detailed examination of the proposals when Item 7 of the agenda was before the Committee.

#### FOURTH MEETING

*held Saturday, May 26th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

#### 9. PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT.

##### (a) *Signature and Ratification of the Convention.*

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to discuss the Progress Report (Annex 3) section by section.*

The Chairman pointed out that fifty-one countries had signed, and forty-two had ratified, the International Opium Convention of 1912.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) enquired whether there was any further information in the possession of the Secretariat with regard to the position of Turkey.

After some discussion, *the Committee decided, on the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE to adjourn the question of Turkey to the next meeting*, when Mrs. Hamilton Wright, who stated that she had been authorised to make certain statements on behalf of Turkey by the Turkish Delegation at Lausanne, would place the Committee in possession of all available information.

##### (b) *Import and Export Certificate System.*

The SECRETARY said that Newfoundland and Hungary had accepted, but had not yet put into force, the Import Certificate System, and should be added to the list of countries given in the report.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the Chinese Government accepted the principle of the Import Certificate System, but that it could not put it into force until the agreement of the *Corps diplomatique* had been obtained. Any delay, therefore, in enforcing the system was due to that body and not to the Chinese Government.

The CHAIRMAN said that time would have to elapse before the merits of the system could properly be judged, since most countries had only just begun to enforce it.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) enquired what was the attitude of the United States Government with regard to the Import Certificate System. When that system had been discussed by the Committee, he had strongly urged that its adoption was a necessary corollary of the Hague Convention. The Committee had considered that the system constituted the first line of defence against the illicit traffic. The adoption of the system enabled each country not only to carry out its obligations towards its own nationals, but also enabled producing countries to export opium with a full knowledge that those countries to which it was sent would use it for legitimate purposes. With regard to the United States, however, there seemed to be some little difficulty. Supposing India was asked to export opium to America, a request which had never yet been made, the United States legislation and Indian practice would in fact require India to refuse to export that opium without a certificate from the United States. The United States Government, however, did not issue certificates to other countries, covering importations. Unless, therefore, that Government adopted the Import Certificate System, producing countries would be placed in a somewhat difficult position.

Under existing legislation, the import of narcotics into the United States was forbidden except with the sanction of the Federal Narcotics Board. This, however, only affected the individual importer and gave no direct guarantee to the Government of the producing country.

If, for instance, an importer asked the Government of a producing country for a hundred chests of opium and stated that the Federal Narcotics Board would allow him to import that quantity into the United States, the position of the exporting Government would be an awkward one.

The CHAIRMAN desired to explain the interpretation placed by France on the provisions of the Convention regarding exports and imports. In its various chapters, the Convention stipulated that persons importing or exporting raw opium, prepared opium, morphine or cocaine, required a special authorisation, but that the giving of that authorisation depended on each Government. It was only in the case of morphine and cocaine that the Convention stipulated that measures should be taken to ensure that export should only be allowed to persons duly authorised by the importing country. The French Government was at the moment considering what measures to take to carry out this recommendation of the Convention, and was examining the system mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 13. This system concerned the communication by the Governments of exporting countries of lists drawn up by the importing countries of persons duly authorised to import. This system was, in fact, a simple variant of the Import Certificate System.

In answer to the Chairman's explanation, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) quoted Article 5 of the Convention, whereby "the Contracting Powers shall not allow the import and export of raw opium, except by duly authorised persons", and also Article 3, whereby "the Contracting Powers shall take measures: (a) to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry; and (b) to control the export of raw opium to countries which restrict its import, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence." From this it followed that a country A could not control its export to a country B unless it knew the restrictions which country B placed upon the import of narcotic drugs, and unless country B gave it a guarantee that the quantities asked for were for legitimate purposes.

In his opinion, Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention sufficiently established the fact that the Import and Export Certificate System was a necessary corollary of the Hague Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Convention explicitly laid down that an authorisation must be obtained for the import and export of morphia and cocaine, but it did not explicitly enjoin this procedure in the case of raw and prepared opium.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) said that the answer to Mr. Campbell's enquiry concerning the position of the United States was to be found in Regulation 4 of the Federal Narcotics Board, which read as follows:

*Regulations for the Control of Traffic in Narcotics.*

*Regulation 4. Applications required.*

"Applications in triplicate for permission to import crude opium or coca leaves shall be made under oath on an approved form, stating all material facts, and addressed to the Collector of Customs at the proposed port of importation, who, after careful consideration thereof, and any investigation deemed necessary, shall forward the application, with his recommendation, to the Federal Narcotics Control Board, c/o Division of Customs, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C. Such application must state the amount of the stock on hand, the usual requirements for the ensuing six months, and the necessity for the proposed importation.

"Upon request, the Collector of Customs may furnish to the applicant a certified copy of the approved application for use under the laws or regulations of the exporting country."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the last stipulation of Regulation 4 was, he understood, a permissive and not an obligatory one. His point was, therefore, not fully met.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) replied that if any exporting country asked for a certificate it could immediately obtain one.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) referred to the action taken by the Council concerning the Import Certificate System.

The Committee had stated in its report drawn up at its last session that:

"After weighing carefully all the considerations bearing on the subject, and in the hope that the next few months may see the adoption of the Convention and of the Import Certificate System by all the chief countries which are at present outside, the Committee agreed that it was desirable to postpone a final decision in regard to the Assembly's resolution until its next session, which is due to be held in the spring of this year, and to request the Council in the interval to take all possible steps with the Governments of the countries concerned to secure their co-operation. The Committee hopes that the course it recommends will receive the approval of the Council.

"In communicating with Governments on the question of the adoption of the Import Certificate System, the Council might think it well to point out, while it recognises that, in some countries, the adoption of the system would involve changes in legislation and this has necessarily led to some delay, yet, in its view, the system is a direct corollary of the stipulations of the Opium Convention — that its adoption is essential, not merely to enable the country concerned to control its imports and exports but also to enable other countries to control theirs."

On that report coming before the Council, M. Hymans, Rapporteur, had said that:

“The Committee, in its report, expressed the hope that the Council may think it well to point out to Members of the League that, though in some countries the adoption of the Import Certificate System will involve or has involved changes in legislation, yet, in its opinion, the system is a direct corollary to the stipulations of the Opium Convention, and its adoption is perhaps advisable in order not merely to enable the country concerned to control its imports and exports, but also to enable other countries to control theirs.”

M. Gout, the French representative on the Council, commenting on this passage of M. Hymans' report, had said that:

“He was of opinion that, as regards the passage of the report which concerned the adoption of the Import Certificate System, it would be dangerous to give the impression that, unless the League of Nations took certain steps, it would cause an international convention already in force for a considerable period, and already producing results, to break down.

“The Convention applied to the abuse of dangerous drugs; import certificates only concerned legitimate commerce, which there was no intention of prohibiting. He personally did not think that it was essential for a country to adopt the system of Import Certificates in order to facilitate the exercise of control by the countries affected, or by any other countries, as this passage of M. Hymans' report suggested.

“He proposed therefore that, in the sentence of the report which read: ‘its adoption is essential not merely to enable the country concerned to control its imports and exports, but also to enable other countries to control theirs’, the words ‘is essential’ should be replaced by the words ‘is perhaps advisable.’

“He also proposed the suppression of the following phrase: ‘and that without co-operation on these lines there is a danger of the whole system of control devised in the convention breaking down.’”

M. Gout's amendment to M. Hymans' report had been accepted by the Council and the attitude of the Advisory Committee had been entirely misrepresented. The Committee had throughout considered that the adoption of the Import Certificate System was essential. The Council had now appeared to have decided that it was “perhaps” advisable. This decision was doubtless due to inadvertence, but he thought that, in order to correct any erroneous impression, renewed mention of the Committee's opinion should be made in its report.

He desired to know the attitude of the French Government towards the Import Certificate System. This system had been adopted by the Committee two years previously after the utmost consideration. It had considered the suggestion for the communication by each Government of a list of licensed importers and exporters. It had rejected this procedure as being unwieldy and had adopted the Import Certificate System. That system had been unanimously approved by the Council and the Assembly on two occasions and also by a large number of countries. If the attitude taken up by M. Gout at the meeting of the Council indicated a change in French policy in this respect, the position was serious. He hoped that the French representative would be able to inform the Committee that the French Government had adopted the system. It was essential that the Committee should know the views of France not only because of her influence and importance but also because a country which stood outside the Import Certificate System invariably became a Centre of the traffic. Traffickers operated in France and Switzerland and elsewhere, since it was easier to carry on their trade in a country where the system was not enforced than in a country which had adopted it.

Sir John JORDAN said the Import Certificate System was necessary for Europe, but he doubted whether the system, if applied to the Far East, would materially alter the conditions of trade existing between India and the Far East. He wished to know how the system affected the arrangements concluded by India with the various Governments of the Far Eastern European possessions. In his opinion, the Import Certificate System would have no effect there. Morphia continued to enter China and the consumption of opium in the Far Eastern possessions of European countries had remained constant for many years. He did not wish to make any special attack on India, and his remarks applied equally to Persia, Turkey and other countries. Would Japan, for example, give Persia a certificate saying that her imports of opium into Formosa were for legitimate purposes? The word “legitimate” had been worn threadbare. Persian opium imported into the Far East was, it was well known, manufactured into morphia which found its way into China.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was merely considering the general situation regarding the various problems with which it had been called upon to deal, and thought that no discussion on questions of principle should take place while the Progress Report was being considered. He proposed to reply later, during the discussion on the Import Certificates, to what Sir Malcolm Delevingne had said.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that the Bill which had been presented to the Portuguese Chamber by the Government of Portugal provided that a certificate of import should be given to all exporting countries which asked for it. The certificate should state that the quantities imported were for legitimate medical and scientific purposes and further that the drugs would not be re-exported. This law would apply to European and Insular Portugal.



Sir John JORDAN enquired whether the law would apply to Macao.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) replied in the negative. With regard to the Portuguese Colonies, the Portuguese Government had thought it preferable to make separate provisions after a detailed study of the situation, in view of the special conditions obtaining in India and Macao with regard to the question of opium.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) enquired why the United States was not mentioned in the list of countries which had adopted the Import Certificate System. The Jones-Miller Bill had provided for the adoption of a system on similar lines, and it was merely a question as to what precise form the certificate should take.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that his point was that there was nothing in the legislation of the United States which made the giving of a certificate covering importations from an exporting country obligatory.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) pointed out that every individual importer was required to possess a certificate before he could import.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said it appeared to him that the United States had adopted the Import Certificate System in principle. Every importer had to obtain the approval of the Federal Narcotics Board for each import and could send a certificate of that approval furnished by the Board to the Government of the exporting country.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) pointed out that the Federal Narcotics Board had full power to adopt any form of certificate which it might think good.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he had no doubt that in practice the system in vogue in the United States was very similar to the Import Certificate System. He merely desired a definite guarantee in order to safeguard the producing country. At the present moment the United States legislation in this matter was purely domestic. Under the Import Certificate System, for example, it would have to inform the exporting countries of the Government authority in the United States who would sign the certificate. He had no doubt as to the efficacy of the present system in the United States; he only pressed the point in order to define the position of the exporting country and to safeguard it.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that the Secretariat should communicate the system in force in America to all the Members of the League and the States signatory to the International Opium Convention of 1912. These States would then be in a position, before granting a licence to export to the United States, invariably to require the production of a certificate from the Federal Narcotics Board.

*The Committee adopted this proposal.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to draw the attention of the Committee to the position of Switzerland in regard to the Import Certificate System. The statistics for import into the United States for the year 1921-22, which had just been handed to him, showed that 1,509 oz. of morphine, 1,536 oz. of codeine, 312 oz. of heroin, 109 oz. of dionin and 3,486 oz. of cocaine had been imported from Switzerland. These quantities represented the bulk of the imports of the United States. Switzerland had no real control over her exports since she had not adopted the Import Certificate System.

(c) *Annual Reports.*

The SECRETARY gave the following information regarding Annual Reports additional to that appearing in the Progress Report:

1921	1922
Australia	Canada
Siam	St. Lucia
Chosen	Portugal.
Formosa	The Portuguese report contains figures for the Colonies of West Africa, Mozambique, India and Timor. The figures of manufacture, consumption, import and export in Macao for the years 1921-1922 will be sent as soon as possible.
Kwantung	
Straits Settlements	
Germany:	
Advance figures have been supplied by Dr. Anselmino. The report is being forwarded through official channels.	
Liberia:	Straits Settlements.
States that there is no traffic in opium or other dangerous drugs in that country.	Preliminary statistics for 1922 have been forwarded by:
	Great Britain,
Bolivia:	Japan,
States that the traffic in opium is so negligible that there are no statistics on the subject.	Belgium.

The CHAIRMAN said that France would shortly forward her Annual Report to the Secretariat.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the reason for delay in the despatch of the Netherlands Annual Report was because of the lack of staff. The report concerning the Netherlands Indies was ready and merely required translation.

(d) *Traffic in Cocaine.*

The SECRETARY said that Persia, Monaco and Hungary had replied concerning the traffic, and Hungary had also replied concerning the manufacture of cocaine. In addition, the Secretariat had received a letter the day previously from the Netherlands Government regarding the traffic in cocaine and reiterating the substance of M. van Wettum's speech at the Committee's last session in which he had stated that, under the present law, a manufacturer had the right to refuse figures of manufacture for publication. M. van Wettum had said that "in the present circumstances, the Netherlands Government was unable to supply the required figures concerning the production of cocaine. There was only one manufacturer in the Netherlands and he refused to produce them for publication. The Ministry of Labour, which was the authority entrusted with the enforcement of the Opium Laws, was of opinion that, according to the provisions of these laws, the manufacturer was under the obligation to give these statistics to the health inspectors, but that the laws did not authorise the Ministry of Labour to make these figures public. Should the Netherlands Government be the only one which did not supply the figures, and thus did not co-operate in this matter, the Minister for Foreign Affairs was willing to propose to the Minister of Labour that a Bill should be introduced authorising the Netherlands Government to publish the figures."

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would appreciate the vigorous action which the Netherlands Government proposed to take.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) enquired what countries had not yet sent in their figures for the manufacture of cocaine.

The SECRETARY replied that the information was contained in Annex 5.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as regarded France, the request for the necessary figures of manufacture had been made by the competent authorities and in two to three weeks the statistics would be ready and would be forwarded to the Secretariat.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that, when the Secretariat had received the figures for France, the Netherlands would be the only country which had not yet complied with the request to furnish figures of manufacture. He hoped, therefore, that the Netherlands Government would give effect to the proposal outlined by M. van Wettum.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) asked the Secretary to inform him of the date on which the figures for the manufacture of cocaine in France were received, in order that he might be enabled to request his Government to take action.

M. BRENIER, on being informed that no figures had been submitted by Peru regarding her exports abroad of cocaine, suggested that the Secretariat might collect figures for raw cocaine.

The SECRETARY said that, as far as Bolivia and Peru were concerned, this was being done. A special letter had been sent to them on the subject, and the replies were awaited. Meanwhile, the South American Bureau attached to the Secretariat had taken up the question.

In reply to a question from Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT, Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that India produced no cocaine.

(e) *Total Annual Requirements of Opium and its Derivatives for Internal Consumption.*

The SECRETARY informed the Committee that information had been received from New Zealand, Belgium, the Sudan and Hungary, in addition to the countries mentioned in the Progress Report.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that the requirements for Hong-Kong were to be found in a special memorandum (Annex 6), circulated to the members.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was impossible to obtain information regarding the annual requirements of France at the moment. The system of inspection of the pharmacists would have to be reorganised.



(f) *Discrepancies between the Returns of the Various Governments.*

The CHAIRMAN said that discrepancies with regard to import and export statistics of the various Governments, notably Japan, had occurred, but that, as a result of correspondence, they had largely been cleared up. A summary of the correspondence was to be found in Annexes 7 and 8.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) said he was ready to discuss this question whenever the Committee so desired.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the question was one of considerable importance. The discrepancies between Great Britain's statistics and those of Japan had not yet been entirely cleared up. He desired to make a proposal concerning them. The British Government's report on the question was to be found in Annex 8.

*The Committee decided to discuss the question of discrepancies after it had finished the consideration of the Progress Report.*

(g) *Co-operation between Japan and China with regard to illicit Traffic.*

The CHAIRMAN said that negotiations were in progress between Japan and China regarding this question, and that a Committee was to be set up with the object of remedying this state of affairs. He enquired what date that Committee would begin to sit.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) stated that he had no information regarding the date.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) said that negotiations were in progress.

(h) *Exchange of Information with regard to Seizures of Drugs.*

The SECRETARY said that the following countries, in addition to those mentioned in the report, had signified their agreement with regard to the resolution of the Council concerning the exchange of information on seizures:

New Zealand (Comptroller of Customs, Wellington, N. Z.);

Hungary (Ministère Royal hongrois de la Prévoyance sociale et du Travail, Budapest); and

France (Direction des affaires administratives et techniques, Sous-Direction des Unions, Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris).

Hong-Kong had sent a list of seizures made and rewards given for the year 1922.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, from the answer of Poland, it appeared that Poland considered that the exchange of information should only take place with regard to cases where the offence constituted an infringement of the law of the country to which the communication was made. Poland also thought that the information should be communicated to the Secretariat in an Annual Report. If this conception were adopted, the arrangement would be very seriously crippled. The main object of the system was that the country from which the drugs had been sent should be enabled to make enquiries and to take whatever action was proper to the circumstances, and the limitation imposed by Poland would render the system useless. Further, the whole value of the information depended upon it being communicated immediately to the country concerned in order that action could be taken without delay. If information was only communicated once a year, there would be little hope of bringing any offender to justice. The Polish Government evidently entirely misunderstood the system, and he hoped that it might be possible for the Secretariat to give it further information on the subject.

The SECRETARY said that she had approached the Polish representative on the Permanent Polish Bureau accredited to the League, and that he was taking up the matter with his Government. A reply was expected shortly.

Sir John JORDAN enquired what action had been taken with regard to the large seizure made near Hong-Kong, in which an Englishman of the name of Humphreys had been implicated.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that the drugs seized had been sent from Switzerland and that a large number of persons of different nationalities had been engaged in the transaction. The Englishman Humphreys had been convicted and sent to prison. New legislation had just been passed in the United Kingdom raising the penalty for illicit traffic to ten years' penal servitude and a fine not exceeding £1,000.

Information which had been obtained in the course of the investigation as regarded the operations of the traffickers on the Continent had been communicated to France, Switzerland and Germany. He was unable to say what steps these countries had taken, but, as far as the British Government was concerned, the investigations carried out had been very vigorous. A large manufacturing firm of the name of Whiffen, trading as A. J. Wink, had been implicated and its licence had been withdrawn. He hoped that the other countries would take similar steps.

He pointed out that Germany had on several occasions taken drastic action as the result of information supplied to it by the British Government.

M. BRENIER stated that this question was related to the more general question of the control of manufacture, a control which was provided for by the Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the exchange of information had been of great value.

The CHAIRMAN endorsed this opinion and said that the French Government shared it. He asked the members of the Committee to urge their respective Governments to communicate information regarding seizures without loss of time.

The French Government had communicated information to Spain, and information regarding other alleged instances of traffic in French possessions was to be found in the Appendix to the Progress report (Annex 3).

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) pointed out that the communication of information on a seizure to a country which had not adopted the Import Certificate System, and which consequently did not control its imports or its exports, would be of very little value, since nationals of that country could not be punished in view of the absence of any legislation forbidding them to carry on the traffic.

Sir John JORDAN said that, in the Appendix attached to the Progress report, there was a list of seizures which had been communicated to the League of Nations, but that no mention of the particular seizure under discussion had been made. Had this seizure been reported to the League, and if so, what action had been taken?

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the Committee, in discussing the system for the exchange of information at an earlier session, had decided that communications ought to be made directly between the Governments concerned, and not through the League of Nations.

The list in the Appendix merely contained communications which were either replies to requests made by the Secretariat, or had reached it through other means. The ordinary course was for the government to communicate particulars of the seizure direct to the other government concerned. It was for this reason that Sir John Jordan did not find any reference to seizures in Hong-Kong. These seizures had been reported by the Government of Hong-Kong to the British Government and action had immediately been taken.

Sir John JORDAN understood this explanation, but thought that the present system was most unsatisfactory. It would be much better for information to pass through the League of Nations.

The seizure in question had been one of the most remarkable that had been effected since the formation of the Committee, and yet that body knew very little about it. Some machinery must be provided whereby seizures would be made known to the League with the fullest particulars, in order that the Committee might be able to discuss them. These seizures should not be communicated to one or two countries only. A communication made to Switzerland, for instance, was useless, but if the matter was made public in the Committee, that publicity might have the effect of shaming the Swiss Government into taking some action. Such large seizures did not occur very frequently, and there was no reason why they should not be communicated to the League.

M. BRENIER pointed out that in the Annual Report a list of seizures made by each Government was to be found. He thought that the information thus supplied would be sufficient for the requirements of the Committee. It was very difficult to ask a government to communicate particulars of each seizure to the League of Nations at the time when it was made.

Sir John JORDAN repeated that the Committee was not in possession of the information which it really required. This was through no fault of the Secretariat, for which he had the greatest admiration. The Secretariat was a most efficient organisation, but it was called upon to collect a great deal of information which was not required for practical purposes. He thought that attention should be concentrated on the position of affairs in six or more of the principal nations concerned, without wasting time regarding other and, from the point of view of the traffic, less important countries.

It was a fact well known throughout the East that eight tons of Persian opium had lately been seized in a cave in an island near Hong-Kong. He desired to know whether this seizure had been reported to the Secretariat and all the facts investigated.

The SECRETARY replied that the Secretariat possessed no information whatever regarding this seizure.

Sir John JORDAN said that it was the largest seizure which had been made for many years and that many facts connected with it should be made public. There was a great defect in any machinery in regard to seizures which prevented a seizure of this magnitude from being known to the Secretariat and consequently to the Committee, when it was well known throughout the East. It was the duty of the Hong-Kong Government to have reported it.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) repeated that the Committee had considered the best arrangement for the exchange of information regarding seizures would be for the Governments concerned to exchange information direct, and had decided unanimously to this effect.

Its decision had been approved by the Council and the Assembly, and the system set up was now in use by a number of Governments. When the British Government made a seizure, it immediately communicated the facts to the other Governments concerned with full information. It did not communicate the facts to the Secretariat because the Committee had decided against that course. The British Government, however, was ready to give any particulars regarding seizures and prosecutions which might be of use to the Committee.

With regard to the seizures made at Hong-Kong in which the Englishman Humphreys had been implicated, information had been supplied to the Secretary the Committee who had been present at the proceedings in the Courts. The prosecuting Counsel in the proceedings had given the full story of the case in opening the prosecution, which had been reported at length in the *London Times* and other newspapers. Thus the fullest publicity for that case had been secured.

As far as the seizure of the eight tons of opium was concerned, it had not yet been discovered who was responsible for the shipment or to whom the chests belonged. The consignment had borne no identification marks whatever.

Sir John JORDAN thought that, with regard to this latter seizure, if it had been reported to the Secretariat, more information might have been collected than by merely reporting it to the British Government. That seizure was well known in the Far East and a great many facts were also known. He was very much surprised that these facts had never reached Geneva.

At its third session, the Committee had taken the following decision:

“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 should be sent by each Government to the Secretariat for purposes of correlation.”

He thought it a terrible thing that a seizure of the importance of the last seizure made at Hong-Kong had not been dealt with in a proper way. All China had been startled by it, and yet the Committee was sitting without any knowledge of it whatever.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was surprised at the sudden attack made by Sir John Jordan on the Governments of Hong-Kong and Great Britain with regard to this matter. He would have thought that the two seizures made by these Governments were matters upon which they should have been congratulated.

With regard to the seizure of the eight tons of Persian opium, it had been made as a result of excellent organisation on the part of the Government of Hong-Kong. When it had discovered the consignment there was nothing to show who had been concerned in the matter, as those persons had been much too wise to leave any marks by which the opium could be identified. No information, therefore, was available for communication to anyone except that eight tons of opium had been seized, and that fact had already been published to the world through the agency of the Press. He thought, therefore, that the Hong-Kong Government, instead of being reproached, should be congratulated on the skill with which it had made the seizure.

As regarded the seizure in which Humphreys had been concerned, this had been due to a fortunate combination of circumstances. The information had been communicated to the British Government, which had made enquiries for several months, with the result that a whole gang of traders had been unmasked and one of the leaders brought to justice. It had further been discovered that one of the most important drug-manufacturing firms in the world had been implicated and drastic action had been taken.

He was therefore astonished that Sir John Jordan should suggest that the British Government was desirous of hiding these facts. On the contrary, it was well satisfied with the action it had taken, and it had given the fullest publicity to that action.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had never intended to make any attack on the Government of Hong-Kong, which had done most useful work in regard to these seizures, and he indignantly repudiated the suggestion that he had made any reflection on that Government. What he had wished to maintain, and still maintained, was that the machinery with regard to the communication of information was defective.

The fact that the Hong-Kong Government had made a seizure in circumstances well known to the Far East ought to have been communicated to the Committee and something ought to have been done to make known the whole of those circumstances. It was not for the British Government or for any other Government to communicate such information privately. Had the information been given to the Committee, it would have been able to discuss the matter very fully. He himself knew the company which had shipped the opium and had conveyed it to Hong-Kong.

He fully realised that the British Home Office had done all that was possible in the case in which Humphreys had been implicated, but he thought that the Committee should be kept informed of all important seizures in order to enable it to take some action.

He himself was ready to place any information in his possession at the disposal of the British Government.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the British Government would be most happy to receive any information which Sir John Jordan might be able to give it. The only fact in its possession regarding the second seizure was that the opium had been Persian.

(i) *Assessors to the Committee: Reappointment by the Council for a period of one year.*

The CHAIRMAN conveyed to the Assessors the congratulations of the Committee on their reappointment.

(j) *Resolutions of Voluntary Organisations.*

The Committee decided to discuss the resolutions of the International Anti-Opium Association, the Edinburgh Anti-Opium Association and the Harvard International Assembly immediately after the question of the discrepancy between the statistics furnished by the various countries.

---

## FIFTH MEETING

*held Saturday, May 26th, 1923, at 3.45 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present.

### 10. PROPOSAL OF SIR JOHN JORDAN CONCERNING THE COMMUNICATION TO THE SECRETARIAT OF PARTICULARS OF SEIZURES.

Sir John JORDAN submitted the following proposal:

“That the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, being greatly impressed with the desirability for the widest possible publicity for all seizures of opium and other drugs;  
“Having noted the lists of seizures reported by various nations to the League of Nations;  
“Having also noted that several most important seizures had not been so reported:

Resolves:

“That the attention of the Governments should again be called to the extreme desirability not only of direct communication to other immediately interested Governments of the details of any seizures made, but also of a general communication to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, in order that the fullest international publicity may be secured by the transmission of this information by the Secretariat both to other Governments not immediately concerned in the specific case and to the Press.”

He did not think that this would raise any controversial question, neither did he wish to make any reflection whatever on what had occurred. Publicity was a most important weapon, and anything which could be done to secure fuller publicity for these very important seizures was a step in the right direction. He thought, therefore, that it would be most advisable if all these seizures, especially when they were very large, were communicated to the Secretariat, which would give them publicity.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the resolution would be accepted by the majority of the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) asked that the resolution be circulated before any decision was taken.

*The Committee agreed to this proposal.*

### 11. STATEMENT BY MRS. HAMILTON WRIGHT ON TURKEY'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE RATIFICATION OF THE HAGUE CONVENTION.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT wished to answer Mr. Campbell's question put at the previous meeting, and promised to enter later on more fully into the Turkish, Persian and the whole Near Eastern situation.

She stated that she had gone to Lausanne and had spoken with the Turkish Delegation. They had told her that she might assure the Committee that they had included the Convention in the text of the Treaty which was at present being discussed. That Treaty had not yet been signed, but it certainly was a great step forward. It should be remembered that in 1914, at the third International Conference, Turkey and Serbia were the only countries which had refused absolutely to sign or to have anything whatsoever to do with the Convention. She thought that it was most important that the Turkish delegates should have expressed their willingness to incorporate the Convention in their Treaty. The Turkish Delegation had also said later that

Turkey would be very glad to join the League of Nations, and that she would accept the same restrictions placed upon her as upon any other nation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) enquired whether Mrs. Hamilton Wright had been officially authorised by the Turks to make such a statement.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT replied in the affirmative. When she asked the Turks whether she might repeat at Geneva what they had told her at Lausanne, their answer had been "You may." They had also given her other information, which she had promised to place before the Committee. She could therefore claim to be speaking with authority.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had noted with the greatest interest Mrs. Hamilton Wright's statement.

## 12. STATEMENT BY THE JAPANESE DELEGATE ON CERTAIN DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE JAPANESE RETURNS AND THOSE OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that, on the question of the discrepancies existing between statistics submitted by Japan and other States, the British and Japanese Governments had presented explanations, which were contained in Annexes 7 et 8. It seemed to him that the actual facts of the discrepancies were very well explained. It was regrettable that there had existed some discrepancies in this matter, and it was his desire to remove them. To that end the proposal of the British Government (Annex 8) that statistics of imports and exports should be compiled on a uniform basis and published at frequent intervals seemed to him a very good one, and he earnestly recommended the acceptance of this principle.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was glad to hear from the Japanese delegate that he was willing to accept the suggestion of the British Government. The Japanese Government and the British Minister at Tokio, as well as the British authorities at home, have taken an immense amount of trouble to carry out the request which had been made by the Committee in 1922 to investigate, and, if possible, to ascertain the causes of the great discrepancies between the British statistics of exports and the Japanese statistics of imports. Owing to the lapse of time, it had proved almost impossible to get to the bottom of the matter. The curious fact remained that those discrepancies were still continuing, or, rather, were continuing at the time when the British Government had last received the Japanese figures of imports. These figures for the early months of 1922 still showed considerable imports of the drugs from Great Britain, though in fact no export of the drugs from Great Britain to Japan had taken place for several years. He thought that this was a conclusive proof that the statistics of Japan and the statistics of Great Britain were compiled on different bases, and that what the Committee required was to distinguish very clearly the country from which the drugs were consigned, the country or countries through which they passed by way of transit or transshipment, and thirdly, the ultimate country of origin.

It was not always possible to give the country of origin, and it might not always be possible to give the countries through which the goods had passed by way of transit or transshipment; but it ought always to be possible, in the case of the substances for which the special procedure had been established under the Opium Convention, to give the country from which the goods were consigned, and that was, in his view, the important matter. The British suggestion was that some arrangement should be come to between the interested countries to prepare and furnish their statistics of imports and exports of drugs on a certain uniform basis, and giving certain uniform particulars — the country of consignment, and, if possible, the countries through which the goods were passed in by way of transit or transshipment, including any shipments out of bond, and, if possible, the country of origin. Those statistics should be prepared and published at frequent intervals so as to allow of the investigation of any discrepancies that might appear. No doubt the suggestions made in the Notes received from the Japanese and the British Governments respectively went some way to explain these discrepancies. He noticed that goods had often remained in bond for a very long time before they were withdrawn from bond, passed through the Japanese Customs and made to appear as imported. This would cause the exports of one year to appear as the imports of another. Anything which could be done to make the statistics uniform would give the Committee and the Governments themselves very valuable assistance in carrying out their obligations under the Convention. He suggested that the Secretariat be asked to examine the subject and to draw up some scheme for the uniform preparation and presentation of statistics, possibly in consultation with the representatives of some of the Governments concerned. If that course recommended itself to the Committee and to the Secretariat, he felt sure that the British and Japanese Governments would be willing to give any assistance they could. He would be ready to move a motion to submit a recommendation to the Council in that sense.

M. BRENIER supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal. He thought that it would be of use to the Secretariat, which had already presented the Committee with very useful statistics, to take up the question of ascertaining with accuracy what were the countries of origin (which was a most important matter to be ascertained) and the countries through which the goods had passed by way of transit or transshipment.

Sir John JORDAN failed to understand so large a discrepancy as that between 1 lb. and 11,000 lbs. For the year 1920, the Japanese returns had been 11,714 lbs. of morphine and heroin, and for the same year the British returns had been 1 lb. He was not at all confident that the system

proposed would give the results desired. The Japanese Government had explained that all the morphine imported in the year 1921, amounting to 5,926 kilos, was brought from England, and that all that had been purchased prior to the year 1921. Could permits have been issued for that before the year 1921? Was it possible, under the system of Export Certificates, that during the year 1921 all that amount could have gone to Japan on British permits?

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that no morphine had been exported from Great Britain to Japan for at least four years.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether any morphine had been contracted for in previous years. If a contract for morphine had been made, as the Japanese stated, before 1921, say in 1917 or 1918, would the export have been authorised?

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) replied in the negative.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether a permit issued in 1918 could be used in 1921?

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) replied in the negative.

Sir John JORDAN expressed his inability to understand the Japanese explanation.

M. BRENIER asked whether the morphine could possibly have been transported clandestinely from Great Britain.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that if it had been smuggled out of Great Britain presumably it would not have been passed through the Japanese Customs.

M. BRENIER wondered how the Japanese would know if it had been smuggled should it arrive on an English ship. That hypothesis was a possible one.

Sir John JORDAN said that, as Sir Malcolm did not understand how these drugs came from England, he would ask the Japanese representative for information about the 1,703 kilos that had entered Japan in the year 1921 from England. According to Sir Malcolm, it could not have been exported from England at all.

M. UCHINO (Japan) replied that statistics showed that 1,703 kilos were imported from England.

Sir John JORDAN reiterated that, as Sir Malcolm had said, that was impossible.

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that there was no mistake in the statistics.

Sir John JORDAN said that the drugs might have been smuggled.

M. UCHINO (Japan) replied that there was no smuggling.

M. BRENIER said that it was possible that the morphine could have been smuggled on board a British ship without the knowledge of the British authorities. The Japanese Customs authorities could in that case conclude that the morphine came from England, in view of the fact that the ship flew a British flag.

Sir John JORDAN said that would explain a great deal of the traffic in morphine in the Far East. If morphine was travelling in ships in that way without any supervision whatever, it was not to be wondered at that thousands of ounces were reaching China.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) disclaimed the probability of such an occurrence under the British system of regulations.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) stated that no country that he knew of took the flag of the carrying vessel as determining the country of origin. It was a question of fact settled by the manifest. The manifest must show the country of origin. It should show the country which sent the drugs to Japan. If the Japanese delegate was now able to assure the Committee that the Japanese system of statistics was based on the manifest, the flag under which the goods were carried had nothing whatever to do with the matter. If they took, as every other country did, their statistics from the manifest, it followed that the explanation suggested by M. Brenier would not apply to this case.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) asked whether it was not possible that it might have been a bonded shipment *i. e.*, that the consignment might have been taken from a bonded warehouse without actually clearing the Customs?

M. BRENIER asked whether it was possible in Great Britain to store morphine in a bonded warehouse. It might have come from a bonded warehouse in England.



Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that Great Britain did not import morphine except in trifling quantities.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a sub-committee should be appointed to go into the matter, composed of the representatives of the three countries concerned, Great Britain, Japan and the United States. M. Brenier, who was especially competent in such questions, should also serve on the sub-committee.

*This proposal was adopted.*

### 13. RESOLUTIONS OF VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS.

The CHAIRMAN said that three voluntary organisations had forwarded resolutions to the Secretariat.

First, the Harvard International Assembly, which had adopted five resolutions.

The first resolution said that the only legitimate use of opium and its derivatives should be medical; the second proposed a very strict official regulation; the third concerned the signature, ratification and enforcement of the International Opium Convention of 1912; the fourth suggested that a clause should be inserted in the Treaty being negotiated at the moment between certain European Powers and Turkey to the end that she should become a party to the Convention; and the fifth that every effort should be made to secure the ratification by Persia of the Convention.

The Chairman thought that the Committee need not discuss these resolutions, since their contents had all been the object of special examination on the part of the Committee. He proposed, therefore, to thank the Harvard International Assembly for the interest which it had displayed in the opium problem.

*This proposal was adopted.*

The CHAIRMAN said that the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking had forwarded two resolutions. The first concerned free ports and bonded warehouses, which was one of the questions on the Committee's agenda. The second resolution concerned publicity, and on that point satisfaction had already been given to the International Anti-Opium Association.

The Edinburgh Anti-Opium Committee had forwarded a resolution concerning the rumoured scheme for the creation of an opium monopoly in China. This resolution read as follows:

"The Committee regret the rumour as to a possible opium monopoly in China: they welcome the speedy disclaimer of the Chinese Government; at the same time, they desire to state that, in their opinion, such a step would be retrograde, and not fitted to check the illicit traffic or to diminish the opium vice itself; they therefore appeal to the League of Nations to use its utmost influence with China and other opium-producing countries to adopt the same policy of restriction to medicinal requirements as has been suggested by us in regard to India."

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) desired to give official information regarding the resolution sent in by the Edinburgh Anti-Opium Association on the rumour concerning the establishment of an opium monopoly in China. Some time ago, a Reuter telegram had been despatched from Peking and published in the English newspapers — and there had also been published an article by the London *Times* correspondent in Peking — reporting that Sir Francis Aglen, the Chinese Inspector-General of Military Customs, had proposed to the Chinese Government that the opium traffic should be legalised in China in order to check the illicit traffic in opium. Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu had immediately telegraphed to Peking for information, and upon receipt of official instructions from his Government, he had made an official denial, which had been published in the *Times* a copy of which he had sent to the Secretary of the Committee for distribution to the members. Afterwards another rumour had been reported in the *Times* saying that a Japanese merchant had proposed to the Chinese Government to establish a monopoly in opium traffic in China in order that it should be able to negotiate a loan. This was also connected with the proposal made by Sir Francis Aglen. He had immediately telegraphed to Peking for information, and had received official instructions from his Government to make a further official denial. He had done so, and it had been also published in the *Times*. He had sent a copy to the Secretary of the Committee for distribution to the members. In addition to this, a Reuter telegram had also been despatched from Peking stating that the Chinese Government had published an official denial in Peking that it had ever considered the possibility or advisability of establishing an opium monopoly. He had made up his mind that, if his Government really had considered the advisability of establishing a monopoly, he could not have faced the members of this Committee, and he would have resigned. Fortunately, just before he had left London for Geneva, he had received a telegram from Peking saying: "Go to Geneva and tell the Committee that the Chinese Government has never considered the establishment of such a monopoly, and will never do so."

At the same time, Sir Francis Aglen had arrived in England. He had seen him and had asked him for first-hand information about the rumour. Sir Francis had told him that he had simply made the proposal, not to the Chinese Government, but through the Press to the Chinese people in general, asking the Chinese people whether it would not be advisable to establish a monopoly in opium traffic in order to check the smuggling of opium into the country. Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu understood that Sir Francis had made a speech before the Anti-Opium Association of Peking about an opium monopoly in China. The Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs had been present

at the meeting, and had made a strong protest against Sir Francis Aglen's proposal. This had also been reported in the newspapers both in China and abroad. Sir Francis Aglen had told him that he had seen Mr. Chu's official denial published in the *Times* and other papers in London, contradicting his own proposal for legalising opium traffic in China, and that he thought Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu was right. The idea of establishing a monopoly was Sir Francis' own private opinion. It was not the opinion of the Chinese Government. In conclusion, Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu wished to assure the Committee that the Chinese Government had never considered the possibility of establishing an opium monopoly.

Sir John JORDAN said he had had something to do with this question, as he had been concerned to a certain extent in the correspondence on it. He accepted unreservedly every word Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu had said, both with regard to the attitude of his Government and with regard to his own attitude. He was perfectly sure they were both sincere, and that Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu would not have attended this session of the Committee if his Government had accepted the proposal concerning a monopoly. At the same time, he wished to give no erroneous impression about the situation in China. The situation was very grave. The mere fact that Sir Francis Aglen, who had been thirty, five years in China, and who was a very high-minded man and a devoted servant of the Chinese Government, thought it necessary to suggest a monopoly proved how very serious the situation was. Sir John Jordan was sure that Sir Francis, who had exceptional knowledge of the situation, had made the suggestion in all good faith. He disagreed with him, and had expressed his disagreement in strong terms. The Chinese Government was perfectly sincere, and would suppress opium if it could, but unfortunately it could not do so. Native-grown opium was coming down the Yangtze in tons, and the Government could exercise no control over it. The Customs service was demoralised. Bribes were a common occurrence. The result was that all this opium was passing into consumption without any inspection at all. That was the situation, and he supposed that Sir Francis thought it better to choose the lesser of two evils. The Chinese people had at one time stopped opium, and what they had done once they could do again.

It was not the fault of the Chinese Government that opium was produced in very large quantities. One province produced 700 tons, and other provinces were producing it. He personally was a great friend of China, but he would be no friend of China if he did not state the circumstances. He thought it was the duty of the Committee to do all it could to stir up public opinion in China. He was doing it in a small way himself. He hoped the Committee would be able to do something, and that it would take China into its consideration as well as other countries. He believed, if public opinion was sufficiently aroused in China, there was still a prospect of putting down this great evil.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the members of the Committee would recollect that at its last session it had received an official letter from the Government of China contemplating the establishment of a factory for the manufacture of morphia and other dangerous drugs, and the matter had been discussed, not very exhaustively, but it had been pointed out that the establishment of such a factory and the adoption of such a measure would be contrary to existing treaties with America and Great Britain. Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu had unfortunately been unable at that time to give any information regarding the measure, but he had promised to obtain information and to put it before the Committee at the present session. He was sure that all the members would be very interested in any information which Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu could now give on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a discussion on this point had better take place when Item 7 on the agenda (Examination of the Situation in China) was before the Committee.

*This proposal was adopted.*

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, at the request of the League of Nations, a request which had been made on the advice of the Advisory Committee, the Conference of the League of Oriental Red Cross Societies had examined the question as to how far the different Red Cross Societies could assist the Committee. The Conference had adopted a resolution on this subject.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee should thank the Conference for its resolution, and, before taking any steps, should await the recommendation which would be sent to it by the League of Red Cross Societies.

*This proposal was adopted.*

The CHAIRMAN said that the Ninth Congress of the International Women's Suffrage Alliance had adopted a resolution concerning opium and narcotic drugs.

On the proposal of the Chairman, *the Committee decided to send a letter of thanks to the Congress.*

#### 14. PROPOSAL OF SIR JOHN JORDAN CONCERNING THE COMMUNICATION TO THE SECRETARIAT OF THE PARTICULARS OF SEIZURES.

Sir John JORDAN re-submitted his proposal.<sup>1</sup>

He agreed that the third paragraph, "having also noted that several most important", etc. and the word "again" (in the first line of the fourth paragraph) should be deleted.

<sup>1</sup> See Minute No 10, page 32.



The CHAIRMAN asked that a small change should be made in the resolution. The Secretariat could not forward or publish all the information which was given to it, since some of it was extremely confidential. It was only if Governments thought it to be opportune that such information could be communicated. Governments could further indicate what part of the information should not be made public. The Secretariat would have to take great responsibility if it made public all information. It could therefore only transmit, first, what the interested Governments authorised it to transmit, and, secondly, what it itself considered of use and not involving too great responsibility.

Sir John JORDAN thought that this could be left to the discretion of the Secretariat.

The SECRETARY said that it would be a great responsibility for the Secretariat. For some reason the Governments might wish the information held up for a week or two because it was possible they might be following some particular trail which they would not want the Secretariat to cross.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was entirely in favour of the principle which underlay the resolution, but he wanted to make two observations as regarded its application. The first had just been alluded to by the Secretary. It was impossible to make a communication while the Governments concerned were following up what might be a very confidential enquiry into the circumstances of the seizure. Sir John Jordan, if he understood rightly, proposed a general communication to the Secretariat of the facts of the case when those facts had been sufficiently elucidated.

The other point was that the resolution appeared to refer to all seizures. Sir John Jordan would be well aware that the seizures throughout the world amounted in the course of the year to thousands.

Sir John JORDAN said he meant only important seizures.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that point ought to be made clear. On that understanding, he could see nothing to object to in the resolution, and he supported it.

M. BRENIER proposed that after the words: "in order that the fullest international publicity may be secured", the words: "with the consent of the Governments concerned" should be added. It was for those Governments when they sent in the details of the seizures to say: "You may publish information with regard to such-and-such a seizure, but you must not mention the other seizures," or, at any rate: "You must not mention them yet."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) proposed to add after: "but also of a general communication to the Secretariat of the League of Nations", the words: "of any important seizures."

Sir John JORDAN said that it seemed to him largely a matter for the Secretariat itself. He had no desire to burden the Secretariat with details of seizures. He did not know whether it was important for them to receive particulars of all seizures, but if the Secretariat was satisfied with this amendment, the only addition he would make would be: "*of all important seizures.*"

The SECRETARY said she would prefer to have: "all the seizures" but that certain members of the Committee were not prepared to accept that, because five or six important seizures a day came in. The Secretariat would rather have the important seizures than none at all.

The Secretary added that, in case the Secretariat received information and then had to ask the Governments concerned for their consent to publish it, there might be a delay of two or three months.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that this point would be met if the word "Governments" was changed to "Government."

*The Committee agreed to this proposal.*

The resolution was put to the vote in the following form:—

"The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium recommends the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to the extreme desirability not only of direct communication to other immediately interested Governments of the details of any seizures made, but also of a general communication to the Secretariat of the League of Nations of all seizures, in order that the fullest international publicity may be secured by the transmission, with the consent of the Government concerned, of this information by the Secretariat both to other Governments not immediately concerned in the specific case and to the Press."

*The resolution was unanimously adopted.*

#### 15. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING.

*The Minutes of the first meeting were adopted.*

SIXTH MEETING

*held Monday, May 28th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

16. MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING.

*The Minutes of the second meeting were adopted.*

17. APPLICATION OF PART II OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES OF THE FAR EAST (Annex 4).

(a) *Dutch East Indies.*

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the figures on page 137 gave an inaccurate idea of the consumption of opium in the Dutch East Indies. The figures on page 137 concerned manufacture, notwithstanding the fact that, according to the statistics in an appendix to that document, the figures for consumption were available.

Manufacture and consumption in the Dutch East Indies were kept entirely separate. The manufacture was in the hands of the Government factory. The figures for manufacture gave an increase of 54% in 1920 over the figures for 1916 and of 41% over the average for the six preceding years, whereas in reality the figures for consumption showed an increase of 10% and 8% for the same period.

Sir John JORDAN said that, from the figures in the document, it would appear that imports into the Dutch, East Indies had decreased between 1916 and 1920.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the export figures from India should be exactly the same as the import figures for the Dutch East Indies. The exports of opium from India to the Dutch East Indies from 1913 to 1922 were as follows:

1913 . . . . .	3,535	chests
1914 . . . . .	1,800	„
1915 . . . . .	2,400	„
1916 . . . . .	1,935	„
1917 . . . . .	2,200	„
1918 . . . . .	2,000	„
1919 . . . . .	2,000	„
1920 . . . . .	2,900	„
1921 . . . . .	2,300	„
1922 . . . . .	1,800	„

This showed that in 1922 the export was at the lowest figure since 1913, and equalled the export figure for 1914.

Sir John JORDAN said that, speaking generally from these figures, the decrease did not seem to be material.

M. BLANCO, in reply to M. van Wettum, said that the figures on page 137 of the document gave the amount of prepared opium manufactured in the Dutch East Indies, and took no account of the amount consumed. The figures for 1914-20 were entirely correct as far as manufacture was concerned.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the figures given Page 145 for average consumption, namely 92,712 kgs., were correct.

M. BLANCO said that the figures for manufacture showed a larger increase than the figures for consumption. Both figures, however, showed an increase, although not in the same proportion.

Sir John JORDAN said that this proved his assertion that more opium was consumed and manufactured in the Dutch East Indies at present than was the case before.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands), said that the situation in the Dutch East Indies was the same as that in the Straits Settlements where there had been an increase in consumption during the war.

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain), *the Committee agreed to change the last sentence of the paragraph on page 137 of the document (Annex 4) concerning the Dutch East Indies, so as to give the figures for actual consumption, i. e., for consumption in 1920 and the average for the previous six years, together with the average increase.*

Sir John JORDAN enquired what was the number of the Chinese population in the Dutch East Indies and the number of consumers.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) replied that the number of consumers was not known, but that the Chinese population numbered about 800,000.

Sir John JORDAN said that there was no uniformity in the supply of opium to the various European possessions in the Far East. The Dutch East Indies appeared to import a larger quantity of opium than other places.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) stated that a certain number of natives, in addition to the Chinese inhabitants, consumed opium. The consumption in 1920 had averaged 26 grains per head of the total population.

Mr. PORTER (United States) enquired what use was made of the opium.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) replied that it was used for smoking.

Mr. PORTER (United States) enquired whether this was legal.

Mr. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) replied in the affirmative, and stated that the practice of smoking opium had been legalised by the laws of the Dutch East Indies.

In reply to a further question of Mr. PORTER (United States), Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) stated that the consumption in Java amounted to 702 grains per head of the Chinese population, and to 26 grains per head of the whole population in Netherlands Indies.

Mr. PORTER (United States) enquired what amount of revenue was derived by the Dutch East Indies Government from the sale of opium, and what percentage of the total revenue that amount represented.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) gave the following information:

“The Treasury is still deriving considerable revenues from the consumption of opium. The gross proceeds, influenced by the steady increase of the selling price, amounted in 1921 to 53,264,761 florins, being 7.52 per cent of the receipts of the Government, which in that year totalled 708,592,111 florins.

“The receipts aggregated, in 1914, 281,403,431 florins and the gross proceeds of the monopoly 34,987,860 florins or 12.43 per cent of the total. For various reasons, however, this comparison does not altogether hold good. The following is a more reliable one. The net revenues of the Netherlands Indies (by which is understood the revenues decreased by the expenditure) amounted in the first-mentioned year to 383,396,606 florins, while the net proceeds of the monopoly were 44,209,371 florins, which is 11.53 per cent.

“For 1914, the net revenues totalled 175,537,695 florins, inclusive of the net proceeds of opium amounting to 28,814,637 florins, or 16.42 per cent.”

Mr. PORTER (United States) pointed out that, from Mr. van Wettum's statement, it appeared that something over 11% of the total revenue of the Dutch East Indies was derived from the manufacture and sale of opium.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, with regard to Sir John Jordan's point concerning the lack of uniformity in the supply of opium to the European possessions in the Far East, he was in a position to give the Committee the figures of the total export of opium from India. These figures were absolutely accurate, as all statistics concerning opium were carefully audited by the Indian Government.

In 1919, the total exports had amounted to 12,231 chests, in 1920 to 10,522, in 1921 to 9,770 and in 1922 to 8,128 chests. This showed a decrease of approximately 33% in four years.

The exports had been divided among the following countries: Macao, the Mauritius, Mexico, Japan, Formosa, French Indo-China, Ceylon, British North Borneo, Siam, Dutch East Indies, Hong-Kong and the Straits Settlements.

The figures showed a large and progressive reduction. The Indian Government always reduced its exports in accordance with the reduced demands of any country. It wished for nothing better than that countries should set their houses in order and demand less opium.

There were, however, other producing countries, notably Turkey and Persia.

The figures of imports into Japan and Formosa were most instructive, and an examination of them would show that the gap in the supply of opium was filled by importing opium from

Turkey and Persia which had formerly been imported from India. In 1919, the export to Formosa from India had been 20 chests and there had been no further export since that date.

The figures for Japan were as follows:

1919 . . . .	1,150 chests
1920 . . . .	900 "
1921 . . . .	150 "
1922 . . . .	50 "

Thus a total of 1,150 chests had been exported to Japan and Formosa in 1919, and in 1922 the total export had only been 50 chests, which showed that the trade had practically ceased. The gap, however, had been filled by other countries, and he pointed out that, on page 144 of Annex 4, an import into Formosa of 88,760 kgs., in 1920, from the United States was noted. The fact that Formosa was importing opium in large quantities was well known. The figures showed a very large decrease in its import from India, but the amount had been filled up by imports from other countries.

The point which he desired to emphasise was that it was very little use indeed for an exporting country to control its exports as rigidly as was the case with India, so long as other exporting countries did not fulfil the terms of the Convention, and did not control their exports. It would always be possible for importing countries to obtain all the opium which they needed from countries which did not exercise such control.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT enquired what was the source from which the Secretariat had obtained the figures for imports into Formosa from the United States.

The SECRETARY replied that the figures were to be found in Formosa's answer to the Questionnaire of 1921, a summary of which was contained in Document C. 171 (1). M. 88, (1) which contained a comment on the figures to the effect that a sudden trade appeared to have sprung up between the United States and Formosa. This document, which had been issued in 1922, had been in the hands of the Committee for nearly a year.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the United States had sent a large quantity of opium to Japan in 1920 and 1921.

M. BRENIER said that doubtless this fact would explain how the opium reached Formosa from the United States. Probably the Japanese Government had included all the opium imported from the United States in 1921 in their figures for Formosa and for Japan.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that in 1920 the United States imported 210,000 lbs of opium, 112,000 lbs of which were exported to Japan. The Jones-Miller Bill was passed in 1922 to prevent a recurrence of such an export.

She informed the Committee that she would lay figures before it concerning the imports and exports of the United States at a future meeting.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) enquired what was the reason for the inclusion of statistics on codeine in the document before the Committee, as codeine was not a drug covered by the Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that the statistics for codeine contained in the document gave the impression that codeine was one of the drugs covered by the Convention. The majority of medical opinion regarded codeine as a harmless and useful substitute for morphine. He desired to propose that all mention of codeine should be deleted.

*The Committee decided to discuss Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal when it discussed the statistics on the derivatives of opium.*

(b) *British North Borneo.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that a contract had been entered into between the Indian Government and the Government of British North Borneo whereby the number of chests supplied by India to British North Borneo was reduced to 7 a month. 60 chests had been exported to British North Borneo in 1922, as against 240 in the preceding year. These facts would be of interest to the United States, since smuggling was stated to have been prevalent between British North Borneo and that country.

Sir John JORDAN enquired how the arrangements were made between India and the European possessions in the Far East. On what basis was the figure of 60 chests arrived at?

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that when a British colony made an arrangement with the Indian Government, it was understood that the Government of the colony should inform the Indian Government of any large increase or decrease in its demand. This stipulation had been made because the Indian Government had to look a year ahead in order to have a sufficient stock of opium in its possession to meet all demands. A colony was expected to justify an increase and,

in practice, a reasoned statement was usually submitted to the Indian Government. On the receipt of this statement, the Indian Government checked it by means of any information which it might have in its possession, and the normal practice was for the India Office to discuss the matter with the Colonial Office. As a result of the discussion, a figure was agreed upon and the details were then settled between the colony concerned and the Indian Government.

Sir John JORDAN noted the large reduction in the case of British North Borneo and emphasised the statement in the document to the effect that the Court of Directors had considered that the ration in 1921, when 240 chests had been imported, had been a very moderate one. Presumably the Court had changed its opinion, since it had accepted a further reduction to 60 chests.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, if he remembered correctly, the figure of 60 chests had actually been proposed by the Court of Directors.

Sir John JORDAN welcomed the change of opinion of that board.

(c) *Burma.*

Sir John JORDAN said that the sentence: "the figure for licit consumption per 100 of the population is less than 1 lb. per annum, or an allowance per head of less than one-sixth of an ounce of opium," showed a very moderate standard and one which might well be followed elsewhere.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Government of Burma had absolutely prohibited the preparation in bulk and the sale of prepared opium in Burma. This meant that anyone who desired to obtain prepared opium was obliged to prepare it for himself, which was a very tedious and costly process. This had been found to be the most effective means of checking consumption.

The population included a large number of Chinese, and the figures applied, he understood, to these and also to the Shan States, where opium had been grown for many years.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the smuggling of opium was easier to check in Burma than in the Dutch East Indies, owing to the length of the latter's coasts.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Government of Burma expended enormous sums every year on the control of opium. So great was the expenditure that he thought it likely that the system which it had adopted would be financially impossible for other Far Eastern possessions.

(d) *Ceylon.*

Sir John JORDAN noted that the average consumption in Ceylon amounted to 1 lb. per head, which he considered to be a very large figure.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the figures referred to opium for eating and smoking.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that a very large number of coolies, who consumed opium, went to Ceylon every year to reap the harvest and returned to India.

Sir John JORDAN was satisfied with the explanation.

(e) *China.*

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was no official information regarding the position in China.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) enquired whether the results of the investigations carried out by the Chinese commissioners in the various provinces had been communicated to the Secretariat.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had communicated them to the Secretariat for circulation to the members of the Committee.

*The Committee agreed to discuss the question of China when Item 7 of the agenda was before it.*

(f) *Federated Malay States.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT enquired why the laws of the Federated Malay States protected the native inhabitants from the use of opium, but allowed the Chinese settlers to smoke it.

She quoted the following extract from the *British Bulletin* of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade (April 1923, No. 14):

"Dr. Connolly, of Singapore, has voiced the growing sentiment of a strong public opinion in Malaya against the purchase by the Government of the Straits Settlements of opium from India. In an elaborate article, in which he reviews the whole question of the degradation

of the Eastern peoples by opium, he shows how failure to reduce consumption has followed the higher tax on the drug. 'The British-Malay Governments are committed to a policy of gradual suppression of the opium traffic. Official pronouncements are on record of its disapproval, but conscience has been too easily satisfied by public expression of contrition. The Administration and the country benefit by an opium tax, which now exceeds in the Straits 48 per cent. of the total revenue. Like an Epicurean ascetic, the administration derives pleasure from its profession of virtue and a profitable revenue from the toleration of a vice. Approximately a profit of \$ 14,000,000 is to be collected this year from the Government sales of opium. This represents net profit to the State. So highly profitable is the trade that there is keen competition to obtain a licence. At least 25 per cent. profit on their capital is expected by the opium-sellers.' Dr. Connolly estimates the number of opium addicts in the Straits Settlements at 50,000, and adds that it is sad, but true, that great numbers of Chinese artisans used no opium when they entered Malaya from China, but contracted the habit under the British flag.

"We commend this point to the India Office, for introduction into their next brochure on the lines of 'The Truth about Opium.' As Dr. Connolly says at the close of his article: 'Vicious citizens are incapable of forming a virtuous State. A cynical disregard of the ordinary principles of Christian morality lowers the prestige of a British Colony, and impairs its reputation for sincerity and honour.'"

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that any discussion as to the morality of smoking opium was outside the scope of the Committee. The matter had been discussed in 1912, and Part II of the International Opium Convention was the result of that discussion. Part II stipulated for a gradual suppression. All the British colonies in the Far East were giving steady effect to the provisions of Part II. The action taken by the British Government was to be found in a memorandum published in the previous year and circulated to the members of the Committee.

The figures for imports into the Straits Settlements showed a decrease. In 1920, 3,090 chests were imported, in 1921 3,010 and in 1922 1,820 chests.

These figures showed that the progress was in the right direction.

In reply to Mrs. Hamilton Wright's question regarding the permission accorded to Chinese to smoke, Sir Malcolm Delevingne said that, if the Chinese settlers did not desire to smoke, the problem would be solved, but the Chinese immigrants brought the habit of opium smoking into the country and this habit was not indigenous to the local population. The utmost which the Government could do was to restrict and control the consumption of opium by the Chinese, while forbidding it to the native inhabitants.

The Government of the Federated Malay States had decided to abolish private retail shops and was considering the introduction of a system of licensing and registration of smokers, in order still further to increase the control.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that it could not be denied that a Government which was a party to the Opium Convention but which still allowed the smoking of opium to continue in certain of its colonies was guilty of bad faith. The opinion of Dr. Connelly, which she had just quoted, showed that many of the Chinese immigrants acquired the habit on entering the colony.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that there was no reason why the Governments of Far Eastern colonies should not effectively and gradually suppress the consumption of opium. Article 6 of the Opium Convention stipulated its gradual suppression. Since the signing of the Convention ten years had elapsed, and, according to the figures before the Committee, consumption had increased instead of decreased in the Far Eastern possessions of European Powers.

From the figures supplied by Mrs. Hamilton Wright, it would appear that 48% of the total revenue of Singapore was derived from the opium monopoly. This was a very large percentage, and the opium was said to be consumed by Chinese settlers. As Bishop Brent had pointed out, opium was not necessary to human existence. The Chinese Government would never protest against any action which any Government of a Far Eastern colony might take with a view to the suppression of the consumption of opium.

The Convention stipulated that it should be suppressed gradually, and during a period of ten years no suppression had been effected. The consumption remained either at the same figures or had increased. An opium-smoker could give up the habit in six months. It did not take ten years for him to do so. New recruits of the opium habit had been enlisted in some of these colonies, because too long a time had been allowed to elapse before the suppression had begun. Instead, therefore, of putting an end to opium-smoking, the Chinese new-comers in these Far Eastern colonies had been given a chance to acquire the pernicious habit.

The revenue derived from the monopoly of opium went to the Governments of these colonies, but it was tainted money and no Government should accept money from a source which was poisoning thousands of people. A Government had many sources from which it could obtain revenue. The Chinese population in these colonies spent most of their money on opium. The coolie in Singapore with the opium habit and earning \$ 1 a day spent 50 cents of it on opium. He preferred to spend his money on opium rather than on food and clothing, with the consequence that he was often miserably underfed and ill-clothed. If the Singapore Government suppressed the consumption of opium, thousands of coolies would be saved, and no loss of revenue would occur, since the money at present expended on opium would be used to purchase food and clothing and other necessaries, all to be found in Singapore. The standard of living would be raised and the Government would obtain its revenue from a clean source.

He therefore hoped that the Committee would urge the European Powers with possessions in the Far East to take a far-seeing view in regard to the situation of their colonies.



SEVENTH MEETING

*held Monday, May 28th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

18. STATEMENT CONCERNING EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Bishop BRENT (United States) said that the figures given in the table of exports of narcotics to Japan and Formosa in 1920 had been found to be approximately correct. In the statement which he had made to the Committee at its second meeting, he had particularly drawn attention to the fact that for the period covered by 1915-21 much had been lacking in the character and administration of the legislation of the United States concerning narcotics. No attempt at self-justification had been made. The published figures in question, whether of raw opium, morphia or heroin, had concretely stated this fact. At the close of the war, as soon as the matter had been discovered, legislative steps had been taken to meet the evil. A year ago the Jones-Miller Act had been passed. Since that date no unlicensed narcotics had been able to pass through the United States in transit and they could only be exported directly on certificate in the manner which he had already explained.

19. APPLICATION OF PART II OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES OF THE FAR EAST (Annex 4).

(f) *Federated Malay States* (continued).

Sir John JORDAN said that the Federated Malay States were dependencies of the Straits Settlements and were under the Government of the Straits Settlements; therefore, they should be considered together. He asked the members of the Committee to turn to the statements on pages 139 and 140 of Annex 4, from which it appeared that the manufacture, sale and distribution of prepared opium in the Straits Settlements had become a Government monopoly from January 1st, 1910. That Government claimed that it had made use of the monopoly since 1910 to discourage the smoking of prepared opium, and it stated that the number of licensed opium dens had been reduced from 503 in 1909 to 211 in 1922. How far was that contention supported by the actual facts? The total amount manufactured in 1910 in the Straits Settlements had been 323,633 lbs, and in 1920 that amount had risen to 370,688, lbs which showed an increase of almost 50,000 lbs. He did not see, therefore, how it was possible to contend that there had been any decrease. On the contrary, there had been a large increase. The position was similar in regard to consumption. In 1910, the consumption had amounted to 138,163 lbs and in 1920 to 151,322 lbs, which showed an increase of 13,000 lbs. This was the situation in the Straits Settlements. The Malay States received their opium, not directly from India, but from the Straits Settlements. The Straits Settlements exported opium which they received from India to the Federated Malay States. He drew special attention to the export figures for 1910, the year in which the monopoly had first been established, a monopoly which the Singapore Government claimed had led to a large decrease in smoking. In that year the exports to the Federated Malay States had amounted to 101,000 lbs, and in 1920 to 216,000 lbs, which was more than double the export in 1910. This was his own analysis of the figures, but, so far as he could see, that was the situation in the Straits Settlements and in the Federated Malay States up to 1920. Sir Malcolm Delevingne, it was true, had given some more recent figures, which were not included in the document before the Committee, but, except for the year 1918, he did not think that they materially altered the situation. He thought for 1921 it had been 3,000 odd chests. He assumed that a large proportion of opium was consumed by Chinese. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had stated that the Chinese had introduced the habit into the Federated Malay States and it had been suggested that the Chinese must have opium. That was not so. There were 400 millions of Chinese: certainly not more than ten or fifteen million smoked opium. Therefore it did not follow that all the Chinese necessarily smoked opium. So far as he knew at the present time, it was only where there was no representative Government that opium-smoking was indulged in to any large extent. If the countries in the British Empire, where there was a representative Government, and where there were considerable communities of Chinese, as for instance, New Zealand and Australia, were examined, it would be found that opium-smoking was non-existent in them. He thought therefore that there was a very good case for a large reduction and a close examination of the whole situation. Mrs. Hamilton Wright had asked why in Great Britain there was differential legislation for the Chinese. He felt that he must point out that, at the time when the British Government had accepted the Hague Convention, it had made a declaration to the effect that the principles and provisions of the Convention would be applied in the colonies in the same way as in the United Kingdom. It was certainly difficult for a layman to see how that was taking place at the present time. There were thousands of Chinese smoking opium in these colonies about whom nobody heard anything at all. The declaration of the British

Government did not seem to have been carried out in the spirit. If his figures were correct, they proved what he had stated previously, namely, that in a great many colonies no reduction whatever in consumption had been effected.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) was unable to agree with the deductions which Sir John Jordan had drawn from the tables before the Committee. Sir John Jordan had taken the figures for 1910, the year in which the monopoly had first been established. If he had taken the figures for 1911, when the new system had fully come into force and when the effects of the previous system had passed away, he would have seen that, in the case of the Straits Settlements, the figure for the manufacture of opium was 393,635 lbs., as against 370,688 lbs. in 1920. With the exception of 1912, when the manufacture had been 414,579 lbs., there had been a steady reduction. The recent figure which he had given at the previous meeting showed an even greater reduction.

Sir John JORDAN asked what was the position in regard to consumption. What was the figure for 1911?

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that the figures for 1911 and 1920 were very similar: 148,209 lbs. and 151,322 lbs. respectively.

Sir John JORDAN said that these figures showed that there had been an increase in consumption.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the increase had been very slight. The exports to the Malay States had amounted to 264,081 lbs., as against 101,806 lbs., in 1910, and from that date there had been a steady reduction, with some small fluctuations, to 216,385 lbs., in 1920, and the figure for 1921, which he had given at the previous meeting, was still lower.

Sir John JORDAN said that there had been no reduction if the average was taken.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the British Government did not claim that there had been a reduction. In the British Memorandum it was admitted that there had been fluctuations. Fluctuations invariably occurred in the consumption of prepared opium in accordance with the state of trade and the remuneration of the labourers. When trade was good and wages were high, the labourers had more to spend. When trade was bad and wages were low, they had less to spend and the consumption consequently decreased. That was the case under any system which might be adopted so long as the consumption of prepared opium was continued and so long as there was no definite system of rationing. In the memorandum which he had circulated to the Committee, containing suggestions for dealing with this matter, he had put forward a proposal for a definite rationing system.

Sir John JORDAN stated that his arguments had been based upon the statement of the Straits Settlements Government, in which it was claimed that the monopoly had been used to discourage the smoking of opium.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the British Government had done its best to discourage it by raising the price and strictly restricting the places of sale. There was no free traffic whatsoever and opium had been made very expensive.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the deduction made by the Secretariat: "It will be seen, therefore, that the methods adopted to obtain a reduction of consumption have not had the desired results, inasmuch as there has been an increase of both manufacture and consumption since the coming into effect of the Government monopoly" was justified.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed that, as his own memorandum admitted, the present system was not securing an effective application of the provisions of Part II of the Convention which provided for a gradual and effective reduction of the smoking of opium, and consequently he would propose a system of rationing.

(g) *Formosa.*

After some discussion, the Committee took note of a misprint in the figures. The figure for 1910 should have read: 323,654 lbs.

Sir John JORDAN wished to know the origin of the opium imported into Formosa. He was perfectly clear as regarded the export of Indian Opium, and he accepted Mr. Campbell's statement on this matter as being absolutely correct. Only 50 chests of Indian opium at the present moment went to Japan proper and Formosa combined. What was the present source of the other opium imported into these countries? He did not know whether the Secretariat had statistics on this point but it was most important that the Committee should have as exact a figure in regard to Persian and Turkish opium as it had of Indian opium. Mr. Campbell had said, and Sir John Jordan did not doubt it, that India had ceased to export opium, but opium was still being introduced into Formosa in very large quantities. He had found no Japanese statement as to imports into Formosa after 1920 and yet statistics had been asked for a year ago by the Committee. He

wanted to know what amount of Turkish and Persian Opium was being introduced into Formosa and Japan for the purpose of manufacturing morphia. Those figures appeared to him to be most important.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) said that in 1921 34,996 lbs of raw opium were imported into Formosa from Persia.

M. BRENIER asked if they were English or Japanese pounds.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) thought that they were English lbs. The imports had been from British India 21,706 lbs; from Great Britain 17,581 lbs; from the United States 8,000 lbs, and from Hong Kong 5,921 lbs. He said that the opium imported into Formosa was manufactured into prepared opium and in the manufacture a certain residue of unrefined or crude morphia was left over, which was exported to Japan proper where it was used in the preparation of pure morphia and other drugs.

Sir John JORDAN said that since 1917 the Japanese Government had established a monopoly in Formosa. It had always aimed at decreasing the consumption and claimed to have made great progress in this direction. At the present moment the number of consumers of opium in Formosa was 49,000. Why was all this opium required for 49,000 people? Why was this morphia required in Japan? Japan was the one country in the world which handled those drugs and never used them. There was no consumption of morphia in Japan whatsoever. 108,204 lbs of opium were recorded as having been imported into Formosa and taken to Japan to be made into morphia. It was impossible for the Committee to solve the question until the situation in Formosa was leucidated.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that Sir John Jordan's point in connection with the report of the Japanese Government should be considered more fully later when the Japanese report was under discussion. The Committee would find that the series of statistics contained in that report was rather extraordinary and more than corroborated the point raised by Sir John Jordan. Large importations of morphine and cocaine were recorded and no export was mentioned. There would seem to be a very large production of drugs in Japan and there was no explanation whatsoever as to what became of these drugs. Perhaps the representative of the Japanese Government on the Committee might be able to supply some information on the subject.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN *the Committee decided* to discuss the question of the Japanese manufacture of morphia when the Committee was examining the position regarding derivatives of opium.

(h) *Indo-China.*

The CHAIRMAN gave the following information with regard to the position of Indo-China, where a series of decrees and laws had been passed in that Colony in connection with the campaign against opium. These decrees were: two local ordinances of January 29th., 1904 and June 19th., 1907; the setting up of the Regie in 1914, the Decree of December 27th, 1916, and a Decree of 1919; Decree of March 1922. They increased progressively the sale-price of opium, reduced the number of smoking divans and the retail shops, and finally suppressed these in Tonkin and Annam (that was to say, in two-thirds of Indo-China).

The price of a kilogramme of opium had been raised from 147 piastres in 1914 to between 187 and 253 in 1921. The number of smokers did not exceed 120,000, or 4 per thousand inhabitants.

In order to compute the actual progress realised in Indo-China the statistics dating from 1907 should be examined since in that year the Local Government campaign against opium began. If this were done the reduction in consumption would be shown to be 45 %. This figure proved the actual magnitude of the effort made and of the results obtained.

The consumption during the last few years had been as follows:

1915.....	75 tons
1916.....	140 tons
1921.....	73 tons

The rise in consumption in 1916 — a rise which had been general throughout the Far East — could be explained by the moral and material upheaval in Indo-China brought about by the war. The accumulation of wealth, the abundant rice crop, the rise in wages all created fresh needs. The results, therefore, obtained between the years 1907 and 1915 had been partially destroyed by the war.

The campaign, however, had been energetically renewed after the war, and decrees had been promulgated in 1919, 1920 and 1922. For the second time the consumption of opium was reduced by half (73 tons in 1921 instead of 140 in 1916). The campaign against opium in Indo-China, therefore, must be considered in two periods — the period before the war and the period after its conclusion. During each of these periods the consumption of opium had been reduced by half.

The situation in Indo-China was a particularly difficult one. It was the Chinese who were smokers and not the native population. The Chinese population, however, was a floating one and was constantly being renewed by the arrival of opium smokers coming from the southern provinces

of China. A fresh solution for the problem had therefore to be found each year. The campaign against opium in Indo-China, therefore, very closely depended on the results of the campaign in China itself.

The reduction made had been far greater than the official statistics showed. The consumption of smuggled opium had been considerably diminished as a result of the energetic measures taken to combat the illicit traffic. Smuggling, always difficult to guard against on the Tonkinese frontier which was of a mountainous nature and extended for two thousand kilometres, would increase immediately the Regie made too great a reduction in the quantity of chandu placed on sale. The opium problem in Indo-China did not constitute so grave a danger as elsewhere. The vice of smoking was unknown among the native inhabitants.

The number of smokers was far less than anywhere else in comparison with the number of the population. The consumption of opium, for instance, of the two million inhabitants of the Straits Settlements was about the same as that of the 16 million inhabitants of Indo-China. In the Malay States it was 68 tons for a population of 1,176,000. In 1920 the import of opium into Indo-China was 118 tons, in 1921 335 tons. This last figure might appear large, but all the opium which had been imported had been raw and it would have to be reduced by about half in order to obtain the actual quantity of prepared opium. Stocks also had to be renewed in order to provide material for the manufacture of opium of a superior quality.

The population of New Caledonia, Tahiti, the Reunion Isles and Madagascar, had been threatened in 1914 with an outbreak of the opium scourge. The consumption of opium in those territories had been entirely prohibited since 1922.

This prohibition had been most rigidly enforced.

The Colonial Ministry had recently received a request from the doctors in Tahiti for permission to import, as an exceptional measure, a certain quantity of opium for the use of forty addicts, whose state of health was said to be suffering gravely by reason of its complete suppression. The French Government had refused to grant this permission.

He desired to draw the Committee's attention to a fact mentioned in the British Government's report, which had been communicated to the French Government by the British Government. A considerable quantity of opium from Yunnan had been allowed to pass through Tonkin *en route* for a province in the south of China. As soon as this fact had been known, the French Government had ordered an enquiry to be set on foot, and the strictest measures had been taken to prevent a recurrence. The British Government had been officially notified.

M. BRENIER said that he could give the Committee certain additional information on this matter. Smuggling was difficult to prevent in Tonkin, not only because the frontier was very mountainous, but also because of its great length (2000 kilometres). He corroborated the Chairman's statement regarding the difficulties in connection with the floating population. The Chinese population of Indo-China numbered about 546,000.

When the Committee discussed Item 7 of its agenda, he would lay before it the figures for the consumption per head in the various European colonies in the Far East.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that it would be very useful if M. Brenier would circulate the table as soon as possible, because a fair comparison between the consumption in one possession and another could only be made if a common denominator, based on a common unit, were taken. As in most Possessions the consumption was confined to the Chinese residents, it would seem to be a fair basis to take the number of the Chinese population in the Possession. He drew attention to the excellent figures shown by Hong-Kong on that basis.

M. BRENIER agreed to this proposal. As a basis of comparison, the quantity manufactured should be compared with the number of the Chinese residents in each territory.

The CHAIRMAN had said that the British Government's report stated that a tax was alleged to have been imposed by the Government of Indo-China on the opium transported from Yunnan through Indo-China. He had immediately telegraphed to his Government, which had informed him that, to its knowledge, no such tax had ever been imposed. The transport of the opium had been in no sense secret. The local French authorities had authorised the provincial authorities in Yunnan to transport the consignment.

Sir John JORDAN considered that the consumption per head in Indo-China was as large as elsewhere. There were about 110,000 smokers and the consumption was, he thought, 73,000 kilos, or about 146,000 odd lbs. That was 1 1/2 lbs a head, and he did not see therefore that there had been an appreciable reduction. In 1921 the figures had been higher than for the preceding two or three years — very considerably larger than for 1919 and 1920. Could Mr. Campbell inform the committee as to whether Indo-China obtained its opium from India exclusively or did some emanate from Persia?

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that Indo-China was not in any way obliged to obtain its opium from India.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether Mr. Campbell knows how much it imported from India. Mr. CAMPBELL (India) stated that the quantities exported by India were

1918	3,790	chests
1919	1,920	"
1920	950	"
1921	1,655	"
1922	1,700	"

Sir John JORDAN said that there seemed to be a slight reduction but that the consumption appeared to have remained fairly steady throughout. He had been glad to hear the Chairman's statement with regard to the transaction of the export of opium from Yunnan. He fully realised that the situation in Indo-China must be difficult. There was a very large production of opium in Yunnan. He had received very recent information from the late British Consul-General to the effect that there was 220 tons of opium in Yunnan awaiting export. Was there any further information available with regard to the particular consignments? He understood that it had passed along the French railway and been sent through to another part of China. If opium from Yunnan was going to be exported through Tonkin (he was glad to hear that explicit orders had been given to the contrary) it would be terrible if it reached China or Hong-Kong.

The CHAIRMAN said that, according to the Governor of Yunnan's statement, the opium had been consigned to a province in the south of China and not to Hong-Kong. The French Government had been in complete ignorance of the operation and had only learnt of it when informed thereof by the British Government. Orders had immediately been issued to prevent a recurrence. He could assure Sir John Jordan that the opium had not been sent on behalf of the French local authorities who had simply acceded to the request of the provincial authorities of Yunnan and had allowed the transport.

On the proposal of the Chairman, *the Committee requested M. Brenier to furnish it with further figures in regard to Indo-China when Item 7 of the agenda was discussed.*

(i) *India.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that the remarks in this section of the document conveyed a very misleading impression. No statistics for the manufacture, sale or consumption of prepared opium for smoking were available because there was no manufacture nor sale of prepared opium in India. The manufacture of prepared opium, with the exception of a negligible quantity for private consumption, was prohibited.

(j) *Macao.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that the figures quoted for Macao gave the impression that the Portuguese action regarding the reduction of consumption had been very slight, because these figures showed a consumption of 147,297 milligrammes per head amongst a population of 74,000. Nevertheless, these figures should not be too closely relied upon, and the Portuguese Government should not be held responsible. If the consumption per head was calculated on the basis of the permanent population, the figures were perhaps correct, but there existed in Macao a further element, which had not been taken into consideration. A considerable number of Chinese entered Macao annually, and the Government could not prevent their entry on the ground that they smoked opium. Recently, owing to the recrudescence of poppy cultivation in China, the reduction of consumption had become very difficult. The Chinese, not having lost the habit of smoking among themselves, could not be expected to lose it when they went to Macao.

It was in the light of these facts that he thought the question of Macao should be considered. The Committee must, above all, not forget that the Portuguese Government was endeavouring to carry out the Convention of 1912 with the utmost goodwill, since it was gradually reducing its manufacture. This was proved by reference to the figures supplied by the Portuguese Government, which he had laid before the Committee in the preceding year. The question of opium alone should not be considered, but the whole question of narcotics, and the statistics should be reduced to a common basis.

100 kilogrammes of opium were required to manufacture 10 kilogrammes of morphia. The figure given by Portugal for raw opium should therefore be divided by ten, or the figure for the morphia produced in other countries should be multiplied by ten. It was only by this means that a common basis for judging the consumption per head could be obtained.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had little to add in regard to Macao.

He agreed with the Portuguese representative that the import of opium to Macao had considerably decreased. Formerly about 1,600 or 2,000 chests for a population of 70,000 odd had been imported.

In 1913 an agreement had been drawn up between the British Government and Macao by which the import of opium had been fixed at 540 chests per year, about 260 chests of which was to have been exported. That arrangement had been of five years' duration, and he wished to know whether a new arrangement would be made and what would be its terms. How much opium was Macao going to import in future? He could not agree with the Portuguese representative's view that the consumption was not excessive. The memorandum before the Committee showed a consumption of 2,266 grains per head, which was, he thought, unprecedented. Siam and other countries only consumed 120 to 126 grains per head.

M. Ferreira had stated that the floating population in Macao accounted for this consumption, but he ventured to suggest that the floating population was one which went to Macao in order to consume opium.

He particularly wished to enquire into the 9,500 kilos of prepared opium which had been exported from Macao. Sometimes it was sent to Mexico and sometimes to Chile. There was a very strong suspicion that this opium did not go to Chile but to China. He had never understood why the Government of India sent opium to Macao to be exported in this way and why Macao exported prepared opium. It was contrary to the Convention. The Contracting Powers had agreed to stop the export of prepared opium as soon as possible, and this export had now been continuing for years.

He would like to receive explanations in regard to (a) the export to Chile, (b) the terms of any new agreement with Macao, and (c) whether the annual import into Macao had been reduced below 540 chests. He thought 50 chests of opium would be ample for Macao with its population of 74,000 people. This would be in proportion to the amounts imported by Hong-Kong and other places.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he was unable to give Sir John Jordan any information regarding the new agreement made with the government of India. He thought, however, that the old contract had been prolonged during the war.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) stated that he could give all the information required, but that some of it was perhaps not suitable for putting before the Committee in public. The Agreement had been concluded in 1913 between His Majesty's Government and the Government of Portugal, and was to remain in force until it should be denounced by either party. It provided for 260 chests for export, with a provision for an increase if more should be required by Macao for export to legitimate destinations. The Agreement had also provided for 240 chests for internal consumption. That agreement, concluded in 1913, represented a large reduction in the quantity which had formerly been sent to Macao. As the members of the Committee were aware, the Government of India had been dissatisfied with this agreement, but, before it had been able to approach the Government of Portugal, reliable evidence on which it could act had had to be secured. The collection of that evidence had naturally taken a certain time, but, as soon as it had been obtained, His Majesty's Government had acted upon it. The Treaty had now been denounced and a new arrangement was at present being negotiated. The amount of opium to be exported under this new arrangement would be fixed and the matter was now under discussion between His Majesty's Government and the Government of Portugal.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the old agreement was meanwhile remaining in force.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) replied in the negative. The agreement provided so far as he could recollect, that it should remain valid for a year from the time of its denouncement, and the denouncement had taken place last year.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether any Persian opium was imported into Macao?

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said there was no record of any such import in the statistics of the Portuguese Government.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that this was a very important omission, because Mr. Campbell had shown Indian opium had been replaced by Persian opium. The Committee ought to know by what countries Persian opium was imported.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he would communicate with his Government regarding the import of Persian opium, and hoped to obtain a reply before the end of the session. The Portuguese Statistics made no mention of an export to Chile.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the 240 chests would continue to be exported to Macao.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) replied that the details of the agreement were still being negotiated, but he understood that the Government of India had stated that it would not supply any opium to Macao except for internal consumption there.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the consumption was stationary? He thought that Siam received about 1700 chests a year. There did not appear to be any great difference between the imports in 1910 and in 1920.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that there had been a reduction of about 50,000 kilos, in 1921-22.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had circulated to the Committee certain proposals. He had understood that his memorandum on Hong-Kong would be considered when the general proposals were discussed. He suggested that, since his proposals raised questions of principle, the discussion of them should be adjourned to the next meeting.

*The proposal was adopted.*



## EIGHTH MEETING

*held Tuesday, May 29th, 1923, at 10.45 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

### 20. STATEMENT BY THE PORTUGUESE DELEGATE REGARDING MACAO.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he had received recent information concerning the agreement between the Portuguese and Indian Governments, relating to the supply of opium to Macao which he desired to lay before the Committee.

The Agreement of 1913 had expired in 1918. It had been prolonged for several years because of the war. At the moment, a new agreement was in course of negotiation. The British Government had made proposals and the Portuguese Government had submitted counter proposals, in which it had asked for 360 chests of opium per year, 240 for internal consumption and 120 for re-export. Provision was made for an annual reduction of 20 chests on the amount for internal consumption and 10 chests on the amount for re-export. Further, the proposed agreement contained a stipulation that the Import and Export Certificate System should be applied to Macao. In his statement at the previous meeting, Sir John Jordan had, therefore, not been quite correct when he had said that the system did not apply to Macao.

At a previous meeting, M. Ferreira had said that there was a Bill concerning the Import and Export Certificate System which was about to be presented to the Portuguese Parliament. He had now learnt that the Bill had actually been before Parliament for some months.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Ferreira for his information.

Sir John JORDAN said that he could not congratulate the Portuguese Government on its proposals in regard to the new Agreement. He thought that it was quite unnecessary for Macao to import any opium for the purpose of re-export. No one knew the destination of the opium so exported. He did not wish to go into particulars, but he felt sure that an export of 120 chests a year was indefensible. Further, 240 chests of opium for internal consumption among a population of 74,000 was altogether excessive. The amount necessary for Macao was, in his opinion, not more than 50 chests a year.

It would be of the greatest interest to the Committee to have details of the amount of Persian opium imported into Macao laid before it. He was under the impression that there had been a considerable import into Macao in the previous year from Persia, and until the figures relating to Persian opium had been obtained, it was impossible for the Committee to form any adequate idea of the situation. The import of Persian opium into Macao and Formosa was the central fact in the Far Eastern situation.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he would transmit Sir John Jordan's observations to his government with regard to the counter-proposals made by it concerning the import of opium into Macao.

He desired to state that his Government had always endeavoured to fulfil the spirit of the Hague Convention and that it had successively diminished its imports. The Agreement of 1913 had allowed an annual import of 500 chests of opium, and the Portuguese Government was now asking only for 360 chests. That was a fairly considerable reduction.

Sir John JORDAN desired to know what quantity of opium from Persia took the place of the opium formerly imported from India. He thought that it amounted to a considerable quantity.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) desired to add to the reply which he had given to Sir John Jordan at a previous meeting that the Portuguese Government proposed to apply the import and export certificate system not only to Continental and Insular Portugal but also, under certain conditions, to Macao.

### 21. STATEMENT BY M. BRENIER FOR INSERTION IN THE MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING.

M. BRENIER said that he desired to replace the statement appearing under his name in the Minutes of the Third Meeting by another. The new statement contained the following paragraph which he thought might give rise to discussion:

"Nothing in what he had said seemed to him to contradict in principle the declarations of the American Delegation, who had insisted especially, if he had rightly understood, on the necessity of the limitation of *production*, whether of the raw materials or of the derivatives. If he were not mistaken, the definition of the words "legitimate uses", to which his colleagues had also drawn attention, had already been examined and settled by the Assembly."

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that Mr. Brenier desired to make a change of principle in the Minutes.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, in his opinion, the Assembly had never defined the word "legitimate". The word had been used only in connection with an enquiry which did not refer to prepared opium. He quoted the following resolution, which had been adopted by the second Assembly:

"The Assembly recommends to the Council that the enquiry referred to in paragraph 7 of the latter's resolution dated June 28th, 1921, should be extended to include all opium the consumption of which may be considered legitimate, and that to this end the word "strictly" be omitted and the word "legitimate" be substituted for medicinal and scientific. It further recommends to the Council the omission of the reference to prepared opium; that is to say to opium prepared for purposes of smoking, the complete suppression of which is provided for in Chapter 2 of the Convention."

M. BRENIER said that, with regard to the Assembly's definition of the word "legitimate", he was prepared to alter the last paragraph of the text which he had read at the third meeting, and which he had just quoted. Evidently the fact that no mention had been made by the Assembly of prepared opium changed the accuracy of this part of his statement. He had, however, qualified his allusion to the definition of "legitimate purposes", by the phrase "if he was not mistaken." Mr. van Wettum had now proved him, in this instance, to have been mistaken, but though he could speak with authority regarding the discussions which had taken place at the Hague in 1912 and in which he had taken part, it was impossible for him to speak with equal authority regarding the discussions in the Assembly which he did not attend.

*The Committee agreed that M. Brenier's new statement should replace the previous one in the Minutes of the Third Meeting subject to the additional explanations which he had just given.*

## 22. STATEMENT BY BISHOP BRENT REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Bishop BRENT (United States) made the following statement regarding the opium situation in the Philippine Islands:

I did not anticipate that I would be called upon to give a statement covering our problem as it took shape in the Philippines, but I wish to thank you for your courtesy in giving me the opportunity which I now have of telling what our problem was and how we handled it. The American occupation of the Philippines began in 1898. There was a military government for three years, and in 1901 the Civil Government began. It was government under a Commission composed of a majority of Americans and a minority of Filipinos.

Perhaps I might venture to make a few preliminary statements about the Philippines. We estimated at that time that there was a population of 7,572,000 people, of whom about 70,000 were Chinese. There was no actual census and my feeling is that inasmuch as, at the present day, we have a Chinese population of 44,239, the earlier figures were something of an over-estimate. There has been a decrease of Chinese population inasmuch as an exclusion Act is in effect; in all probability, in 1901 there were about 50,000 Chinese instead of 70,000 which we estimated.

I need hardly remind you that these people are tropical. They are scattered through some 3,000 islands. Many of these islands are not inhabited, but a great number have at least some population. All the countries hard by, are opium producing or consuming. The Filipinos are a singularly temperate people. While they do produce a very fiery liquor it is seldom used to excess and drunkenness is by no means a vice. The use of tobacco and of beetul nut is common.

Prior to the American occupation the custom of getting revenue from farming out opium prevailed; and for the first few years of the American occupation we got a large revenue from Custom's duty. A high tariff was put on imports in 1901. I need not spend time on matters that are obvious. Inasmuch as the Philippines were to pay their own way the Government was looking anxiously for sources of revenue, and there was a good deal of anxiety in this connection, but from the very beginning it was felt that all the protective laws and laws of privilege which were in force in the home country should also be extended to the Philippine Islands; that we must not have one law for the home country and another for the dependency; that we should require for the Philippines that freedom which we claimed for ourselves — even self-Government as capacity developed. In our laws, then, there could be no discrimination between races that were resident in the Philippines.

It was proposed in 1903 that we should revert, as was officially proposed, to opium farming. It caused a considerable stir among Americans in the Philippines and a hearing was asked before the Commission. That hearing resulted in the appointment of a Committee to go to Japan, Formosa, Burma, Java and other countries "in order to collect information that would be likely to aid the Commission in determining the best kind of law to be passed in the Islands for reducing and restraining the use of opium by the inhabitants". Before going further, I ought to say that we recognised at the outset that the problem in the Philippines was not as serious as that in the neighbouring territories. The Report says:

"The first thing that we should bear in mind in discussing this question is that at the present time the use of opium fortunately does not constitute so grave a social calamity in the Philippines as it does in the neighbouring territories. As we have already observed, the proportion of Filipino smokers to the entire population of the island is insignificant save in three of four puebls. The danger therefore lies in the tendency of the vice to grow and spread, until the number of victims

now inconsiderable may at some future time reach a point where it shall constitute an alarming evil. As long as the present Chinese exclusion act continues in force, there can be no influx of opium smokers from without, and with a steady effort of the Government to prevent an increase in the number of proselytes to the vice within, the habit will be confined to those who are already its slaves." (Report P. O. I. O. pp. 44, 45.)

We estimated that there were perhaps 10,000 Filipinos largely Chinese Filipinos — that is, the product of mixed marriages — and it may be 14,000 Chinese, who are addicts. Let me quote from the report relative to the effect of opium smoking on people of different racial temperament and constitution, as we understood it.

"In comparing the effects of opium smoking on people of differing racial temperaments and constitution, it is at best an imperfect argument to maintain that in some cases no great depth of degradation is reached and therefore no serious evil is involved. The question is not only *to* what, but also *from* what, men fall. Degradation, like poverty is relative. So that if a Chinese for instance, endowed with large powers of endurance and fine intellectual faculties lowers those powers ten per cent by some vice, although not becoming incapacitated by his excess, he is as culpable as the Malay with fewer gifts who by the same vice reduces his vitality in the same measure but in so doing touches the bottom of worthlessness. In both cases the social order is robbed of powers, though in the latter the spectacle of the abused faculties is more striking and the results more immediately disastrous than in the former. In the long run the chastisement for the fault is as severe in the one case as in the other." (Report p. 41.)

I mention these things to bring out the basic considerations on which we took action. We eliminated entirely the question of revenue. Whatever part that might play, we were prepared to meet it so far as it effected the Philippines, and we tried to study the question on its merits, and the evidence that was presented to us. I have here the figures of the imports of opium from 1900 to 1903, year by year.

In 1900,	224,115 lbs	were imported
In 1901,	369,037 lbs	„ „
In 1902,	137,583 lbs	„ „
In 1903,	254,547 lbs	„ „

You will note that in 1901 there was a very large increase which was due to the fact that in that year a high tariff came into effect.

The above figures give a total of 985,282 lbs, value 1,403,112 dollars, and the duty was 520,290 dollars

I can give you — and perhaps this tells the story better than anything else I can say — the figures covering the importation of opium from 1918 to 1921 inclusive.

In 1918	the import was approximately	235 lbs.
In 1919	do	237 „
In 1920	do	1,550 „
In 1921	do	192 „
Total: . . . .		2,214 lbs.

as against 985,282 lbs for the four years to which I have just referred.

The value of the imports during the four years closing with 1921 is 25,290 dollars and the duty 3,976 dollars.

Of course in nearly twenty years there has been quite a large increase of population. According to the census of 1918 the population reached the neighbourhood of 10 million people.

We visited the various countries which we were charged to visit. We went to Formosa, Japan, China, Hong-Kong, French Indo-China, the Straits Settlements, Upper and Lower Burma and Java. We studied the Royal Commission report for India. In 1904 we presented our report. Our findings are as follows. The preliminary observation was made in our Report that we were taking the traditional position of America relative to opium, and the traffic in opium in the Far East. "The official attitude of the Government at Washington, while not determining the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee, had had some weight in its deliberations, and is a support to it. Now that it has reached its decision the conclusions of the Committee are unanimous, though the members started from varying view-points, and in the course of the investigation almost the whole gamut of opium was run. In the end the conclusions may be said to have shaped themselves solely and naturally out of the data in the hands of the Committee, so that the recommendations herewith offered are made with conviction." (Report p. 13.)

I will summarise the findings as they are rather lengthy, but I shall be glad to answer any questions that you may like to ask relative to the details. The plan outlined is as follows:

- 1. Immediate Government monopoly, to become
- 2. Prohibition, except for medical purposes, after three years.
- 3. Only licensees, who shall be males and over 21 years of age, shall be allowed to use opium until prohibition goes into effect.
- 4. All vendors or dispensers of opium, except for medical purposes, shall be salaried officials of the Government.

5. Every effort shall be made (a) to deter the young from contracting the habit by pointing out its evil effects and by legislation, (b) to aid in caring for and curing those who manifest a desire to give up the habit, and (c) to punish, and if necessary to remove from the Islands, incorrigible offenders.

In working out the details of the plan, the Committee recommends:

1. A head office or depot in Manila where opium may be supplied to licensed consumers in Manila and to sub-offices in such places as the Commission may select.
2. These entrepots will supply the licensed consumers in their vicinities.
3. A system of entry, registration and book-keeping should be devised to keep accurate account of the quantity of opium sold to each licensed habitue, so that it may be detected in case he is buying for others or increasing his own dosage. In that case the quantity sold should be diminished.
4. The licensee should be licensed to buy at one depot or entrepot only, and should be required to show the vendor his license, a copy of which, together with a photograph of said licensee, should be furnished to the said vendor." (Report pp. 48, 49).

These in brief, were our recommendations, and they were acted upon, though not in exactly the way which we proposed. As I said in my opening address last week, the United States Congress did not see fit to adopt, even for a brief period, a Government monopoly, and by an Act of Congress of March 1905, there was absolute prohibition except for medical purposes, to take effect in March 1908. The law was carried out more effectively than had we attempted all the machinery and all the difficulties that were involved in a Government monopoly.

The very first thing we did was to try to help in the most humane way possible, the unfortunate addict. Such revenue as came from the import of opium during that period was used for the treatment of the addicts. That seemed to us perfectly legitimate and right. But what a travesty it would have been to have used the income from opium for the building up of youth and for the education of the people of the Islands. The treatment of the addicts was in the main effective I think all of us who had any experience with them realised that they are by no means incurable, except in extreme cases, and provided that they are kept out of the way of temptation after they have once been released from this awful craving. Provided they are in a Society that protects and upholds rather than destroys, they will remain firm. It may be interesting to know that the name given to the characteristic appetite of the addict in the Philippines, is "Guian", which means a craving so intense that it cannot be resisted.

Of course, we have had enormous difficulty with smuggling. Let me read to you a letter that was written by the Chief of Constabulary (the Constabulary in co-operation with the Customs service have to supervise the carrying out of the law) which shows that unless the nations stand together it is virtually impossible for any people to be free from opium addiction:

"In order that the provisions of the Act may be enforced, 37,000 piasters, about 1/8th of the amount necessary to enable this Bureau to fully prosecute this prohibited evil is annually appropriated. 250,000 piasters (that is, 125,000 dollars), it is believed, would be insufficient to enable the Constabulary to run down the wily Moros from the Sulu Archipelago, the principal importers of the drug from Borneo and the Straits Settlements, with fast launches and aeroplanes."

The Moros do bring a good deal of the drug in their vintas from Borneo, and, it would seem from this letter, from the Straits Settlements. We also know that a good deal comes in from Macao. Macao, I think is the worst source of infection.

"To illustrate the activities of the organisation during 1920 and up to and including March 31st, 1921, members of the Philippine Constabulary, under instructions contained in General Orders No. 22, made 291 opium raids, caught 474 persons in these raids and captured opium valued at 1,392,428 piasters." That is upwards of half a million dollars.

"In addition to this amount, the Customs officials during this period captured and prosecuted 158 opium importers and confiscated opium and other prohibited drugs valued at 1,116,735 piasters. The city of Manila where much of the opium and other prohibited drugs are used, during the same period arrested 501 persons engaged in the enterprise, and captured opium and other prohibited drugs valued at 107,333 piasters". (Letter of July 20th, 1921.)

There are a great many details which would be interesting, but I will not take up your time with them. I should, however, like to outline, from an official paper, the Law and the situation as it now stands:

"The importation of opium into the Philippine Islands, except by the Government and for medicinal purposes after March 1st, 1908, was prohibited by the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1905."

The legislation at present in force in the Philippine Islands governing the traffic of opium and other stupefying drugs is the following:

*Acts of Congress:*

Philippine Tariff Act of 1909 — Section 3: "That importation or shipment into the Philippine Islands of the following articles is prohibited; (g) opium, in whatever form, except by the Government of the Philippine Islands, and by pharmacists duly licensed and registered as such, under the laws in force in said Islands, and for medicinal purposes only."

There were various amendments of that Act, followed by the Harrison Act which was made law in 1914. I would point out that the Philippines got greater opium protection than the Home Country until the Harrison Act and the subsequent Acts.

"The law prescribes that all importations of opium into the Philippine Islands must be made through the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The importation of opium into the Philippine Islands is prohibited except through the Government and for medicinal purposes. Accordingly the opium problem in the Islands resolves itself into that of the prevention of smuggling and the detection of the presence or unlawful possession of opium in the Islands. The Philippine Constabulary is charged with the enforcement of the opium laws, and there is appended a series of bulletins reporting the activities of that organisation in this connection. The Philippine authorities have not discovered that stupefying drugs are manufactured in the Islands. The evidence indicates that the unlawful traffic in prohibited drugs originates in Borneo, Straits Settlements and China. Opium is not produced in the Philippines."

There are six ports of entry under the law which allows opium to come in for medicinal purposes. "It is believed that the opium-using habit is confined almost exclusively to the Chinese and Chinese-Filipine population. It would undoubtedly be of assistance in suppressing the opium evil in the Philippine Islands if its exportation from other neighbouring countries could be more stringently controlled."

"Under the Philippine Law, the term 'opium' covers all forms and derivatives from opium, and data severing morphine, heroin, cocaine or other stupefying drugs, are not separately available. Opium only for medicinal purposes is permitted entry into the Philippine Islands. Under the Act of Congress of Dec. 17th, 1914, all dealers and importers of opium must be registered. The report of the collector of Internal Revenue for the year 1921 shows 457 licenses issued to dealers in prohibited drugs, 55 licenses issued to importers, manufacturers, etc. of prohibited drugs."

I think that gives a fair summary of the Law and its working at the present time. Unless there are some questions to be asked, I think I have, in the main at any rate, done what you have so courteously asked me to do.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Bishop Brent for his statement and enquired whether an educative propaganda against the use of opium had been carried out in the Philippine Islands and what results had been obtained.

Bishop BRENT (United States) replied in the affirmative and said that special care was taken to influence children. In the general lessons given on health and the care of the body, children were warned against drugs.

There were about 700,000 children in the Schools in the Philippines.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the same system of propaganda was being proposed for the State schools in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Japanese Government employed the same method in Formosa where children were taught rhymes in which the use of drugs was condemned.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he had understood Bishop Brent's reference to Borneo to apply to British North Borneo and not Dutch Borneo. No smuggling was carried on in the latter territory.

He desired to know what in Bishop Brent's opinion were the results of the system employed in the Philippines to prevent opium smoking. Had the use of opium in those islands effectively diminished? In countries where there was not a monopoly, smugglers were always active, owing the to great profits obtainable. Personally he thought that the Philippine Islands would be better off if the government possessed the monopoly of opium.

Bishop BRENT (United States) replied that he had referred exclusively to British North Borneo when speaking of smuggling.

All the opium which was seized in the Philippines, if it was prepared opium, was destroyed. If it was crude opium or in some other form, it was either destroyed or placed in the hands of the government.

As regarded Mr. van Wettum's observations concerning a government monopoly, he asked whether, if the Dutch possessions in the Far East were put under the same law as that in force in the Philippines, it would not be a very much better measure of control than if the Philippine Islands were placed under the laws existing in the Dutch possessions. In other words, the greatest menace to the Philippine Islands was the system of a monopoly, which was in vogue in so many neighbouring countries.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, in his opinion, the system of a monopoly was a far better one in places where smuggling was rampant. Seizures effected by the customs and other authorities only concerned part of the opium which entered the territory, so that there was probably a great deal more opium used in the Philippine Islands than the United States was aware of.

Bishop BRENT (United States) enquired whether the Dutch Possessions in the Far East did not experience considerable difficulty in regard to smuggling, as, for instance, in the territories round about Java which possessed an opium monopoly.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) replied in the negative. There was not much smuggling carried on and no big seizures had been effected. When the opium had been farmed, smuggling had existed, but since the establishment of a monopoly no important seizures had been recorded.



Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT observed that if production was reduced sufficiently there would be need neither for a monopoly, nor for smuggling.

The CHAIRMAN said that the geographical situation of a country played a preponderant part in the question of smuggling; the proximity for instance of a country to a producing country, or the nature of its sea and land frontiers.

### 23. PROPOSALS OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT REGARDING THE CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM FOR SMOKING IN THE FAR EAST.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had certain proposals which he wished to lay before the Committee with regard to the consumption of opium for smoking in the Far East, and to the application of Part II of the Hague Convention.

Governments had undertaken by the terms of Part II a definite obligation to bring about the gradual and effective suppression of the use of opium for smoking. The Convention had now been in force for two years, and the Committee and the Governments themselves had been engaged in reviewing the working of the present systems of restriction and control.

The results of their investigations were before the Committee. He reminded the Committee that all the systems of control had been established long before the Convention had come into force. The figures before them would have to be examined with care if correct inferences were to be drawn. False conclusions might be reached if the gross figures were simply taken without any consideration of such factors as special movements and the character of the population.

For instance, in territories where there had been a large influx of Chinese owing to the demand for labour, there might have been a considerable increase in the amount of opium consumed, co-incident with a real decrease in the rate of consumption per head. He drew the Committee's attention especially to this fact because the figures which were before it covered a period during which enormous fluctuations had taken place, fluctuations which had been partly due to the war. The statistics covered years of great prosperity and great depression. When trade was good wages rose and there was a demand for labour; the labourers had more to spend and Chinese entered the territories in question to meet the demand for labour.

The Committee had noted at its last meeting a marked decrease in consumption during the last two years, since the Hague Convention had come into operation. That was no doubt partly due to the depression of trade. It was also due, he believed, to the more vigorous measures which had been enforced with a view to applying the terms of the Convention.

It was a curious fact that the more vigorous the action taken by a government to prevent illicit consumption of opium, the greater was the licit sale. This had occurred at Hong-Kong.

The price of opium had been raised in Hong-Kong and other Possessions to such an extent that excessive consumption was impossible, except in the case of comparatively wealthy persons. Private gain was eliminated by the establishment of Government monopolies and in some Possessions smokers were licensed and registered. Strictly preventive control and other measures had been established. There could be no doubt that legislation of this nature had a great restraining effect in all the States which had adopted such measures, and one of the points which the Committee ought to consider was whether a uniform policy of control, combining the good points of the different existing systems, could not be elaborated and put into force pending the complete suppression provided for by the Convention.

He was prepared to admit that, good as much of the control was, it did not appear to be bringing about that gradual and effective suppression of consumption which was desired.

It was difficult to speak very positively about all the figures before the Committee. They had not been analysed to show the rate of consumption per head, and he hoped that the table which M. Brenier was preparing would throw a good deal of light on the subject: nor had the figures before the Committee been analysed to show the differences in circumstances at different times and in different places. The rate of consumption depended largely on the proportion of the adult male Chinese in the Chinese population, and that proportion differed widely in the various possessions.

The question which the Committee had to consider was what steps could be taken in order to secure the gradual and effective suppression of the consumption of opium which was required by the Hague Convention. The present recrudescence of poppy cultivation in China was the chief difficulty with which the Far Eastern Possessions were faced in dealing with this problem, and he referred the Committee to the memorandum which he had circulated in regard to the existing situation in China (Annex 9). It must be recognised that measures for the reduction of government sales would be followed by an increase in the attempts to smuggle, the prevention of which would be both costly and exceedingly difficult, since the Chinese were the cleverest smugglers in the world. If all government sales were stopped immediately in, for instance, Hong-Kong, the only result would be that opium would be smuggled in large quantities from the mainland, because the profits from the sale of illicit opium would increase enormously. This was the crux of the situation. If government control were abandoned in a colony like Hong-Kong, the situation might become far worse than it was at the present time, when the sale of opium was strictly controlled and supervised. He might remark in passing that at present the consumption per head of the Chinese population in that territory compared favourably with that in other Far Eastern Possessions. When China had put her own house in order the end of opium smoking in the Far East would be in sight.

The detailed proposals which he wished to lay before the Committee were to be found on page 168 of his memorandum (Annex 6). Briefly these proposals were as follows:



- (a) the elimination of all private profit;
- (b) a system of rationing and restriction of consumption;
- (c) a system, if possible, of registration and licensing of smokers; and
- (d) certain other matters, such as fixing of price, increase of penalties, etc.

As regarded the question of the elimination of private profit, the system of farming which had formerly prevailed had been abolished in nearly all of the Far Eastern Possessions. He suggested first that, where the farming system was still in operation it should be abolished, and, that the opium trade should become a government monopoly, which should cover the whole process from the import down to the retail sale. This would involve the abolition of all private retail shops for the sale of government opium, and was a measure of reform which had already been adopted in the Malay States, and which, he believed, the British Government would be prepared to adopt for all its Possessions.

The next question was that of rationing. He thought that the table, which M. Brenier had promised to lay before the Committee, would show marked variations in the rate of consumption in the various Possessions, and he hoped that it might be possible, by an analysis of the figures, to draw up some uniform scheme of rationing which would fix the maximum amount that should be allowed to be purchased. Such a scheme would determine the maximum amount of opium which would be placed on sale by the Government and, consequently, the amount of opium which would be imported into the Possession for that purpose. The easiest and most effective method of carrying out such an arrangement would be by means of a system of licensing and registration. Systems of licensing were already in force in certain of the Far Eastern Possessions. By these systems every smoker was obliged to obtain a licence from the government before he was permitted to purchase government opium, but he would like to see a system established whereby the amount of opium to be purchased would be stipulated on the license. Complete control could be obtained by such a system and the maximum consumption could be definitely fixed, and progressively reduced, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. A strict and energetic administration was necessary for the effective working of a system of registration and licensing but given that, the system was most effective. He thought that Great Britain was certainly prepared to adopt a system of this nature in some of her Possessions. A difficulty existed in the case of Hong-Kong, where there was a very large floating population which circulated continuously between that colony and the mainland, and he did not know what the decision of the British Government would be in regard to this difficulty, but it was under consideration at the present time. His proposals only suggested that the Committee should explore the possibilities of a system of registration and licensing.

The marked difference in the prices of retail opium in the various Possessions should be carefully studied, with a view to the attainment of a certain, if not a complete, uniformity in price, since widely differing prices produced a tendency to smuggle.

Illicit trade in opium should be subject to equally rigid punishment in all the Far Eastern Possessions, because slight penalties or laxity in legal control rendered a system, however good it might be theoretically, ineffective in practice.

In his memorandum he had further suggested that whatever measures the Committee might see fit to recommend should be embodied in an understanding or agreement between the Powers concerned. His proposals were merely in outline and he thought that their transformation into any definite scheme would more properly be undertaken by the authorities immediately responsible for the administration of the different Possessions. He therefore proposed that the Committee might recommend to the Council and to the Assembly of the League that they should invite the governments of the States interested to enter into immediate negotiations with a view to working out a scheme on the lines suggested by the Committee, and embodying it in an understanding between the Powers. As Bishop Brent had said, it was essential that the countries of the world should unite in this matter if the opium evil were to be overcome.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he had no general objection to the suggestions which had been put forward by Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

The proposals contained in the first and second paragraphs had already been made by the Netherlands delegation at the Shanghai Conference in 1909, and at that time they had not been accepted.

In regard to the third paragraph, he pointed out that, as far as the Netherlands Indies were concerned, the native smokers, who individually consumed far less than the Chinese smokers, had to be considered. Further, the quantities of opium smoked individually by Chinese differed widely in the various parts of the Far East.

Where a monopoly was in the hands of a government which was honestly carrying out the stipulations of the Convention, it was useless to fix the maximum consumption. If that maximum were too low, profiteering and hoarding would result, which would mean that the system would have to be abandoned. If it had been thought possible to fix a maximum price and a progressive reduction, the Netherlands Indies would have done so long ago.

The Netherlands Government possessed a licensing system, but he would like to know what was to be done in regard to newcomers to a territory in the Far East.

He thought that it would be of great value if the interested Powers, assisted by their experts, could discuss the possibility of reaching an agreement for the effective application of Part II of the Convention, and he therefore supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal that a recommendation should be made to the Council, based on the proposals which were before the Committee, provided that the native inhabitants should also be considered in connection with the third proposal, and provided that his remark with regard to the fixing of a maximum consumption should be duly noted.

*The discussion on Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals was adjourned to a subsequent meeting.*

## NINTH MEETING

held Tuesday, May 29th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

### 24. STATEMENT BY THE JAPANESE DELEGATE ON THE OPIUM SITUATION IN FORMOSA AND IN JAPAN PROPER.

#### (a) *Formosa.*

M. UCHINO (Japan) explained the actual state of the traffic in opium and the movement of opium and other dangerous drugs.

In September 1897, the opium ordinance of Formosa had been put into force, and a monopoly system adopted. The importation of raw opium and the cultivation of the poppy had been prohibited, except by the Monopoly Bureau of the Government. Opium smoking was to be allowed only to those who had received governmental licences as opium addicts. The distribution of opium among consumers, who were all Formosans or Chinese, was carried out under government control, and smokers who did not possess a licence were severely punished. As regarded the permission to purchase and use prepared opium, new applications for the permit to smoke opium had been refused since March, 1909.

The total amount of raw opium imported and produced in 1921 had been 88,407 lbs.; 88,206 lbs. had been imported from other countries and the remaining 201 lbs. represented the cultivation and production by the Monopoly Bureau. The raw opium produced or imported was used in the manufacture of prepared opium in order to meet the needs of the licensed consumers, and in this manufacturing process crude morphine was produced as a by-product.

During 1921, 121,996 lbs. of prepared opium had been manufactured, while 10,540 lbs. of crude morphine had been produced. This crude morphine had been imported into Japan proper for the purpose of manufacturing morphine hydrochloride and heroine hydrochloride. He thought it was better to explain this point fully when the manufacture of morphine in Japan proper came up for consideration.

The policy pursued by the Government in carrying out the monopoly system was not that of immediate suppression but that of gradual suppression. The Government had adopted this policy after carefully considering the welfare of the people. There was no financial consideration involved. The object of the system of monopoly was to enable the strict control and the gradual suppression of the use of opium. This policy in Formosa was entirely in conformity with the principle laid down in Article 6 of the Hague Convention which provided for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in, and use of, prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned. This policy of gradual and effective suppression was clearly proved by the facts.

The number of licensed consumers had decreased

from	169,064	persons	in	1900
to	99,982	„	„	1910
and from	49,031	„	„	1920
to	45,832	„	„	1921

This showed a decrease of more than two-thirds, about one quarter during twenty-one years, and one-half in ten years.

The date on which the use of prepared opium would be completely suppressed in Formosa could not exactly be ascertained at present, but, taking into consideration the facts that the number of licensed consumers had been about 50,000 in 1920, and that the average number of deaths among the opium smokers during the last 10 years had been about 4,000 a year, it could be assumed that the complete suppression of licensed smokers might be effected within, perhaps, fifteen years.

Since opium was imported into Formosa to meet the requirements of the licensed smokers, there was no export of raw opium or prepared opium. The Government was making an effort to check smuggling, if it existed.

#### (b) *Japan proper.*

M. UCHINO said that the situation in Japan was very often unknown to the outside world, owing to the distance of Japan from Europe, and to the difference of language and customs. But one thing on which he desired to lay stress was the fact that the pernicious habit of smoking had never existed in Japan.

More than sixty years ago, previous to the Meiji Restoration, the Japanese Government had realised how serious an effect opium smoking would have on the nation in the future; and, fearing the spread of this bad habit among the population, it had prohibited the importation of opium, regarding it as a grave danger to national security.

After the political reform known as the Meiji Restoration, the newly organised government had taken measures to prohibit strictly not only the use, but also the sale and distribution, of prepared opium, by the infliction of a heavy penalty, and in the penal code of 1880, very heavy penalties had been laid down for offences relating to the smoking of opium. The same principle of strict prohibition of opium smoking had been strengthened in the revised Penal Code of 1907 and every action relating to opium smoking or even the possession of instruments for indulging in it was punished by heavy penalties. In consequence of this strong policy, which the Japanese Government had followed for more than half a century, the habit of opium smoking was unknown to the Japanese people.

The CHAIRMAN said that this information was of great interest to the Committee, and that it would appreciate the success which had been attained by Japan through its powerful and energetic efforts in the struggle against the opium evil in Formosa and in Japan itself. His personal experience, gained during the thirteen years which he had spent in Japan, had taught him that, despite the proximity of that country to China, and despite the large number of Chinese inhabitants who belonged to a class from which smokers were principally recruited, there was not a single smoker in Japan.

25. APPROXIMATE CONSUMPTION OF PREPARED OPIUM PER HEAD OF THE CHINESE POPULATION IN THE EUROPEAN AND JAPANESE COLONIES OF THE FAR EAST AND SIAM IN 1921.

M. BRENIER wished first to explain the object of the table which he had drawn up on this subject (Annexe 10). It had been noted that it was very often incorrect to divide the amount of opium consumed by the total figure of the population, since the majority of smokers were Chinese. He had therefore taken the total figure from the official statistics (which had been furnished to the Committee) and divided it by the total figure of the Chinese population, in order to arrive at statistics which would represent the consumption per head of the Chinese population in grammes and in grains. He had also judged it necessary to determine the equivalent of morphia in the opium consumed, since it was morphia which constituted the danger to the consumer. Since a large quantity of opium and the morphine contained therein was lost in the form of smoke, it was impossible to gauge this danger exactly from the figures for prepared opium.

M. Brenier thought that his calculations were approximately correct because in most of the Far Eastern possessions and territories the population consisted exclusively of adult male Chinese. The few Chinese women and children in these possessions were not addicted to smoking opium.

He added that his table, although the figures which it contained were only approximate, gave an accurate idea of the danger to which the Chinese population in the Far Eastern countries was exposed.

He asked the Japanese representative whether he could give the figures relating to the Chinese population in Formosa.

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that at the end of 1921 there had been 28,482 Chinese living in Formosa.

M. BRENIER explained that the question concerned the grave danger to which the Chinese were exposed, because they were obliged to smoke opium. He thought that the Chinese inhabitants of Formosa, although they had become Japanese subjects, should still be considered as belonging to the Chinese race.

As regarded his calculations, the only difficulty which existed was that in Formosa and in Siam, there were in reality, or so the eighteen years which he had spent in the Far East had led him to believe, many Chinese who were not considered to be Chinese in those countries, but who, nevertheless, belonged to that race. For Siam, in order to make a fair comparison, the figure for the Chinese race as it was known in the different countries, which had been given by the Siamese representative, should be taken.

In order to complete the table, he gave the consumption per head, per year of opium, and its equivalent in morphia, by the Chinese population in Formosa, taking the figure of 28,000 Chinese inhabitants which Dr. Uchino had quoted. In 1921 the consumption had been 2,943 grammes instead of 22.2 grammes.

Sir John JORDAN stated that he shared M. Brenier's opinion that there were about three million inhabitants of the Chinese race in Formosa.

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that the population of Formosa was composed chiefly of Chinese, Japanese and a large number of Formosans. He gave the figure for the Chinese population as being 28,482.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that the Chinese who came to Siam did not bring Chinese women with them, but married Siamese women. Their children had no intention of returning to China; they spoke Siamese and could not speak Chinese and in every respect were considered as

Siamese, being liable for military service. There were in Siam about 200,000 Chinese born in Siam. The number did not increase as there were always Chinese going into and coming out of the country. For this reason the Siamese Government only considered persons born in China as being Chinese, in the figure which it had given. If all those who had Chinese blood in them were to be considered as Chinese, he himself would be counted as Chinese as, originally, all Siamese had come from China: but he, in fact, considered himself as Siamese.

The number of opium smokers was 200,000, which comprised all the smokers in Siam, including about 50,000 Siamese born in China.

Mr. PORTER (United States) asked what percentage of the Chinese population of the Far Eastern Possessions and Territories were addicted to opium and its derivatives?

M. BRENIER said he proposed to make another calculation if the Committee agreed. His table had only been drawn up because attention had been drawn to the fact that the Chinese population was in danger.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said he did not ask for an exact figure but merely an approximate idea of the percentage of Chinese addicted to the use of opium or its derivatives.

M. BRENIER said that so far as he knew, it varied according to the Colonies. In French Indo-China it was estimated that there were about 110,000 smokers.

Mr. PORTER (United States) suggested that that would be about one-fifth of the Chinese population.

M. BRENIER said that of these 110,000 smokers there were about 100,000 Chinese and 10,000 natives. He thought the proportion was different in the Dutch East Indies and in other Colonies.

Sir John JORDAN thought that it ranged from 40 % upward.

Mr. PORTER (United States) asked if this addiction was confined to the Chinese population or to the non-Chinese.

M. BRENIER said that so far as French Indo-China was concerned, about 10 % of the natives were addicted to opium smoking. On the other hand, in certain other possessions of European countries in the Far East the proportion of natives addicted to opium was much larger.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) stated that in Java, for instance, there were more natives than Chinese who smoked opium.

M. BRENIER thought that it would be very difficult to obtain the proportion of Chinese opium smokers from the total of the Chinese population. In certain colonies an estimate made by the Opium Regie of the number of smokers existed. Smokers were not registered in Indo-China, but in Formosa they were. He asked Mr. van Wettum whether smokers were registered in the Dutch Indies.

Mr. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he was afraid the figures supplied by M. Brenier would give rise to some incorrect conclusions. In Java, for instance, there were more natives than Chinese who smoked opium, but the Chinese individually smoked more opium than the native.

Mr. PORTER (United States) asked if the percentage of non-Chinese addicts in British North Borneo was obtainable.

Sir John JORDAN said he did not think there were any addicts.

M. BRENIER said he did not think that the figures supplied by Sir Malcolm Delevingne for British North Borneo gave the number of Chinese addicted to opium smoking. The average consumption per head was 3,360 grains.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that it appeared that over half the addicts in Java were natives. M. Brenier's calculation, however, was based on the Chinese population only.

M. BRENIER replied that the Committee, struck by the danger to which the Chinese race was exposed, had asked him to draw up a table giving the consumption of opium per head of the Chinese population, and not per head of the whole population.

Mr. PORTER (United States) remarked that in French Indo-China, for instance, the consumption was 160 grains of morphia per capita per year, and that quantity was consumed by 20 % of the population; that gave a consumption of 2 grains per day by the addicts. It would be interesting to have information as to the mortality of the people.

M. BRENIER said that he would take up that question later, so that the Committee would have a fair comparison of the drug habit in the Far East, in Europe and in the United States of America.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that he had tried very energetically to ascertain the nationality of addicts in the United States, and the result appeared to be that all nationalities were afflicted with it in the same way.

Sir John JORDAN said that looking at the matter from a general point of view it might be said that roughly 85 % of the consumers were Chinese.

The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion showed the great interest which attached to the question. He thought, however, for many reasons, that the moment had not yet come for conclusions to be drawn from M. Brenier's table.

He thanked M. Brenier for his interesting document and asked him if he would either alter the title of the table or add an explanatory note, in order to avoid any misunderstanding as to its import. He asked the Secretariat to draw up similar statistics, completing and amplifying them.

29. NOTE BY THE BRITISH DELEGATE ON THE LEGITIMATE OPIUM REQUIREMENTS IN HONG-KONG  
(Annex 6).

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) was sure that his Government would cordially welcome the proposals which had been made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne for dealing with the situation in the Far East. As he had explained to the Committee on previous occasions, the Government of India was only too anxious that the consuming Governments should put their houses in order. The Government of India felt that a good deal of the odium attaching to the opium traffic was at present placed upon it — in his opinion unjustly — and his Government was most earnestly anxious that the consuming Governments should assume the responsibilities which were legally placed on them by the Hague Convention and which the practical exigencies of the situation also imposed on them. The Government of India's argument was now, and always had been, that it was impossible for the Government of India to control consumption in a consuming country. In brief, its argument was that, under the Convention and in view of the overriding facts of the case, improvement could only be effected by action on the part of the consuming countries. He was in a position to guarantee that any reduction, even extending to actual prohibition, which the consuming countries might wish to impose would be completely accepted by the Government of India, which would undertake that no opium left India for those countries in excess of the quantities demanded by them and certified by them as legitimate.

He personally agreed with the criticisms which Mr. van WETTUM had made, as would anyone, he thought, who had had practical experience of administration in the East. His own view was that a system of rationing could not be made effective unless it was logical and complete. It had to start with a ration for the country and work right down to the actual consumer. Rationing was possible but it was extremely expensive, and it had to be complete, if it was to be of any practical use.

The other point which Mr. van Wettum had raised was the exclusion from the actual proposal made in the Committee of any population other than a purely Chinese population. He did not suppose that Sir Malcolm Delevingne would wish to press that point. If there were other consumers in a country and the Government of that country considered it advisable to include those consumers in its registered number, then he had no doubt Sir Malcolm Delevingne would be quite willing to modify his resolution to cover the point. The Committee had heard how important this was in Java, and he believed he was right in saying that the position was very similar in Burma.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had listened with great interest to Mr. Campbell's statement as to the position of the Government of India at the present time. The Government of India exported 8000 chests of opium a year. It was willing to reduce the number to a minimum if the Governments of the consuming countries would do their part. He earnestly hoped that all the consuming countries would come into line. This was really the first constructive policy that had been suggested in the Committee, and he hoped that the members would study it in all seriousness. He had always maintained that the responsibility rested not with the Government of India alone, but was shared by the Powers who asked for this opium.

He did not quite agree with all the small objections which had been raised. In China after the 1909 conference at Shanghai a very similar case had had to be dealt with. The question had arisen in China as to what the Foreign Powers should do in their Chinese Settlements and Territories with regard to Chinese residents. Some of these Settlements contained as large a Chinese population as British Colonies. Shanghai had a Chinese population of about 800,000 people. This question had had to be dealt with in concert with the Chinese Government, and the European Powers had introduced a system of gradually closing the opium dens and reducing the number of consumers. This work had been carried out by the Municipal Council at Shanghai, which consisted of nine merchants — who had had no special administrative experience. If it had been possible to do this at Shanghai, it could also be done by the Administrators in the Far Eastern Possessions of the European Powers.

He was heartily in favour of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal. Some of the measures which he had put forward might seem hard, but he would make them even stricter. He would



obtain the registered number of smokers at the present time. He believed they had been registered in the foreign colonies and territories in China at each place and that it had been insisted that there should be no new smokers registered. The existing consumers had been allowed to possess a certain amount of opium, but it was to be gradually eliminated and in three years the whole situation had been cleared up. He thought that the most important points of Sir Malcolm's memorandum were Nos 3, 5 and 6. No 3 seemed to him worthy of acceptance but as regarded No 5 he would say that there certainly ought to be an arrangement between the Far Eastern Possessions and the Indian Government. The Indian Government was prepared to say that it did not want them to have any opium at all.

He asked if India did not produce more opium than was required by the Far Eastern Possessions.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) replied that the Government of India gave an absolute guarantee that no quantity in excess of the amount demanded and covered by a Government certificate would leave the shores of India.

Sir John JORDAN assumed that the Council would appoint a Committee of Experts to work out a scheme which could, and ought, to be accepted by these Governments. Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals seemed to him to constitute a good basis for action; something of this nature must be done if the Committee was really sincere.

He would like to strengthen the sixth proposal and say that it should apply for a period of ten years. A similar measure had been a success in China and that success justified it being employed again. In China cultivation had been reduced annually for ten years, as imports had been reduced, by one-tenth each year. There was no reason why this should not be done in the Eastern Colonies — that was to say a progressive reduction by one tenth each year, subject to periodical revision and inspection. He did not think it could perhaps be effected in five years, but it could certainly be effected in ten. He therefore suggested that a limit of ten years should be fixed.

With regard to new smokers, he thought that the Chinese Government could and ought to assist the Foreign Powers. He did not agree with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that the matter should be postponed. On the other hand, he did not think the system ought to be set up altogether independently of China. China ought to know what the Foreign Powers were doing. All the Chinese who went to these Eastern Colonies, except Hong-Kong and Indo-China, left from two ports. All the emigrant steamers were inspected conjointly by the Chinese authorities and by the authorities of the ship. The Chinese authorities should be asked to arrange that only non-opium smokers should leave China for these colonies. The Chinese ought to be informed in a friendly manner that the measure was being taken to complete the whole opium programme. The Indian Government had ceased entirely to export any opium to China. This would complete the programme, which he himself had advocated for years.

After the suppression had taken place in China he had been very anxious indeed that the measure should be extended to the colonies; it had not been done at the time, but he thought it ought to be done now. The Chinese Government should be told what action the Foreign Powers were taking to suppress opium consumption among the Chinese overseas, and it was to be hoped that this would inspire the Chinese Government to do the same in China. He thought that this would be of great assistance to Chinese public opinion.

In conclusion, he hoped that this scheme would materialise and be accepted in some form or another. Otherwise he considered that the proceedings of the Committee would be of no worth.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that with regard to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's first proposal, he would like to state that the farming system had been abolished in Siam as long ago as 1907, and the system actually in force in Siam was that suggested in the proposal. He did not see any objection to the measures proposed in the second suggestion since they were the logical sequence of the policy of the Siamese Government, and he would be glad to submit the proposal for its consideration.

As regarded the third suggestion, he was afraid it would not be possible to take the Chinese population as a basis, as there were fewer opium addicts in that category of the population than amongst the nationals of the country. There were about 200,000 opium addicts in Siam, of whom about 25% were Chinese born in China. In adopting a system of rationing, therefore, the 75% of opium addict other than Chinese born in China would also have to be considered.

The measure suggested in the fourth proposal had already been contemplated by the Siamese Government and provisions for registration and licensing were to be found in the Opium Law of 2464 B. E., Title 5. These provisions, however, would remain in abeyance until jurisdictional and fiscal autonomy had been restored to Siam by the powers in treaty relations with her.

As far as the proposal for the establishment of a uniformity of price was concerned, the Siamese Government would welcome such a course, since it had found that opium was smuggled into the country owing to the cheaper retail price abroad. The application of a uniform penalty would also be welcomed by Siam. The difficulty there had been the refusal, which the Siamese Government contested, of some of the Treaty Powers to accept Siamese laws and regulations on opium. He was very glad to learn that the Japanese Government had, last November, accepted them; but he would be grateful to the Japanese representative if he would be good enough to submit to the Imperial Government the desirability also of adopting the penalties provided in the Siamese opium law. These penalties were £ 5 to £ 50 and or imprisonment up to a maximum period of two years. The Japanese Government, however, while accepting the law, provided for a penalty or a fine not exceeding £ 5 or detention. He did not understand what detention



meant. It would be seen that the penalties adopted by the Japanese Government would have no deterrent effect on smuggling.

He concurred entirely in the fifth and sixth proposals.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) said that in regard to the proposals presented by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, he had no special instructions from his Government. If these proposals were adopted, the putting into practice of them would involve expenditure. He thought the proposals were good and that, if they were adopted in all countries, great progress would be achieved. He was therefore prepared to support them. He thanked Prince Charoon for his suggestion and said that he would refer it to his Government.

Mr. CHAO HSIN-CHU (China) said that, when the request of the Hong-Kong Government for ten more chests monthly of Indian opium, had been brought up at the last September meeting, Sir John Jordan and he had not agreed with it and it had been abandoned. It had been brought up again at the Assembly when he had been the only person in a position to answer the arguments put forward in the Fifth Committee. Finally the question had been left aside, on the understanding that it should be referred to the Committee once again.

He did not think he would receive much support from the majority of the Committee in this matter. He quite agreed with the points brought forward by Sir John Jordan — first, that no new smokers should be allowed, and secondly that suppression should take place within ten years. The consumption of opium should be reduced by a certain amount each year so that at the end of ten years a complete suppression would be effected in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention. Officially he could not agree with this request for ten more chests of opium for Hong-Kong, because he still had his Government's instructions as had been the case last year. He had been instructed to oppose this request at the Fifth Committee of the Assembly. Furthermore, if this request unanimously were acceded to in the Committee it would not create a good impression. He would therefore have to vote against it.

He had examined the facts enumerated by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and he believed that some of them were not sound.

With regard to the second proposal, for example, smuggled opium in Hong-Kong was much cheaper than Indian opium.

The price of the former was from two dollars to eight dollars per tael as compared with \$ 14.50 per tael for Indian opium. He remembered that formerly the opium coming from India had been called "Kung-Yen" and the native product had been called "Pak-Yen". The price of "Kung-Yen" had been at least a half or two-thirds higher than that of "Pak-Yen". There was no duty on the opium smuggled into Hong-Kong and therefore it was cheap and, even when duty was paid, it remained cheap. No argument could be based on the fact that because the smuggled opium was cheap the opium smokers would not buy the Government opium. The habitual smokers understood the quality of the opium and were willing to pay a higher price for the Indian than the native opium. The Hong-Kong Government, therefore, need not be afraid that the habitual smokers would consume the native product instead of the imported product.

With regard to the third proposal it was based on the argument that if more native opium were brought into Hong-Kong, then the Government opium would find no market in Hong-Kong. Smuggling could and ought to be checked. It was entirely in the hands of the Hong-Kong Government. It could impose whatever penalties it desired upon the smugglers and could even make it an offence capable of capital punishment. In the early days of the Republic a Military Governor of Canton had objected to the gambling that was going on, and he had, therefore, made a law that anybody who gambled would be shot. Several had been shot, and the gambling had stopped immediately. If the Hong-Kong Government wanted to stop smuggling, it was very easy to do so. The Chinese Government would never raise any protest against the Hong-Kong Government being too severe with the Chinese smugglers. They did not want that kind of Chinese citizen.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne said in his fourth proposal, that the only people who profited were the smugglers. Mr. Chu had stated the reason. Smuggling was a great temptation. It could not be stopped altogether. He was told, however, by the Customs Authorities that if 5% of the smugglers were arrested it would be a very effective measure.

In the fifth proposal it was said that the Chinese population was growing, but that was no reason for increasing the amount of opium imported in to Hong-Kong. All the arguments were more or less based on the financial aspect. He did not think that a Government should try to obtain money from illicit sources.

Debaters always said: "let us wait for the Chinese Government to put its house in order and then we will act accordingly." Why should they wait for the Chinese house to be set in order before they set their own house in order and thus set China a good example? China had set her house in order by the suppression of the opium traffic in 1917 as a good example to all the Far Eastern colonies under the European or Japanese Governments. At the end of ten years the traffic had been suppressed completely. He agreed with Sir John Jordan that Shanghai, an international concession, had completely suppressed the opium traffic. Why had not the other foreign Concessions done so? When he had been a magistrate in the little island of Kulangsu, an international settlement opposite Amoy, he had been responsible for trying all the criminal cases, such as smoking opium. In that island there existed a very peculiar law allowing the smoking of opium in a place where there were less than three persons. Once he had found a row of people in front of a house. Inside the house there had been only two persons smoking opium. The people had been lined up waiting for one of the two persons to come out so that another one could enter. Between Kulangsu and Amoy it was only fifteen minutes by a sampan. An opium smoker could pay a visit to Kulangsu once a day in order to satisfy his wants. How could the Chinese Government prohibit opium smoking when in that place other Governments were

allowing it legally? The foreign concessions, instead, of helping the Chinese Government to suppress the opium traffic, really prevented the Chinese Government from suppressing it.

In conclusion, he desired to repeat what Sir John Jordan had brought forward a short time ago. He did not think that there would be any objection if these two conditions were observed, first, that no new smokers should be allowed to be registered as smokers, and secondly that in ten years opium smoking in Hong-Kong, or in any other Far Eastern Colony under the European or Japanese Governments should be completely suppressed, according to the provisions of the Convention.

He thought that the British Government was very sincere and honest and had the intention of carrying out the provisions of the Hague Convention. Hong-Kong and India were two governments under His Britannic Majesty's Government. If they had not been honest, they could have made secret arrangements to transport Indian opium to Hong-Kong very easily, but they had come to the League and asked permission to do it. This was honest and sincere. Hong-Kong could easily buy opium from Persia without giving notice to anybody or to the League.

He had no objection to this increase of only ten chests a month, which was not very large but he must ask why it was required.

---

## TENTH MEETING

*Wheld ednesday, May 30th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present, with the exception of Bishop Brent, United States.

### 27. MINUTES OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH MEETINGS.

The minutes of the fourth and fifth meetings were approved.

### 28 PROPOSALS OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT REGARDING THE CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM FOR SMOKING IN THE FAR EAST.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was opposed to the proposals because they were contrary to the text and spirit of the Convention of 1912. The proposals concerned fixed supplies and a common system of rationing to be adopted by the interested Powers. The Convention, however, stipulated that the final aim of Part II was to suppress the use of prepared opium, but that the method whereby such a result should be obtained was to be left entirely to each country which was a party to the Convention. Article 6, which read as follows, was clear on the point:

“The Contracting Powers shall take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, trade in and use of prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence.”

From this it appeared that it was for each Power signatory to the Convention to take its own steps, without consulting the others, because of the varying circumstances in each country. The country concerned was therefore the sole judge of the means whereby consumption should be reduced. This was not an interpretation of the Convention, but was contained in the text itself.

Article 24 further safeguarded the individual freedom of each of the contracting States. By the terms of this article of the Convention, the Contracting Powers could consult together, but only in two cases: first, in the event of questions arising relative to the ratification of the Convention, and secondly, in regard to questions relative to the enforcement either of the Convention or of the laws, regulations or measures resulting therefrom. The Legal Section of the Secretariat had given a formal opinion on the matter at the third session of the Committee, which was as follows:

“The complete and effective suppression of the manufacture of, home trade in, and use of prepared opium constitutes one of the ultimate obligations undertaken by the Governments under the 1912 Convention; but it is for each State to decide, according to individual circumstances, as to the precise manner in which its suppression may be brought about.”

At the present moment, when the cultivation of the poppy had broken out afresh in China, and when smuggling threatened every country, he thought it particularly inopportune to propose that the scope of the Convention should be altered.

For these reasons, he proposed that the Committee should adjourn the consideration of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he had listened with the greatest interest to the representative of France, and he entirely agreed with him as to his interpretation of the Convention. While admitting this, however, he did not think that the Chairman had entirely disposed of the matter under discussion.

Each individual State undoubtedly possessed the right under the Convention to decide the amount of opium required for consumption by its nationals, but the proposal before the Committee was that the interested States should come together and discuss this particular matter. There was no suggestion, either direct or implied, that the resulting conference should impose its will on any individual State. Nothing but good, therefore, could, in his opinion, result from the conference, at which, while fully accepting the definition of the Convention given by the Chairman, States would be at liberty to discuss the matter in detail with one another and, if possible, arrive at some common policy in accord with the declared intention of the Convention, and one which could be accepted by each individual State for its own nationals in virtue of its own sovereign powers. This was the really practical point contained in the proposal.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had listened with very grave disappointment to the Chairman's statement. He had thought that the Committee was at last reaching some practical decision on a question which had been before it for more than two years.

The situation in the Far East was the vital point of the whole question. He had examined the statistics for the different colonies in the Far East in order to see how far there had been any diminution in the rate of consumption of opium. In his opinion, the statistics proved that, although fluctuations had occurred, nothing had been done towards carrying out the provisions of the Hague Convention with regard to the gradual suppression of prepared opium. That was an indisputable fact. The Committee was not to blame, since it had been engaged for two years in obtaining the necessary statistics and other information in order to be in a position to take a decision in regard to this matter. It was now in that position, and it would have to take practical action or stultify its whole work.

The proposal of the British delegate seemed to him to contain the germ of some practical action. It could be re-framed in such a form as not to deprive any of the Powers of the rights which they possessed under the Convention. It was impossible to achieve any real progress in this matter if co-operation was lacking. There appeared to be nothing whatever to prevent the interested States from coming to an understanding as to the amount of opium which ought to be consumed in their Far Eastern possessions.

In his opinion, the attitude of the Government of India was perfectly justified. It said to any State which applied for opium: "We will give you all the opium you desire. If you do not want so much, we will reduce our production *pari passu* with your demands."

The British Government had now come forward with a proposal which would enable a gradual reduction to be effected. States which refused to entertain that proposal were assuming a grave responsibility before the world, and were placing themselves in a position which would elicit much public criticism. He appealed to these States to consider the proposals seriously. If they were rejected by the Committee, he, personally, did not see why it should be necessary for it to continue to exist.

The signatory States had been engaged in carrying out the International Opium Convention since 1912, each in its own way. What had been the result? Neither Indo-China, nor the Dutch Indies, nor the Straits Settlements, nor any of the other Far Eastern possessions or territories had reduced its consumption. This could only be effected by goodwill and co-operation.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that it would be most discouraging if the first constructive measure towards fulfilling the terms of the Convention were rejected.

The attitude of the Indian Government was admirable, and Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals were most instructive. It would be very wrong indeed for the Committee to entrench itself behind the Convention instead of using it as a means to achieve the end demanded by public opinion. If the Committee adopted such a narrow view, it would be repudiated by the whole world and would merit such repudiation.

It would fall to pieces, and she would be the first to be delighted to part from it.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Campbell was in agreement with him regarding his interpretation of the Convention. He did not see personally, however, how the proposals before the Committee could be regarded as in accordance either with its spirit or its letter.

The reform proposed was a radical one, and consisted in the assumption of mutual engagements to carry out the total suppression of consumption within a given period. The proposal spoke of progressive scales of reduction leading to complete suppression.

He was in full agreement with Sir Malcolm Delevingne regarding the ultimate end in view. Experience had shown in Indo-China that great prudence was necessary. The French Government had gone far further than the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, since, in 1916, a Ministerial Ordinance had fixed a period of ten years within which the consumption of opium should be completely suppressed. At the end of some years it had been found necessary to extend the period, not from any fault on the part of Indo-China, but because circumstances in China, her neighbour, had rendered its application in practice impossible. The cultivation of the poppy and the use of opium had revived in China. The French Government would therefore have been in a very serious position had it adopted an undertaking towards someone else which it was unable to carry out even towards itself.

The policy pursued in Indo-China showed the goodwill of the French Government. It showed too that it was owing to unavoidable circumstances that the French Government had not been able to settle this matter as quickly as it had wished.

The only point, therefore, at issue between Sir Malcolm Delevingne and himself was whether the moment was opportune or not. In his opinion, at the present time, when there was a recrudescence of poppy cultivation in China and when smuggling was rampant, it was most inadvisable to undertake international engagements which would considerably extend the scope of the Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that there was no difference between himself and the Chairman regarding the interpretation of the Convention. Article 6, like the other articles of the Convention, left it to the individual State to devise its own measures for giving effect to the provisions. He had not suggested that that freedom should be removed. He had suggested that the Committee should recommend the Council and the Assembly to invite the interested Powers to come together to talk the matter over and see whether improvements could not be devised for giving a more effective application to Part II of the Convention.

In the course of the Committee's discussion, it had been shown that differences existed between the administrative measures taken in the different possessions. The results obtained were likewise different and the rates of consumption varied. It appeared to him, therefore, that it would be advantageous for the Powers to come together to see whether they could derive profit from each other's experience and thus improve their present systems of control.

The Chairman had called attention to the provisions of Article 24 of the Convention, whereby, in the event of questions arising relative to its ratification or its enforcement or to the enforcement of the measures resulting therefrom, the Netherlands Government should invite the Contracting Powers to meet in a conference at The Hague. His proposals did not refer to any question in dispute between any Powers, or any question of the interpretation of the Convention. All that he had suggested was that the Powers should give each other the benefit of their experience with a view to improving the measures which had already been taken. That was the object for which the Committee was in existence, and the object for which the provisions had been inserted in Article 23 of the Covenant, which entrusted the League with the control of the traffic in dangerous drugs, in conformity with international conventions or agreements already in existence, or to be concluded.

The whole purpose of Article 23 of the Covenant and the whole purpose of the Committee was to promote international co-operation with regard to the control to be exercised in these matters. Time after time, the Committee had recognised in its discussions that without international co-operation, abuses of the traffic were bound to remain unchecked. It had expressed the view that the Members of the League must help each other by the exchange of information, by the adoption of a universal measure of control of imports and exports and by other measures to secure mutual co-operation in all the aspects of the problem.

One of the greatest difficulties was obtaining effective control of smuggling, and without international co-operation, as experience had repeatedly shown, smuggling could never be adequately suppressed.

His proposals, therefore, simply concerned the promotion of further international co-operation in regard to the application of Part II of the Convention.

The Chairman had drawn attention to the position of China, and had asked whether the moment could be considered opportune for the discussion of further measures. In his (Sir Malcolm Delevingne's) opinion, the present situation in China, far from being a reason for remaining inactive, called for strong action on the part of the Powers with Far Eastern possessions, who should meet and devise measures for strengthening the control of the traffic in opium.

Sir John Jordan had reminded the Committee that hundreds of tons of opium were being produced in China, being sent down the Yangtze River through Indo-China over the French frontier, being smuggled into Hong-Kong and elsewhere and thence spreading over the Far East. Was there not a grave danger that, as the production of opium in China increased, the Far Eastern possessions of the Powers would in time be submerged by this flood of opium? Would it not be a great advantage for those States to meet and consider measures by which they could protect themselves against this menace?

He thought that the Chairman had misunderstood the proposal concerning the fixing of a definite limit of time within which the consumption of prepared opium should be suppressed in the Far Eastern possessions. He had never suggested a definite limit, and not one word in his proposals implied it. All that he had said was that the Powers should fix the rate of consumption and that that rate should be revised from time to time with a view to reducing it, if possible. He had merely called attention to the fact that the Powers signatory to the Convention had engaged to secure a gradual and effective suppression of the opium evil.

He had not specified any rate of reduction in consumption, nor a maximum limit for the present consumption. These were matters which would have to be discussed by the Powers themselves.

The other point upon which the Chairman had laid stress had been that the proposals would necessitate the adoption of further binding obligations by the Powers concerned. He had in his proposals used the word "agreement", but he did not attach any great importance to a formal agreement. His suggestions were designed not to extend the scope of the Convention, but to give it more effective application, although on some matters an agreement was certainly desirable, for instance, in regard to the matter of price. The lack of uniformity in the price of prepared opium in the different Far Eastern possessions was a difficulty which had to be considered, and it was one on which the Powers might come to some mutual understanding.

Prince Charoon had pointed out to the Committee the difference in the penalties imposed in his own country on Siamese subjects and on the subjects of other Powers. This constituted a great difficulty for the Siamese Government, and doubtless there were other Governments in the same position. This, therefore, was another matter on which the Powers concerned might come to

some sort of understanding. He did not attach any great importance to a formal agreement; elasticity must be preserved and the proposed conference could do no more than arrive at a certain general understanding regarding price, rate of consumption, adoption of a rationing system, adoption, if possible, of a system of licensing and the abolition of all private trade. Without, however, infringing in any way the freedom of an individual State, there was room for a definite improvement in the present system in all the Far Eastern possessions and it should be possible to arrive at some common understanding as to future policy. China was the great difficulty, and he saw very little hope, as long as the present state of affairs continued, of the total suppression of the consumption of prepared opium within any fixed period.

He hoped that by his explanations he had given satisfaction to the Chairman, and he would reduce his proposals to a formal motion, but he emphasised once again that his proposals were only suggestions for the guidance of the interested Powers who would be invited by the Council and the Assembly to discuss the question of giving a more effective application to Part II of the Convention.

Mr. van Wettum and Mr. Campbell had suggested that allowance would have to be made for races other than Chinese. He quite agreed, and this would be a matter for the consideration of the interested Powers. Mr. van Wettum and Mr. Campbell had further thought that the rationing system must be a complete one. This was also his own view, but he had refrained from making more definite proposals because of the difficulties which he had brought to the Committee's notice and which had not yet fully been explored and discussed by the Governments concerned. He believed that a licensing or registration system was certainly possible in most of the British Far Eastern possessions and it had apparently been tried with success in the Dutch East Indies and elsewhere. If his proposals were approved in principle, he asked that the Committee should pass them in the manner which he indicated. Then, the Council and the Assembly, in referring the proposals to the interested Powers, could send them the minutes of the discussion which had taken place in the Committee, so that every point of view would find expression.

He did not desire to answer Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu's speech made at the previous meeting. Mr. Chu had only made one constructive suggestion, perhaps it should rather be called a destructive one, and that had been that the Government of Hong-Kong should shoot all smugglers that it captured. He did not suppose that the British Government would be prepared to accept that suggestion. He did not, however, desire to enter into any controversy with the Chinese representative.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had dealt at the previous meeting only with the question of Hong-Kong, and that he now desired to give his views on the more general question of the position of the Far Eastern colonies as a whole. He did not desire to oppose any of the proposals made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, except on certain minor points which he would like to see made clear. The time-limit, for instance, ought to be stated, for without a limit it was impossible to know when total suppression could be effected. It did not seem to him that that limit should be of long duration. In the Philippine Islands, the opium traffic had been suppressed in three years and these islands were in about the same situation as the other Far Eastern colonies of European Powers and of Japan. If total suppression were effected in the Philippine Islands, there was no reason why it could not be effected elsewhere. Shanghai, for instance, was an international settlement under the control of an international municipality. Shanghai had completely suppressed the traffic in opium, but it was in a far more difficult position than any other Far Eastern colony because Shanghai was the gateway to China. It had been very difficult for the Government of Shanghai to put an end to smuggling, but that Government had done so, and he did not understand why the Government of Hong-Kong could not do the same thing. The whole blame of smuggling was laid on China. This was not fair. The only adequate protection from smuggling was to stop the smuggling from the Far Eastern possessions. Geographical considerations played a very small part, since opium could easily be shipped from Turkey or Persia to any of the Far Eastern colonies. If strict methods were adopted, a Concession could be protected from smuggling. He thought that the severest methods, extending even to capital punishment, should be put into force. The cure lay with the Governments of the Far Eastern colonies.

Much had been said concerning the Chinese situation, and the production of opium in China had been compared with the production of opium in Persia and Turkey. China was, at the moment, in a very unfortunate situation, since it was unable to carry out the provisions of the Convention. This, however, was only temporary and the moment a firm Government was established the whole production and cultivation would end in a year. Instead of being so concerned with the Chinese situation, the Governments of the Far Eastern possessions would do better to be more concerned about their own. If they desired to abolish the traffic in opium, they could do so, since they had a free hand. Both the Government of the Philippine Islands and that of Shanghai had done so in a very short time. Though the position of China was unfortunate, the Committee should not forget that the total prohibition of cultivation and production of opium was still the law of the land. Whenever it was possible to enforce that law in any province of China, that law was enforced.

In conclusion Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals wholeheartedly. China recognised her obligations under the Convention and would do her best to fulfil them.

Sir John JORDAN said that the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, if they were passed by the Committee, would come before the Council and receive further consideration. Further, the discussion in the Committee upon them would also be before the Council. He had intended to move an amendment to the resolutions, but he did not wish to press it and would therefore not formally move it, but place it on record so that his opinion would be known when the matter was further discussed. The amendment was as follows:



“That the last two paragraphs of Sir Malcolm Delevingne’s resolution should be altered to read as follows:

“That the interested Powers, with possessions where the consumption of prepared opium is still permitted, shall agree:

“(a) to apply the foregoing measures” — that is, the measures that preceded them in Sir Malcolm’s memorandum;

“(b) to reduce the amount estimated in paragraph 3 by one-tenth annually until total suppression is established;

“(c) to review annually the position and report thereon to the League of Nations.”

He did not want to press this amendment, as he thought it would rouse opposition and that there was no chance of it being accepted at the moment.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) submitted the following resolution embodying the proposals contained in his memorandum which should follow immediately after the text of the resolution and should include two further suggestions concerning the uniformity of price and the uniformity of penalties:

“That, having regard to the large amount of detailed information now available, it be recommended to the Council to invite the Powers with Far Eastern possessions where the use of opium for smoking is temporarily continued in pursuance of Part II of the Opium Convention to enter into immediate negotiations, by means of the calling of a special conference of representatives of these Governments or otherwise, to consider what measures could be taken to give a more effective application to Part II of the Convention and bring about a reduction of the amount of opium used, and whether, on the lines of the suggestions set out below or on other lines, an agreement or understanding could not now be reached for the adoption of a uniform policy on the matter.”

The proposals in the memorandum would follow, with this addition:

“That the possibility should be considered of making uniform, so far as circumstances permit,

(a) the price at which prepared opium is retailed in the different possessions, and

(b) the penalties for infraction of the law in regard to the import, export, sale and use of prepared opium.”

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he was unable to support Sir Malcolm Delevingne’s proposals because, if he did so, he would have to change the attitude which he had adopted at previous sessions. They were, however, of the greatest interest and should be very carefully studied.

The CHAIRMAN said that, while he did not at all wish to withdraw his remark that the statement which Bishop Brent had made concerning the situation in the Philippines was not only information for the Committee but also an object lesson in the suppression of the opium traffic, he was bound to point out that there was much to be said with regard to the comparison made between the situation in those islands and in other Far Eastern possessions. The best proof of this lay in the fact that France had been able totally to suppress the consumption of opium in all its colonies except in the French Indies and Indo-China.

The Committee must realise that Sir Malcolm Delevingne’s proposal would cause it to adopt a new line of action which was not that taken by the Convention. The Convention stipulated that each State should be allowed complete freedom in the choice of measures to be taken gradually to diminish the consumption of opium. The proposal of the British representative would, on the other hand, entail the assumption of obligations by the States by the adoption of common measures. The discussion concerned not the end but the means whereby it should be attained: on the one hand, the system in vogue at the moment, that was to say, individual freedom; on the other, the proposed system, that was to say, the assumption of engagements. The Chairman also desired as earnestly as the other members of the Committee to bring about total suppression, but in his opinion the Committee was choosing both a moment and a means which were inopportune. It was proposed to assemble a kind of conference to deal with the question, but no more competent representatives could ever be found than those which were at the moment sitting on the Committee. He did not, therefore, see why a new organisation should be established. The Committee must keep strictly to the spirit and letter of the Convention and should not set up a scale or a ration or a time-limit.

He desired, before putting the proposals to the vote, to move the following amendment, in view of the fact that these proposals might entail such grave consequences that Governments should be allowed time more fully to consider them:

“That the Committee decide that the vote on the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne shall be postponed to the next session.”

*The Chairman’s amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 3.*

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether it would be possible to state more clearly in Sir Malcolm Delevingne’s proposals that they were made with the object of keeping entirely to the spirit



and letter of the Convention. He made this proposal in order that the Governments should not misunderstand them.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) preferred the wording which he had already proposed, since the whole object of his proposals was to secure the effective application of Part II of the Convention. His proposal consisted of an invitation to the Governments to consider what measures should be taken to apply that Part more effectively and consequently to bring about a reduction in the amount of opium consumed. Whatever was decided by the special conference mentioned in the proposals would be decided by agreement between the Powers, and it would be left entirely to their discretion to come to whatever understanding they might think fit.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as a result of these explanations, he considered that the Committee was of opinion that the proposals before it were in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Convention.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he would vote for the proposals on the understanding that the minutes of the discussion would be placed before the Council when the recommendations of the Committee were submitted.

*The Committee unanimously adopted Mr. van Wettum's point of view.*

*The Committee adopted Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal by 6 votes to 1, with one abstention.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) explained that he had abstained from voting because he did not want to appear illogical by changing the attitude which he had taken up at other sessions

The CHAIRMAN said that he was obliged to vote against the resolution.

---

## ELEVENTH MEETING

*held Thursday, May 31st, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

### 29. MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING.

The minutes of the sixth meeting were adopted.

### 30. LIMITATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF MORPHIA, OTHER OPIUM DERIVATIVES AND COCAINE (Annex 5).

#### (a) Germany.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the quantity of morphia manufactured in Germany was between 8,550 and 9,000 kgs., 1,000 to 1,500 kgs. of which were manufactured into heroin and diacetyl morphine. The 5,300 kgs. shown as available for internal consumption represented not only internal consumption, which amounted to about 1,200 kgs., but also the stock in hand possessed by the manufacturers and the wholesale dealers. There had been no import of heroin or diacetyl morphine. The figure of 3,000 kgs. represented the amount of codeine made from morphia and the amount of other harmless drugs manufactured therefrom.

In 1922, the export of morphia had been reduced by about 5% and the export of cocaine by about 17%. Further, the import of coca leaves had greatly diminished. The imports of raw opium, however, had been largely increased for the manufacture of other drugs as, for example, codeine, of which double the amount exported in 1921 had been exported in 1922. Exact statistics for 1922 were not yet available.

The CHAIRMAN said that the reference made by Dr. Anselmino to codeine showed that it was important for the Committee to take it into consideration in its calculations.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, in the document before the Committee, mention was made of the quantity of morphia manufactured in India in 1920 as being 448.1 kg. He thought that this must be an error. The report of the Opium Department of the Indian Government showed

that there had been no morphine nor hydrochloride of morphine manufactured during the season 1920-21. The error had probably occurred owing to the habit of the Opium Department of the Indian Government of giving in the first line of its report the balance which existed. At one time a small amount had been manufactured, but this amount averaged 500 lbs. a year, and in 1920-21 the balance in stock had only been 192 lbs. 5 oz.

Sir John JORDAN said that, according to the document before the Committee, Germany would appear to have produced 5,000 kgs. of morphia for Chinese consumption, while the amount asked for had been 1,000 kgs.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the quantities of morphia available in Germany referred to internal consumption and stocks in hand.

Under the heading "Quantities available for internal consumption," the figure 5,300 kgs. covered not only internal consumption, but also the quantities used in the manufacture of heroin, and of codeine and other harmless drugs. The stocks in hand had amounted to about 400 kgs.

The CHAIRMAN enquired what were the names of the different drugs manufactured from morphia in Germany.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the morphia manufactured in Germany was used for internal consumption and export. It was also manufactured into heroin and diacetyl morphine. About half the morphia produced had been used in the manufacture of drugs not covered by the Hague Convention (codeine, peronine, dionine).

The CHAIRMAN pointed out the difficulty and even the impossibility of obtaining a basis of comparison for the consumption of narcotics. This arose from the fact that certain countries used substitutes which did not appear in their statistics.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the German figures referred to the amount of morphia used, including the amount employed in the manufacture of drugs not covered by the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a distinction should be drawn between the two purposes for which the morphia was used.

(b) *Great Britain.*

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, in 1922, Great Britain had manufactured 315,342 ozs. of morphine, and that, in the document before the Committee, this figure appeared in comparison with the figure of 147,790 ozs. manufactured in 1921. The comparison was somewhat misleading; the figures for a series of years ought to have been taken. Of the 315,342 ozs. of morphia manufactured in 1922, 146,086 ozs. had been converted into codeine. Codeine was not a drug which came within the terms of the International Opium Convention. In England it was not regarded as dangerous, but as a very advisable substitute for morphine, because it did not possess the dangerous qualities of that drug. During recent years, the use of codeine as a substitute for morphia had, he believed, rapidly increased, which explained the large amount of codeine manufactured in 1922.

To give an accurate impression of the amount of morphine manufactured in 1922 for use, it was necessary, therefore, to deduct from the total amount of 315,342 ozs. the amount subsequently converted by the manufacturers into codeine. Morphine was not the final product, but codeine. The figures for the output of morphine would then be reduced to approximately 170,000 ozs. That was the figure which ought to have appeared in the document. The case was probably similar in other countries in regard to the manufacture of morphine.

Dr. Anselmino had said that, of the 8,500 kgs. of morphine manufactured in Germany in 1921, 4,000 had been used for the manufacture of codeine and other drugs.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne, therefore, desired to propose that, in summarising the present position as regards the manufacture and use of dangerous drugs, no mention of the codeine statistics should be made, either in the document before the Committee or in the document on the position in Far Eastern possessions. It was misleading to include codeine in a list of dangerous drugs.

On the other hand, it was desirable that the Committee should know how much codeine was manufactured from morphia. There should be no misunderstanding as to the figures which the Committee desired. If it asked for the gross total of the manufacture of morphia, it should also ask for the total quantity which was manufactured into codeine, heroin, etc.

If the document before the Committee were to be published, it would first have to be revised very considerably, since it would otherwise convey a misleading impression.

The SECRETARY said that the statistics for codeine had been included in the Summary for two reasons: first, because practically every country had included figures for codeine in its annual report; and secondly, because it had seemed to be of great interest to the Committee to have before it these figures. Whether codeine was a dangerous drug or not, it was a derivative of opium.

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that, as a physician, he was compelled to dissent from the view that codeine was a harmless drug. There were many codeine habitués in the United States and the number was increasing. As an alkaloid of opium, it clearly fell under

the provisions of paragraph (d) of Article 14 of the Convention. The codeine habit was not so common as the morphia or cocaine habits because, as a drug, it was less potent, and because morphia and cocaine could easily be obtained. The moment, however, that those drugs came under control, codeine would become popular among drug addicts.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Convention existed in order to suppress the abuse of narcotic drugs, that was to say, of harmful drugs, and in order to remove the danger created by these drugs to the health and morals of a people, but it did not exist in order to suppress entirely the use of drugs which were employed medicinally as sedatives, etc. Codeine and dionin were not harmful drugs and they did not have the same result when employed as morphia. The morphinomaniac would be unable to gratify his craving by substituting dionin for morphia.

The Governments could not be compelled, by the terms of the Opium Convention, to furnish the Secretariat of the League with the quantities of codeine manufactured and exported. The Import Certificate System did not cover the imports and exports of codeine, which could not be forbidden by Part III of the Hague Convention.

In his opinion, the control of the manufacture of harmless drugs in the producing countries was necessary in order that the Committee should be able to know the amount of morphine manufactured in those countries.

It should not be forgotten that the quantity of codeine required for internal consumption in each country set a limit to that country's legitimate needs of raw opium, which naturally depended on the quantity employed in the manufacture of drugs which were not more harmful than codeine and dionin.

In the opinion of the Advisory Committee and of the Joint Sub-Committee of the Health and Opium Committees, the use of morphine in medicine ought to be replaced by codeine or dionin in cases where it was desired to treat the respiratory system, that was to say, in all remedies for coughs.

The traffic in drugs designed to replace morphia should therefore be protected and not prevented. If that traffic were interfered with, and if codeine were submitted to the same restrictions as were placed on morphine, no one would desire to substitute it for morphine, especially since codeine was more expensive. Three times the amount of codeine had to be employed to obtain the same effect as would be obtained from morphia.

The CHAIRMAN said that it had been shown already why it was necessary to include statistics of drugs manufactured from morphia. It was also necessary to include substitutes for morphia, even although they might be harmless, because, unless that were done, the Committee would be unable to obtain a basis of comparison, since a country might appear to be consuming a large quantity of cocaine in comparison with other countries, whereas an explanation might lie in the fact that it did not use cocaine substitutes, while the other countries did do so.

There was a third reason for obtaining statistics in regard to certain harmless drugs which were not covered by the Convention. Statistics of this nature would be the best means of knowing whether a drug of that kind was habit-forming. A large development in the manufacture of certain drugs caused him to wonder whether these drugs were not habit-forming and consequently dangerous.

In reply to Surgeon-General Blue, the Chairman said that France attached great importance to the question which he had just raised. She considered that codeine was harmful and had several times expressed a desire that this question should be examined by the Committee. No decision had at present been taken on this point.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, with regard to Surgeon-General Blue's statement concerning Article 14 of the Convention, and his contention that codeine was covered by that article, he was of opinion that the representative of the United States was mistaken. Article 14 of the Convention said that:

"The Contracting Powers shall apply laws and regulations respecting the manufacture, import, sale or export of morphia, cocaine, etc., to all new derivatives of morphia and to every other alkaloid of opium which may be shown by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill-effects."

As far as Great Britain was concerned, codeine was very far from being recognised as "liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill-effects." In England codeine was regarded as a very advantageous substitute for morphine, and no member of the Committee had suggested that it should be considered as one of the dangerous drugs referred to in the provisions of the Convention.

Up to the present time, the Committee had had no opportunity of discussing the question of codeine. In the list of drugs submitted by the French Government for the consideration of the Committee codeine had not been included. He desired strongly to emphasise that Article 14 of the Convention did not refer to codeine at the moment.

M. BRENIER said that, during the Conference at The Hague in 1912, codeine had first of all been included among the dangerous drugs. Afterwards it had been deleted from the list.

He thought, however, that the sense given to the words "generally recognised" by Sir Malcolm Delevingne was not quite correct. "Generally recognised" meant recognised in all countries and not only in one. The United States seemed to be of the opinion that codeine was a dangerous drug.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with M. Brenier. A drug must be generally recognised as dangerous by all countries and by the scientific opinion of the whole world before it could be said to be covered by the Convention. If, however, it was recognised in one country as dangerous and not in another, surely it could not be said to be generally recognised as dangerous,

Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) enquired whether, with regard to paragraph (d) of Article 14 of the Convention ("to every other alkaloid of opium which may be shown, by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill-effects"), if codeine at any time became a habit-forming drug, it would fall under these provisions.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that, when the general scientific opinion of the world recognised codeine "as liable to abuse and productive of like ill-effects" as morphia, it would automatically come under the Convention, but not before that time.

Bishop BRENT (United States) said that he corroborated M. Brenier's statement concerning what had taken place in regard to codeine at the Hague Conference in 1912.

The vote regarding the insertion of codeine in the list of dangerous drugs had been exactly even, and he, as Chairman, had been put in the position of being able to give a casting vote, which, for obvious reasons, he had declined to do.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had no objection to the collection of statistics on codeine, or any other drugs, so long as they were required to throw light on the amount of raw opium necessary in each country for the production of drugs. The Committee desired to know what quantity of raw opium was required in each country for the production of drugs and medicinal preparations. It was therefore necessary to ascertain the amount of codeine and other harmless drugs which was manufactured.

The only objections which he made were to the inclusion of codeine, in the documents before the Committee, under the heading "Dangerous Drugs", and to there having been no allowance made, in setting out the particulars in regard to the manufacture of morphine in each country, for the amount of morphine which was subsequently converted into non-dangerous drugs. A misleading impression was thus given by the documents.

Sir John JORDAN said that, leaving aside the 146,800 ozs. of morphine used for the manufacture of codeine, there still remained about 170,000 ozs. of morphine manufactured in Great Britain in 1922. He would like to know how much of this morphine was used for internal consumption, how much was exported and how much was employed in other ways.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that, in order to obtain a correct impression of what had been done by Great Britain to carry out its obligations under Part III of the Convention, the figures for 1922 must not be compared with those of 1921 only, but with the figures for a series of years.

In the reply of the British Government to the League's Questionnaire of 1921, the manufacture of morphine and heroin was shown for a series of years from 1910 onwards.

In 1910	Great Britain	had manufactured	486,975 ozs.	of morphia	and its salts.
" 1911	"	"	400,000 ozs.	"	"
" 1912	"	"	425,000 ozs.	"	"
" 1913	"	"	564,000 ozs.	"	"
" 1914	"	"	735,000 ozs.	"	"

During the war years, which had been entirely exceptional, the demand for morphine had been very great. The figures for these years should therefore be eliminated from the Committee's calculations, since they were quite abnormal.

In 1920, Great Britain had manufactured 645,000 ounces of morphine and in 1922, 315,342 ounces. In considering the statistics for 1922, a very large allowance would have to be made for the manufacture of codeine, and, although the figures for the preceding years had also, he thought, included the amounts used for the production of codeine, the Committee must remember that that production had increased enormously, by reason of the growing tendency of the medical profession to use that drug in preference to morphine.

The table therefore showed in the first place, even on the gross figures, a large reduction in the manufacture of morphine, and if allowance were made for the manufacture of codeine, a still more striking reduction would be apparent. He would be very much interested to learn whether other manufacturing countries showed so great a decrease in the amount of morphine manufactured as was shown by Great Britain, where it had been brought about by exercising the strictest control over the internal consumption of morphine and its export.

He had at the last session asked the representatives of other manufacturing countries what was their procedure with regard to the export of drugs to countries which had not adopted the Import Certificate System.

So far as Great Britain was concerned, not only was the production of an import certificate required before the export of the drug to any country which had adopted that system was allowed, but, further, in the case of the countries which had not adopted that system any demand for the export of the drugs from Great Britain to those countries was very closely scrutinised. In that way the British Government had succeeded in reducing its exports to what, in so far as they could ascertain, were the legitimate medical requirements of those countries. It was in a very

great difficulty regarding this matter, because it did not know how much morphia was being imported by such countries from other manufacturing countries. So far, however, as the British Government had been able to judge, it had limited its export of morphine to countries which had not adopted the Import Certificate System to what, after enquiry, it had concluded their legitimate requirements to be. The result of this practice was shown, he believed, in the striking reduction effected in the output of morphia in Great Britain.

The British Government was exercising the strictest possible control over the manufacture of drugs and had cancelled the licence of one of the three manufacturing firms because that firm had been found to be implicated in the illicit traffic. It would be very satisfactory to the British Government to know that other manufacturing countries were prepared to take the same drastic measures. Without mentioning names, there were certain firms in other countries which lay under very grave suspicion of complicity in this traffic. If other manufacturing countries took the same line as Great Britain, the same beneficial results would follow.

The figures for export and internal consumption were to be found in the document before the Committee. The amount of morphia sold by manufacturers to dealers during 1921 had been 58,821 ozs., the amount exported by dealers had been 10,856 ozs., leaving a balance of 48,837 ozs. for internal consumption in the United Kingdom.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether there were any measures in force for preventing morphia from going from Great Britain to another country which would send the consignment on to a country which had not adopted the Import Certificate System. Could a country obtain morphine from Great Britain and send it on to a country which had not accepted the system?

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, before the Import Certificate System had been recommended by the Committee Great Britain had entered into individual arrangements with a large number of countries for the adoption of a somewhat similar system. Those arrangements were still in force with such important countries as France and, he thought, the United States. One of the conditions attaching to this system was that those countries should not re-export. With regard to those countries with which Great Britain did not have an individual arrangement, and which had adopted the Import Certificate System recommended by the Committee, the responsibility of controlling the re-exports lay with the importing countries.

In reply to a question from M. BRENIER, Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that every manufacturer had to possess a licence. No cocaine was manufactured in England; it was only imported.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he had already informed the Committee that the Portuguese statistics of manufacture for the years 1921-22 were expected at any moment. It was very probable, however, that they would not contain final figures for the different drugs because, up to the present time, the Portuguese Government did not possess sufficient staff to collect all the information required. The Customs tariff did not make a distinction between the different drugs, but a new tariff which had come into force on March 27th would change this situation by providing for the separate enumeration of all dangerous drugs imported. He was in a position to furnish certain information to the Committee regarding the consumption of drugs in Portugal.

Portugal manufactured neither morphine nor heroin, nor opium nor cocaine nor any other narcotic. The employment of these substances was limited to medical use. In Portuguese East Africa these drugs were only used on a medical prescription. In Mozambique the annual consumption was as follows:

Chlorhydrate of cocaine and morphia . . . . .	1,500 grammes
Laudanum . . . . .	20,000 "
Phosphate of codeine . . . . .	100 "
Dionin . . . . .	160 "

At Macao the following quantities had been imported for medical and scientific purposes:

Morphine (crude) . . . . .	1,500 grammes
Chlorhydrate of morphine . . . . .	55 "
Codeine . . . . .	460 "
Dionin . . . . .	70 "
Chlorhydrate of heroin . . . . .	5 "
Cocaine . . . . .	350 "
Stoveine . . . . .	5 "

Imports into Timor for the years 1921-1922:

Chlorhydrate of morphine . . . . .	8 grammes
Codeine . . . . .	33 "
Dionin . . . . .	5 "
Cocaine . . . . .	III "

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that all members of the Committee were in agreement that it was necessary to obtain statistics regarding all derivatives of opium or morphia, without implying that they were all dangerous drugs covered by the Convention. The reasons for this had been given by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, and the Committee would doubtless accept them. The Committee could not know how much raw opium was required by a country unless it knew how much codeine and other similar drugs were manufactured. He suggested that the Committee should take a decision on this subject; it did not appear to be a controversial one.

He had been a member of the Mixed Sub-Committee of the Health and Opium Committee, which had been largely concerned with the medical aspect of the question. He had felt in that Committee somewhat as Daniel must have felt in the den of lions. The Committee had consisted of four members, three of whom were distinguished doctors. He was neither distinguished nor a doctor, but so far as he had followed the discussions, the general opinion in the Sub-Committee appeared to have been that codeine was not a dangerous drug.

He hoped that the Committee would pass a definite resolution regarding the necessity for statistics for codeine and other drugs.

M. UCHINO (Japan) desired to give the Committee information concerning the use of codeine in Japan. In practice, codeine was subjected in that country to the same control as morphia and cocaine. Article 12 of the Ordinance relating to the regulations of the control of morphia and cocaine and their respective salts (No. 41) by the Department for Home Affairs, dated December 6th, 1920, and effective since January 1921, was as follows: "The regulations provided for in this ordinance shall be applied to the following articles mentioned below:

"Diacetyl morphine, Ethyl morphine, Codeine and their respective salts."

The CHAIRMAN said that the statistics for the various countries could only be compared if statistics were obtained not only for drugs containing morphia and the other drugs prohibited by the Convention, but also for those which did not contain morphia and which were not, therefore, prohibited by the Convention, but which could be employed as a substitute for medical purposes. For example, a country which consumed 3,000 kilogrammes of cocaine could, if there was a medical substitute for cocaine, make use of that amount entirely for illicit purposes. On the other hand, a country which used twice as much cocaine as the first country could use it exclusively for medical purposes because it did not use any substitute for such a drug. It would, therefore, be impossible to compare the statistics unless they contained figures for the substitute of cocaine.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) said that the tables for the United States contained all the opium required under the Narcotic Laws, and the statistics in the Report for the United States included both codeine and dionin. With regard to imports in May 1922, the import and manufacture of narcotic drugs had been prohibited and the export prohibited, except to countries which had ratified the Hague Convention. Export was only permitted by licence, so that in all probability in the next year the United States Returns would show that there was no import whatever of narcotic drugs.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) enquired whether Mr. Neville could give the Committee figures for the manufacture of morphia for a series of years and whether he could indicate an increase or decrease.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) replied that for the moment he could not give figures for manufacture, because the legislation of the United States had changed two or three times during the last few years. Consequently, a comparison of statistics would not be exact even if the figures were available, because the division that the laws and regulations now required would not be the same.

(c) *Indo-China.*

The CHAIRMAN said that the consumption of morphia in Indo-China did not exist. All narcotics other than prepared opium were used exclusively for medical purposes.

(d) *Japan.*

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that a considerable amount of morphia and other drugs was imported and manufactured in Japan. This had occurred largely as the result of the scarcity of those drugs during the war. New Regulations had lately been promulgated in order to put into effect the provisions of the Hague Convention, and these Regulations had come into force on January 1st, 1921. Since that date no permit for the import of morphia had been signed by the Department of Home Affairs. The strict control exercised by the Japanese Government was therefore proved.

Regarding the import of morphia during the year 1921, this was effected under Article 15 of the same Ordinance because the contracts for the purchase of that morphia had been concluded before its promulgation. A great decrease was to be noticed in the quantities to be imported during the previous year. He did not wish to deny that the smuggling of opium and other drugs had existed in the past, but the Japanese Government was making every effort to check this smuggling, and instructions had been sent to the Japanese consuls in China to suppress it. The co-operation of the Chinese authorities in this matter was very desirable and the Japanese Government was negotiating with the Chinese Government with a view to devising some means for mutual co-operation.

It was very difficult to ascertain the amount of cocaine imported which had already been contracted for before 1921. In the circumstances, the imports of cocaine in 1921 had reached a



large amount, in spite of the fact that the provisions regarding its import had been inserted in the Regulations for the control of the traffic. The imports for 1922 had been smaller in consequence of the new Regulations.

The reason why the manufacture of cocaine during the previous year had been larger than in the year 1921 was that the manufacture had increased as a result of the new Regulations restricting import. On the other hand, the price of cocaine had risen to such a figure that it had become necessary to regulate it.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he wished to put before the Committee a broad fact regarding morphine in Japan which was of a very disquieting nature. The Committee would recall that the question of morphine and cocaine in Japan had been considered by it at a previous session. The Japanese delegate at that session, M. Ariyoshi, had made an extremely full and frank statement on the subject, so full and so frank that the Committee had congratulated the Japanese Government on the way in which it had presented its case. M. Ariyoshi had fully admitted the extent and the gravity of the abuses then existing in Japan. The fact, however, remained that there still existed in Japan a very large quantity of these drugs, and there was no explanation as to what became of them. The report now before the Committee, presented by the Japanese Government, seemed to go still further, and if his calculations were correct, it showed the existence there of approximately 500,000 ozs. of morphia and 150,000 ozs. of cocaine, while no exports whatever were shown. This was for the year 1921, the latest year for which figures had been given. This was the broad fact which he desired to bring to the Committee's notice. To this quantity of 500,000 ozs. of morphia and 150,000 ozs. of cocaine, the large quantities left over from the previous year, the existence of which in Japan had been admitted by M. Ariyoshi, would have to be added. No export was shown from Japan in previous years either. Where, then, were these drugs to be found? If the figures were correct, these drugs must exist, and theoretically they could only exist in the bonded warehouses in Japan. He thought that all the members of the Committee would be glad if the Japanese representative could give an assurance that the drugs did in fact exist now in Japan and were under the efficient control of the Japanese Government. The members of the Committee were well aware of the ramifications of the drug traffic and had doubtless noticed the statements on this subject which had been made in the Japanese Diet on February 2nd, 1923. So far as he recollected, the Japanese Government had officially admitted that drugs had been removed from bonded warehouses in Japan without its authority or knowledge and that these drugs had passed out of Japan without any knowledge on the part of the Government as to their destination. If this were correct, the position was a most disquieting one, and he hoped that the Japanese representative would give the Committee all possible explanations.

Sir John JORDAN associated himself with Mr. Campbell. Formosa and Macao were the two black spots in the East regarding the traffic in drugs. 184,204 lbs. of raw opium had been imported into Formosa in 1921. What was it required for? It could not be required for the consumption of only 149,000 persons. At the last session M. Ariyoshi had said that he did not know what had become of the morphia in Japan. It was useless to maintain that only three kilogrammes had been exported from that country in 1921. Everyone knew that the exports to China were enormous. All Northern China was deluged with morphia. It had been found impossible to keep morphia out of the province of Shansi, although that province was under an excellent Governor who had done all he could to suppress that traffic. Until this question was settled, no progress could be made, and it was absolutely necessary for the Committee to obtain the necessary figures.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that, in company with the other members of the Committee, he was most alarmed at the figures of the manufacture of morphine and other dangerous drugs. The amount of morphine in use was far in excess of the amount required for legitimate purposes. In 1921, Germany had produced about 7 tons, Great Britain over 4 tons and in 1922, approximately, 8 tons; Japan over 11 tons in 1921 and over 2 tons in 1922; Switzerland over 2 tons in 1921, and the United States over 9 tons in 1921 and over 5 tons in 1922. Countries thus turned out morphia by the ton, which was purchased by the smugglers by the ton. On December 27th, 1922, to give a single instance, 17,920 ozs. of morphia had been seized in Shanghai. This represented, approximately, half a ton and yielded 28 million doses on a basis of 1 grain to 4 doses. Canada had effected seizures of over half a ton and the same thing had occurred in other countries. This conclusively proved the great danger that these drugs were to the world in general.

China was not to be found on the list of countries producing morphine, but she had suffered more than any other country so far as the consumption of morphine was concerned. Since China had prohibited the smuggling of opium by law, her people had taken to a far more harmful drug, morphia. An opium-smoker only absorbed about 10 % of the opium; the other 90 % disappeared in smoke. An injection of morphia was entirely absorbed by the whole body and was about one hundred times more harmful than a pipe of opium. An opium-smoker could live a normal number of years, but a person addicted to the morphia habit died after two or three years. He had been told in Shantung that it was a common sight in Northern China to see a coolie with his body completely covered with punctures, due to the injection of morphia. A coolie with the morphia habit required at least one injection a day. How, therefore, could the Chinese people be saved from morphine when it had completely given up the use of opium? It seemed to him that the morphine-producing countries were competing with each other owing to the fact that the business was a very profitable one, although the profits went only to smugglers and a few manufacturers. The Governments of those countries gained very little revenue from licences, but lost a great deal in prestige and reputation. He could not understand why civilised countries should allow such a scandalous state of affairs to continue unchecked. In every civilised country it was difficult

for anyone to obtain even a single dose of a drug containing opium without a medical prescription, yet manufacturers in those countries sold those drugs by tons to smugglers. It was clear that many Governments were not making money out of the traffic and the only ones to benefit were a few profiteers and others, who were thus enabled to ship drugs to foreign countries in order to reap a large profit. Governments doubtless thought that people in countries other than their own were under the laws of those countries, and that they therefore could not be held responsible. That was doubtless true, but smuggling had become so profitable that it was impossible to check the illicit use in a country where such dangerous drugs were manufactured.

He desired to emphasise the fact that morphia was not manufactured in China, and further, that the average Chinese doctor did not prescribe it for his patients. A Chinese doctor's prescription rarely included morphia, unless he had been educated in foreign countries where the use of morphia in medical prescriptions was taught.

He earnestly appealed, therefore, to the Committee to take steps to prevent the world from being poisoned by the great superfluity of morphine, not only for the sake of the present generation, but also for the sake of the future. If the traffic were allowed to continue, the dangers to which it gave rise would be more serious than those inflicted by the war.

---

## TWELFTH MEETING

*held Thursday, May 31st, 1923, at 3.45 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present.

### 31. LIMITATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF MORPHIA, OTHER OPIUM DERIVATIVES AND COCAINE

(Annex 5).

(d) *Japan (continued).*

M. UCHINO (Japan) desired to answer the questions raised by Mr. Campbell and Sir John Jordan at the previous meeting concerning morphine in Japan. It was difficult to know the quantity consumed there, and there were no figures of the quantity actually kept in stock out of the quantity of morphine imported. As the exports were not large, however, the stock in hand could be obtained by deducting the amount of morphine consumed in the country from the total imports.

He had no statistics concerning smuggling from Japan, but he did not deny that smuggling existed. The Customs officers had made great efforts to expose this illicit traffic. The Department of Home Affairs, in co-operation with the Department of Finance, Railways and Communications, had endeavoured both directly and indirectly to suppress the illicit traffic in the drugs, especially with China, by instructing all the Customs houses, goods offices of railways, and post-offices handling foreign parcels strictly to enforce the laws and regulations relating thereto, and by instructing the local police to supervise the operations of dealers in the drugs.

The figures which had been quoted at the previous meeting were those relating to 1921, but a more adequate idea of the situation would be obtained by comparing the figures for 1921 with those of 1922, which showed a great decrease. The quantity of morphine imported had been 2,066 kilos in 1922, while it had been 5,043 kilos in 1921, and the manufacture had been 308 kilos in 1922, and 5,926 kilos in 1921. This was explained in the document before the Committee.

Sir John JORDAN said it was satisfactory to know that all the opium was in bond in Japan, and would presumably be used for consumption in Japan in the future. He understood that the very excessive imports which had been allowed in 1921 were still in bonded warehouses in Japan, so that Japan would not require to manufacture any more morphine for some years. In 1922, the Japanese representative had admitted quite frankly that there was an immense import into Japan, and no export whatever, and he had said that the only explanation was that it had been smuggled out of the country. Now it was stated that it was still in the country, and, in addition to the immense amount in stock, Japan was still manufacturing and importing morphia very far in excess of any legitimate requirements. Even taking the figures which had just been given by the Japanese representative, over 70,000 ounces of morphia had been imported and manufactured in 1922. The consumption in Japan could not approach that amount. When he was in the Far East consumption had been reduced to about 30,000 or 40,000 ounces.

A list had been supplied to the Committee of all the seizures of morphia and drugs by the Maritime Customs in China, and he noticed from that list that nearly all the smuggled consignments had been carried in Japanese ships. That was a very remarkable fact, and the attention of the Japanese Government ought to be drawn to it. It seemed to him important that a far stricter supervision should be exercised over the trade.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had not yet been able to understand what was the exact nature of the control which was exercised by the Japanese Government after the morphine had left the factories in which it was manufactured. Like everybody else, he had been impressed with the very large figures of import and production of morphia in Japan in 1921, which amounted to very nearly 11,000 kilos. That quantity was very largely in excess of the normal medical requirements of Japan.

It was interesting to notice that, in the debate in the Japanese Diet on February 2nd, 1923, to which Mr. Campbell had referred at the previous meeting, Mr. Yokoyama, of the Japanese Health Bureau, had admitted that the domestic requirements of Japan were approximately 4,000 lbs. or something under 2,000 kilos, which left considerably more than 8,000 kilos not required for domestic consumption. That was a very large quantity, and, as Mr. Campbell had pointed out, there was nothing to show what had become of it. There were no exports. Dr. Uchino had suggested that the morphia remained in stock. That was a matter which the Committee was not in a position to investigate; but he noticed that, in the debate, it had been admitted by M. Yokoyama that undoubtedly a very great deal of smuggling into China was being carried on, and that in consequence of this the Japanese Government, in the latter part of 1921 and in 1922, had temporarily forbidden the export of morphine. He also noticed that Mr. Yokoyama had admitted that, while the Government knew how the morphine manufactured by Messrs. Hoshi was distributed to the dealers, precise and detailed particulars as to what happened to the morphine afterwards were not forthcoming. He would be glad if the Japanese Government would direct attention to that point, since that, of course, was where any leakage would occur. He felt sure, that, until a Government system of control, carried down from the factory to the wholesale and retail dealers, was exercised, leakage was bound to occur.

He had not been thinking of the firm of Hoshi when he had referred at the previous meeting to certain manufacturing firms in other countries which were under suspicion, but he thought everybody knew that very grave suspicion did attach to the dealings of the Hoshi Pharmaceutical Company of Japan. It would afford great satisfaction to the Committee if Dr. Uchino could give any kind of assurance that the question of control was being seriously considered by the Japanese Government with a view to preventing leakage, which appeared to be occurring on a large scale.

There was also the question, to which Mr. Campbell had called attention at the previous meeting, of the large amount of opium which had been removed from the bonded warehouses in Japan and surreptitiously exported to the neighbouring countries. Sir Malcolm Delevingne noticed that in the debate Mr. Yokoyama had admitted that this had taken place. He had said that opium had undoubtedly been taken from the bonded warehouses and sent to Vladivostock and Shanghai, and that the Government had regarded this as an infringement of the opium law and purposed to deal with it. The Committee would be glad if Dr. Uchino could make any statement as to the measures which the Japanese Government had taken, not only to punish such an action, but also to prevent it.

Sir John JORDAN said that he desired to refer to the question of smuggling. He had just obtained from the Secretary the list to which he referred, which was an official publication of the Chinese Maritime Customs, and he found that, from May 26th, 1922, to June 19th, 1922, practically all the morphia seized had been either in the possession of Japanese or Russians. For instance: May 26th, 1922, Japanese Post Office; March 12th, 1922, a Russian steamer; January 13th, 1922, a Japanese steamer, anti-opium pills worth 38 taels; January 22nd, anti-opium pills, etc., etc. Every item had to do with Russian or Japanese ships, and it was morphia, morphine, and all the appliances — syringes, needles, etc. Therefore he wished to strengthen his statement by an appeal to the list, to which all the members of the Committee could refer.<sup>1</sup>

M. UCHINO (Japan) said he did not deny that there was smuggling from Japan, and he deeply regretted it.

In answer to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's question, he gave a summary of the Ordinances relating to the control of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts.

These ordinances had been enacted in conformity with the provisions of Articles 9 to 14 of the International Opium Convention, and their main object was to restrict the import and export of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts, and at the same time to supervise their manufacture, sale or consumption. To this end, the permission of the Department for Home Affairs was required for the export and import of these drugs and, in the case of export, it was further required that any application should be accompanied by a certificate issued by the authorities in the locality to which the shipment was destined. Further, a manufacturer of the drugs covered by these ordinances was instructed to notify the prefectural governor concerned of the names of the raw materials, products, estimated output for the year and the location of the factory. Moreover, he was required to report, by the end of February each year, the names of products, their quantities, the kinds and quantities of raw materials and the source of supply for the preceding year. For the convenience of inspection and supervision by the controlling authorities, not only importers and manufacturers but also druggists in general were obliged to keep books for recording the reception and distribution of the drugs. Any violation of the provisions of these ordinances was punishable either by a fine or penal servitude not exceeding three months, according to the circumstances which had led to such an offence.

M. Uchino also gave a summary of the Regulations for the sale and the control of medicine.

In the Regulations for the sale and the control of medicine, medicines were classified into three groups: poisonous, powerful and ordinary. In each of these groups there were "specified

<sup>1</sup> See Appendice 2 of Document O. C. 103 (Annex 3).

medicines " for the sale of which restrictions existed to avoid their abuse. The sale of "poisonous" or "powerful" medicines, and "specified" medicines" such as morphine, cocaine and their respective salts, or opium compounds, was allowed exclusively to pharmacutists or to those druggists who employed pharmacutists or possessed the special permit of the prefectural governors, who were authorised to give it to sell in consideration of the particular local circumstances. The sale or distribution of the medicine described was permitted only to a person who presented a certificate and whose occupation necessitated the medicine. The name of the medicine required, the quantity, the object of use, and date, as well as the place of residence, the name in full, and the occupation of the applicant had to be stated on the certificate.

Sir John JORDAN said that he recollected very well the beginning of this programme of reform by Japan, when she had taken over Formosa. At that time general opinion in the Far East had been that there was going to be a great improvement in the situation in Formosa, but he could state now, without fear of contradiction, that the last condition of Formosa was worse than the first. In 1921, over 100,000 lbs. of opium had been imported into Formosa. He did not believe that formerly so large a quantity had ever been introduced by China. There had, therefore, been no reform in Formosa. The number of smokers had undoubtedly been reduced, but an immense amount of Persian opium had been imported into Formosa, manufactured into morphia, and had spread all over China. The situation was far worse now than it had been formerly.

M. UCHINO (Japan) explained that the opium produced in Formosa, or imported into Formosa, was used for the manufacture of prepared opium. During this process of preparing opium, crude morphine was produced as a by-product. During 1921, 121,696 lbs. of prepared opium had been manufactured, while the quantity of crude morphine produced had amounted to 10,540 lbs. Japan proper had imported from Formosa 7,484 kilos or 16,500 lbs. From that, 3,091 kilos of morphine hydrochloride and 1,934 kilos of heroin hydrochloride had been manufactured.

(e) *Switzerland.*

The CHAIRMAN said that 2,500 kgs. of morphine and 774 kgs. of heroin had been manufactured in 1921 in Switzerland, 881 kgs. of cocaine had been imported and 732 kgs. had been manufactured. There had been no export or re-export, and in that year the consumption had only amounted to 255 kgs.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, when it was stated that "no exports or re-exports are recorded", he presumed this meant that no figures had been furnished by the Swiss Government.

The SECRETARY replied in the affirmative.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked whether Switzerland was likely to ratify the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the report by the Secretariat contained a note on the subject. Public opinion was exercising strong pressure on the authorities to induce them to sign and ratify the Convention. The Swiss Parliament was thought to be about to discuss the question.

Sir John JORDAN asked if the Committee possessed sufficient figures, as regarded the situation, to express any view which might influence public opinion; since the Committee was sitting on Swiss soil, it might perhaps have some effect if it commented on the statistics.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT seconded this suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN thought that there had been seizures in China and in Canada of opium prepared in Switzerland. The members of the Committee had received the pamphlet of the Anti-Opium Association at Peking concerning the seizures which had been effected in China.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that the Committee had more than adequate information before it to enable it to express a very strong opinion on the subject; but, in view of the fact that the matter was now understood to be before the Swiss National Council, perhaps the Committee might consider it advisable to refrain from doing so. When the question of Turkey had arisen, the Committee had carefully refrained from expressing any opinion for exactly the same reason. He suggested that the same policy should be adopted with regard to Switzerland, especially as strong references to the latter country had already been made at several previous meetings.

M. BRENIER seconded Mr. Campbell's proposal. He had been the author of the proposal with regard to Turkey and he thought that it was better to abstain from any expression of opinion.

Sir John JORDAN noticed that M. Brenier's motion had been without effect as far as Turkey was concerned. He did not, however, wish to press the matter at all.

32. SUPPLY OF FIGURES CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION OF NARCOTICS  
IN FRANCE AND HOLLAND.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) asked the representatives of France and of the Netherlands whether there was any prospect of receiving the figures of the production of narcotics in France and Holland in the near future. He thought that the French and Dutch figures were the only figures required to complete the statistics of the world production of these drugs. He was sure the Committee would be very gratified if the representatives of France and of the Netherlands could inform it as to whether it might hope shortly to receive these statistics.

The Chairman said that, as he had stated at the previous meeting, the Secretariat would receive the statistics relating to the manufacture of cocaine, morphia, etc., in France in a few week's time.

Mr. van WERTUM (Netherlands) said that, as far as his country was concerned, he hoped that the figures relating to morphine would shortly be sent in to the Secretariat.

The situation regarding cocaine remained in the same position as he had stated it to be at the last session of the Committee. It had been explained to the Secretariat in a letter from the Dutch Government.

### 33. LIMITATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF COCAINE AND OTHER DRUGS.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the Committee would remember that the following resolution had been unanimously adopted by the last Assembly:

"The Assembly of the League of Nations again desires to emphasise the view expressed in the report of the Advisory Committee that, so long as the drugs to which Part III, particularly Article 9, of the Opium Convention applies are produced in quantities exceeding the legitimate requirements, there is a great danger that the surplus will find its way into illegitimate channels, and that the control of production, so as to limit it to the amount required for medical and legitimate purposes, is the most effective method of putting a stop to the illicit traffic. It recommends that the enquiry now proceeding into the world's legitimate requirements should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible, and expresses the hope that a provisional estimate and scheme will be submitted to the Assembly next year."

That resolution had been adopted in September 1922. The Joint Sub-Committee of the Advisory Committee and the Health Committee had been pursuing an investigation along various lines with a view to ascertaining the world's legitimate requirements of cocaine and the other drugs with which the Committee had been dealing. A considerable amount of information had also been collected by the Secretariat from the Governments of the different countries, which had been asked to furnish an estimate of their approximate requirements.<sup>1</sup>

He did not propose to deal with the question of figures, because he believed that Mr. Campbell was prepared to do so; but he thought that the figures and information which had been collected enabled the Committee, for the first time, to form something like a very rough estimate of the legitimate requirements of the drugs in civilised countries, where there was an established system of medical practice, and they furnished it with a very important guide in the consideration of the question of the limitation of production. He thought that the Committee ought to be prepared to submit to the Council and to the Assembly proposals for dealing with the question. Those members of the Committee who were concerned with the administration in their respective countries of the laws and regulations for controlling the traffic in the drugs were aware of the urgency of the question of the control of production, and he hoped the Committee would see its way at least to taking some step forward.

In the motion which he had circulated to the Committee with reference to the proposals of the American delegation, he had included a suggestion somewhat similar to the proposals which he had made the day before yesterday in regard to the consumption of prepared opium in the Far East, namely, that a conference or committee of the countries in which these drugs were manufactured should be convened with a view, if possible, to coming to some understanding or agreement as to the amount of the drugs required to be manufactured for legitimate medical and scientific purposes and as to the measures which might be taken for limiting the production to that quantity.

The CHAIRMAN said that Article 9 of the Convention obliged the Powers to publish laws for the limitation of manufacture. The French text was very clear: "*Les Puissances contractantes édicteront*" — the future imperative was employed — "*des lois pour limiter la fabrication.*" Nevertheless, this text left it to each Government to estimate the quantities which it deemed necessary for its legitimate requirements and, consequently, to take measures to supervise the manufacture of the drugs. The limitation of manufacture was obligatory, but the methods employed to secure this limitation and the fixing of the amounts necessary for legitimate needs were left to the discretion of the Governments.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) pointed out that the quantities of narcotics manufactured in the different countries depended on the amounts in the country itself and the amounts exported. Internal use could be limited to a certain extent, but exports could not, if the demand by foreign countries was regulated by the varying prices in the different countries. If in a certain country the price of a drug were lower than the average world price, the exports of that country would be greater than those of other countries; similarly, if the price were higher, the exports would be smaller. The total requirements of a producing country were therefore regulated by the economic laws of the world. In controlling exports, by a system of export certificates, the illicit traffic would be suppressed and manufacture would be limited to legitimate needs. These limits would vary for the producing countries, but would be fixed for the whole world.

Sir John JORDAN understood that the Health Committee had not reported in such a way as to afford any basis for action. He did not see how the Committee could wait indefinitely for

<sup>1</sup> See Document O.C. 115, page 15.



the Health Committee to come to a decision on the question. The question was not one which should be treated in so technical and detailed a manner; the Committee had reached the point when a decision must be taken. It knew that these drugs were used greatly in excess of legitimate requirements. In his opinion, the amounts could immediately be cut down by one half or more. If the Committee waited for the Health Committee's report, they would never do anything. The Committee must acknowledge that these drugs were produced in far larger quantities than were required for any proper uses whatever. If it had any practical constructive policy, it must recommend to the Council that it should immediately advise the different Governments to reduce their production of the drugs by a certain percentage. Enough information was before the Committee, and it had been discussing the question for two years.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) explained that the Health Committee of the League and the Mixed Health and Opium Sub-Committee had been considering for some time the question of suggesting a limit for the consumption of dangerous drugs. The matter was a very difficult one, even when considered solely from the technical point of view. The difficulty was intensified by the fact that very few statistics were available with which the Committee had been able to deal. His own personal opinion was that the Committee would probably be making a mistake if it tried to hasten unduly the adoption of a definite standard, because, after all, the main idea was to obtain the consent of the countries concerned to such proposals. It was trying to impose a maximum limit, and the whole object was to secure its adoption. As a matter of practical expediency, the Committee was more likely to succeed if it was fortified by the opinion of the technical organisation of the League in putting forward a definite figure.

From the information which had been supplied by Governments to the Committee, he had made somewhat hasty calculations, which he thought, however, were correct, as to the amounts required for legitimate consumption in various countries. These results were rather interesting. They seemed to him to disclose the possibility of the fixing of what would be a practically useful limit in the near future. The results were as follows:

America . . . . .	10 grains	per head	(all expressed in terms of raw opium)
Australia . . . . .	8	"	" " "
Austria . . . . .	12	"	" " "
Canada . . . . .	7	"	" " "
Denmark . . . . .	12	"	" " "
Great Britain . . . . .	11	"	" " "

He would like to add two other figures. Dr. Anselmino, during the discussion in the Joint Sub-Committee, had told them that in Germany, in Scandinavia and the Baltic countries the consumption was approximately ten grains per head.

The only other official figure which he (Mr. Campbell) had of any European country related to Switzerland, where the consumption was 30 (thirty) grains per head. If the figure for Switzerland, which was clearly abnormal, was excluded, a maximum of 12 (twelve) grains per head was obtained, which was the consumption in Austria and Denmark, and the minimum 7 (seven) grains per head, which was the consumption considered legitimate in Canada. This approximation was solely on the basis of statistics at present available from the replies of the responsible Governments. It seemed to him that these calculations constituted a very close practical approximation.

The results had been arrived at in various ways. The American figure, for instance, was purely an estimate based on *ad hoc* enquiries made in America. The English and Danish figures were based solely upon past practice, so that the problem had been approached from different points of view, and closely concordant results had been obtained.

It had occurred to him that these figures possessed a definite practical value. He quite admitted that they supported Sir John Jordan's point, but, for reasons which he had already explained, he questioned whether it would be wise to come to too hasty a conclusion. His main object in putting these figures before the Committee was to show that, without imposing anything on the individual Governments, they had in fact, as regarded the six countries for which he had made calculations, arrived at a more or less general agreement.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) wished to make one correction in Mr. Campbell's figures. He understood that Mr. Campbell had added the British requirements of raw opium to the requirements of morphine and heroin, and reduced them to a basis of raw opium. That was not correct. The raw opium which Great Britain had estimated included the raw opium required for the manufacture of morphine and heroin. The figure of 11 grains for Great Britain was therefore too high.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) replied that he had taken the figures of the Secretariat<sup>1</sup> and worked out the consumption in terms of raw opium. According to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's statement, the figure for Great Britain would be 8 grains instead of 11.

The SECRETARY said that the figures in question had not been compiled by the Secretariat but that Great Britain had supplied them.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he had worked on the note of the Secretariat: "from the above it would appear," etc. He had taken the figures, converted them into terms of raw opium, and the resulting calculation had been 11 grains.

<sup>1</sup> See Document O. C. 115, page 15.



Sir John JORDAN wished to explain his position more clearly. He thought that Mr. Campbell admitted that the present production of morphine and cocaine was far in excess of what it should be according to his calculations. Mr. Campbell's calculations were very careful and very interesting, but he felt that it would be a long time before they materialised. He wished to suggest that the Committee could now easily recommend to the Council a provisional and perfectly safe estimate which would not in any way endanger the medical uses of the drugs. There was a very large margin indeed. To wait for another year until the Committee had obtained all the details would, he thought, be a mistake. It could, at the present moment, submit a provisional estimate to the Council. As soon as these figures were obtained and the calculations made, then it could be revised again. Were the countries to continue, for another year, producing an excessive quantity of drugs?

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) said that, in regard to Mr. Campbell's figures, the provisional estimates of the United States seemed to be fair enough, although they were a little higher than the estimates which they had themselves made. Probably the figure obtained depended upon the number taken for the population. The American Department had calculated that the United States would require, expressed in terms of morphine content, about seven-eighths of a grain per head of the population. He did not know how Mr. Campbell obtained the figure for raw opium, but it would probably be about 9 grains instead of 10. As a provisional estimate, however, he supposed that 10 grains might be allowed to stand.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the amount of narcotics necessary for internal consumption in Germany was 25 milligrammes of morphia and a similar quantity of codeine. When the use of morphia increased, the use of codeine diminished and vice versa. 50 milligrammes of raw opium, in the form of powder, tinctured extracts, etc., or 0.250 milligrammes of morphia and codeine in the form of raw opium, and 0.050 milligrammes of raw opium, which made up 6 decigrammes or 10 grains of raw opium per head per annum, or 36,000 kgs. (500 chests) for the total consumption of the German population. To these figures must of course be added those for export.

Sir John JORDAN wished to insist upon his suggestion. He was not at all convinced by what Mr. Campbell had said with regard to his figures. He had made one confession, namely, that the production was far in excess of the actual requirements of 10 or 12 grains per head per annum. Surely Mr. Campbell could give an approximate idea of what were the requirements and what was the production. If they deferred the question, we would not make any advance at all. The best arrangement seemed to him to allow no traffic at all. Each country should produce its own requirements as far as possible (though he was aware that there were one or two countries that could not do this), and production should be for scientific and medical requirements only. The Opium Convention obliged the various countries to restrict the use of these drugs to medical and scientific requirements. He thought they ought to make a provisional step at once and that with goodwill it could be done. They might put the limit at 15 grains per head.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that Sir John Jordan had suggested that the consumption of opium was clearly in excess of the actual requirements. He regretted that he was unable to give Sir John any accurate information on this subject.

Sir John JORDAN asked Mr. Campbell if he had been told that 3,500 tons of opium were not sufficient for the medicinal and scientific requirements of the world?

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he had been told by gentlemen present at the Committee that it was not. He had no doubt, however, that it was more than sufficient.

Sir John JORDAN hoped that Mr. Campbell would admit that it could be reduced without any danger to the medicinal and scientific requirements of the world.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked Mr. Campbell to suggest the figure for the ration of the drugs.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought those figures showed that, without any pressure of any kind, the larger European nations had in fact worked down to a common basis. This was a gratifying fact. His personal opinion was that it would do more harm than good to insist on a standard unless there was some scientific basis for it.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked Mr. Campbell when he thought that the Committee would have a solid basis.

Sir John JORDAN supposed Mr. Campbell would say that they ought to recommend that there ought not to be any limitation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he did not want to be put in the position of a protagonist, as the question did not concern his country. He thought the figures were of interest and the Committee would like to have them as showing the extraordinarily narrow divergencies which existed in the practices of large nations at the present time. Personally, he thought it preferable to leave the matter where it was until they had a scientific basis in support of the figures, which would warrant their going to the various nations and saying: "Here is a standard which you ought to accept."

The CHAIRMAN asked Sir John Jordan in what way, supposing the quantities necessary for medical and legitimate needs were known, the manufacture could then be limited. France, for example, manufactured no morphia and only a few kilogrammes of cocaine. Did Sir John Jordan mean to suggest that a reduction proportionate to the amount which France manufactured should be made, while neighbouring countries manufactured thousands of kilogrammes?

Sir John JORDAN thought there ought to be an international agreement between all countries for distribution, and unless his colleagues admitted that this could be done with international co-operation and goodwill, they could not carry out the Convention. He did not see any other way of doing it. He did not believe any of the countries would do it in exercise of their own sovereign rights.

Bishop BRENT (United States) said that he would like to ask whether, except in the emergency of the late war, there had ever been any famine of narcotic drugs for medical use; also if there has been in the history of these drugs any lack of addicts.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, except during the war, it had never yet occurred that a country found itself without these drugs as the result of a deficit in the world production. A temporary lack had sometimes resulted which was due to local scarcity. There could be no doubt that the world production greatly exceeded legitimate consumption.

Sir John JORDAN explained that, if there had been any lack of these drugs during the war, it was because the greater part of them had gone to the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN asked Sir John Jordan whether he desired to submit a proposal on the subject.

M. BRENIER thought that the discussion on this point could be renewed when Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals were before the Committee.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was supporting Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) explained that he did not put forward the proposal at the moment because it was included in the proposal he had circulated and it would come up for consideration at the next meeting. He had not suggested nor did he intend to suggest that the Committee should fix at the moment any definite figure as to the world's requirements. He agreed with Mr. Campbell that it had not gone sufficiently far with its investigations to enable that to be done. It had collected a certain amount of material which seemed to indicate that in the near future it would be possible to frame an approximate estimate of the world's requirements. In addition to that, it had received from a large number of Governments — but by no means from all the Governments concerned — estimates of their requirements, which it might take as sufficiently accurate for its purpose.

His suggestion was that the Committee should recommend the Council to invite the Governments of the countries where these drugs were manufactured to consider the data, to compare them with the present figures of production (they had now obtained the world's production) and see whether there was not now room for a considerable reduction of the world's manufacture. The Committee had always taken the view that large amounts of these drugs were being smuggled in all parts of the world — in the Far East, in Europe and in the New World, and it had expressed its opinion, which had been adopted by the Assembly, that the method by which the illicit traffic in the drugs could be dealt with most effectively was by reducing the excess production.

The production would be reviewed from time to time, and, as the data accumulated, it would be able to get nearer and nearer to the exact figure. He agreed with Mr. Campbell that it was not possible to put forward a definite figure now, but the figure was beginning to take shape, and it ought to be considered whether some action ought to be taken in the direction he had suggested at the present moment. Possibly an approximate figure could be arrived at.

Sir John JORDAN said he agreed with Sir Malcolm, who suggested that some action should be taken on the approximate figures before the Committee. He recommended the Council to take action, but it would have no more information than the Committee had, and the Council was not so well qualified to express an opinion as the Committee was.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he suggested that the Council should invite the Governments of the countries where these drugs were manufactured to come together and discuss the matter.

Sir John JORDAN remarked that the representatives on the Committee might be only an advisory committee, but he thought they represented their Governments so far as this matter was concerned. They knew the whole question from beginning to end, far better than the Council or any individual Government; they knew individual Governments would not do anything unless there was some pressure put on them by a corporate body such as the Committee. They had sufficient information to give the Council an indication of what could be done. If they could not do that, then he would say they had failed in their duty. If they were going to hand the matter back to the Governments, it seemed to him nothing would be done.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he thought Sir John had not fully understood his proposition. He wanted not only to give an indication, but he wanted an understanding or agreement between the Governments concerned, and the Committee had no power to conclude that agreement; it must be left to the Governments themselves, and that was why he had suggested that the League should invite the Governments to meet together with a view to arriving at an understanding or agreement. All the data they had collected would be placed at the disposal of such a Conference, but the conclusion of the agreement could only rest with the Governments themselves.

Sir John JORDAN replied that he had perfectly understood the proposal. All he had meant was that the Committee was better qualified than anyone else to give an indication of what reduction was possible without endangering in any way the medicinal or scientific requirements.

### THIRTEENTH MEETING

*held Friday, June 1st, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present.

34. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
(continued).

The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the American Delegation had informed him that that delegation would prefer not to take part in the discussion of the Committee on the proposals. The delegation would accordingly withdraw, but would hold itself ready to reply to any questions which the Committee might care to ask concerning the proposals.

He himself accepted the American proposals, with the addition of two amendments, which he would lay before the Committee at a later stage in the proceedings.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, he desired to point out that the American Delegation had submitted its proposals and was awaiting the Committee's answer. In these circumstances, it would be impossible for the delegation to sit as members of the Advisory Committee and discuss any modifications in the wording of the proposals without having the full text of the counter-proposal before it, should the Committee desire to make one.

He thought, therefore, that the Committee should lay before the American Delegation the full text of its counter-proposal, which could serve as a basis for discussion.

The American Delegation doubted the propriety of remaining present during the discussion of its own proposals, because America was not a full member of the Advisory Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to ask one or two questions concerning the proposals before the American Delegation withdrew.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that the Committee was endeavouring to reach a conclusion in the usual manner, that was to say, by accepting the proposal or making a counter-proposal. He did not think that the American Delegation could assist by taking part in the discussion. If any member of the Committee had a proposal to make to the American Delegation, it would be glad to receive it, and would give it the fullest consideration. The counter-proposal could be discussed by the Committee should it reject the American proposals. It would be extremely unsatisfactory, however, for the American Delegation to have to reply immediately, without due consideration, to any counter-proposal which might be made. The Committee had had a week in which to study the American proposals, and the American Delegation desired some hours to consider any counter-proposals.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that there was evidently a misunderstanding. He thought that the American Delegation had expressed readiness to answer any questions which might be put concerning the meaning of its proposals. He had no intention of initiating a discussion. He merely desired to ask one or two questions, which appeared to be relevant, in order that the meaning and the intention of the American proposals should be made clear. He had thought, from the remarks of the members of the American Delegation at the second meeting, that they would be quite willing to adopt this course.

He therefore proposed to confine himself to asking a few questions, the answers to which appeared necessary or advisable to enable the Committee to understand the proposals which had been laid before it.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that the speeches made by himself and Bishop Brent at the second meeting had illustrated the American point of view as clearly as it was possible to do.

The American proposals had been before the Committee for a week and for that reason the delegation did not care to enter into any discussion at the moment. He repeated that it had made a proposal to the Committee and had given its reasons for that proposal; now it asked the Committee either to accept it or to submit a counter-proposal, and to give the American Delegation full time in which to examine the text of any such proposal.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he desired to make one last effort in the matter. A real misunderstanding appeared to have occurred. He had no desire to enter into any discussion regarding the American proposals, nor had he any desire to submit any counter-proposals. He wished simply to ask a few questions with the object of making clear in his own mind the real meaning of the American proposals. If the American Delegation found itself unable to adopt this course, he could only say that he very much regretted it.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that the American Delegation was not disposed to enter into any discussion. It had stated its position to the Committee and it would hold itself in readiness to examine any counter-proposals which that body might care to transmit to it.

The American Delegation withdrew from the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, before the Committee began to discuss the details of the American proposals, he would like to draw attention to the very grave disabilities under which its labours would be conducted. To do this, it would be necessary briefly to recall the history of the question.

He had arrived in Geneva with no knowledge of the American proposals. At the first meeting of the Committee, he had been informed that the American Delegation would make certain proposals. He had immediately asked for information on the subject and had suggested that it would be of great convenience if such information could be circulated to the Committee. None, however, had been forthcoming. At the second meeting, he had received the American proposals for the first time, and they had been explained in speeches by Mr. Porter and Bishop Brent. Immediately after those speeches, the other members of the Committee had been expected to reply regarding the proposals put forward by the representatives of the United States.

He did not wish particularly to complain that no time had been allowed for reflection; but, in point of fact, the members of the Committee had had to reply immediately, and, so far as he had been concerned, he had been seriously embarrassed in doing so because he had had no possible opportunity of consulting his Government, by telegram or otherwise. Further, the discussion at that meeting had been limited to the general principles contained in the proposals, and no opportunity had been given to ascertain what have been the precise meaning of any doubtful points in them, and no opportunity had been given to the members of the Committee to do this at the present meeting.

It was true that the proposals had been before the Committee for a week, but no formal opportunity of asking any questions had been given to the members, and, as far as he was concerned, no informal information on this point had been obtained.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that, although she was not authorised to speak for the American Delegation, she considered it to be a great pity that a misunderstanding should have arisen. Mr. Porter had not wished to adopt at all a peremptory attitude. The American Delegation had submitted proposals, and if the Committee had any counter-proposals to make, it should submit them to that delegation for consideration. The American Delegation had retired because it had thought that it would be easier for the Committee to discuss the proposals in its absence.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) associated himself with Mr. Campbell's remarks.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he did not in the least desire to object to the withdrawal of the American Delegation, although that had seriously embarrassed the Committee in examining the question. He merely wished to point out that the American Delegation had withdrawn without giving the Committee any opportunity of ascertaining the precise meaning of the proposals.

After some discussion, *the Committee decided, on the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, to invite each member of the Committee to make a general statement of his views regarding the American proposals and then to continue with the agenda of the Committee.* The actual discussion on the American proposals would only take place when the Committee dealt with Item 1 of its agenda, in which the questions raised by the American Delegation were included.

M. BRENIER said that it was very difficult for the Committee to discuss the American proposals when the authors of these proposals were not present.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he desired to define his attitude towards the American proposals.

At a previous meeting he had said that he entirely agreed with them, and these were his feelings at the moment. He thought that the American proposals constituted the end to the attainment of which the Committee's efforts should be directed. He felt sure that this was the opinion of all the members of the Committee. It was his duty to give his personal support to the proposals, and he thought that the facts would prove that too rapid action should not be taken if it was desired to avoid compromising the results wished for.

In supporting the American proposals, he wished to emphasise that they harmonised with the spirit of the Hague Conference, which he had attended, and the preparatory work of which was a weapon in the Committee's hands in its fight against the traffic in opium. The countries were required to combat this traffic little by little and to take measures which would eventually bring about the desired results.

Article 6 of the Convention stated that:

"The Contracting Powers shall take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, the internal trade in and use of prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence."

As far as the Committee was concerned, it could not increase the speed of its action. Individual countries could perhaps do so, but not the Committee as a whole.

It was impossible to conceal the fact that the revenue derived by Portugal from opium formed a fairly considerable part of its budget, a part which was too large to be replaced immediately from other sources. At the moment, Portugal was making every effort to do so, and what she had done in the past was the best guarantee of what she would do in the future. He therefore stated that he supported any proposal which would take account of the considerations which he had just put forward. Should the proposals not do so, he would be obliged to abstain from voting on them.

The following proposals were laid before the Committee in the name of the British Delegate:

1. That the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium accepts the propositions of the United States representatives as embodying the general principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs and on which, in fact, the International Convention of 1912 is based.

2. That the Committee, appreciating the great value to the States Members of the League of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has now for the past two years been making to deal with the question, expresses the belief that they will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention.

3. That it is recognised that it rests with the Government of each State to decide what is or is not to be regarded as medicinal or scientific use of the drugs within its own territories.

4. That, in bringing these proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by: (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adhesion of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medical and scientific uses, with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) establishing the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures for securing international co-operation in suppressing the illicit traffic in the drugs; (4) inviting the Powers with Far Eastern possessions to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for the investigation of the conditions in China, with a view to the more effective application of Part II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic, with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention.

5. That, having regard to the information now available, the Committee suggests to the Council the advisability of inviting:

- (a) the Governments of the States in which the manufactured drugs are produced,
- (b) the Governments having possessions in which the use of prepared opium is temporarily continued under the provisions of Part II of the Convention,

to enter into immediate negotiations (by nominating representatives to form a committee or committees, or otherwise) to consider whether agreements could not now be reached:

- (a) as to a definite limitation of the amounts of manufactured drugs to be produced, and therefore of the amounts of the raw material to be imported for that purpose;
- (b) as to a definite reduction of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those possessions where it is temporarily continued, either on the lines of the suggestions submitted by the Committee in their other resolutions, or on other lines; so bringing about automatically a reduction in the quantities of raw opium and the coca leaf produced for export.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) spoke as follows: I conceive the position to be this. The American Delegation is here, I believe, in what is called an unofficial and a consultative capacity. The American Delegation has submitted to the Committee, by letter, certain propositions which they ask the Committee to accept. Mr. Porter, in the course of the present meeting I think, declared quite plainly that the American Delegation did not consider itself to be a part of this Committee — a part, as he said, of the family, and it preferred to withdraw while we, in the bosom of the family, discussed these proposals. I conceive it is our duty, therefore, to define our attitude towards these proposals, which we shall have to bring to the notice of the Council and Assembly, and to suggest the action which we recommend the Council and the Assembly to take. The motion which I have circulated is an attempt to do both these things, after a good deal of discussion both with the American Delegation themselves (who, I may say in passing, have throughout talked over the matter in the most friendly manner possible), and after discussion with most of my colleagues on the Committee. It is an attempt to do both these things — to suggest the attitude which the Committee should take and recommend the League to take towards the American propositions, and to suggest the action which the League should take with regard to them.

The American propositions are stated in quite general terms. They contain no suggestions for action. They merely lay down general principles and, as I have said in the few remarks I made on the day on which they were presented to us by the American Delegation, I personally see nothing to which this Committee can take objection, nothing which seems to me to be inconsistent with the provisions of the Hague Convention itself. But I feel some difficulty has been caused in the minds of the members by the speech which Mr. Porter made in presenting these proposals



to the Committee. Some of the remarks he made seem to suggest — I do not say they did actually suggest — that it was the duty of the producing countries (and by producing countries, I mean countries producing the raw material of the drugs) to suppress immediately the production and the export of the raw material for any purposes which were not strictly medical and scientific. If that were so, I should at once agree that there was a very serious difficulty in the way of our acceptance of the American propositions; but I am inclined to think that a closer examination of what Mr. Porter said would lead one to suppose that the American Delegation does not take a view so strict and so narrow.

Let me refer for a moment to some of the remarks he did make. He began by saying that: "The United States is of the opinion that there should be complete acceptance of, and compliance with, the terms and spirit of the Hague Opium Convention", and throughout his argument he bases himself on the Convention itself. He did not profess to be laying down any new principles or to be adding anything to what the Hague Convention provided. Then in the course of his speech he made the remarks which have given rise to the difficulty I have mentioned. I quote these sentences: "In regard to raw opium, the production, distribution, importation and exportation of which the Convention binds the adhering Powers to control, the attitude of the United States is that it is a dangerous drug and that its use for other than strictly medicinal or scientific purposes is unlawful. The United States feels that the unrestricted production of raw opium inevitably results in a surplus of the drug over and above that required for medicinal and scientific purposes, and the diversion of it or its derivatives into illicit channels of international traffic, thereby creating a problem of universal international concern, and making impossible the execution of laws adopted by the several Governments under the terms of the Convention. The United States believes, therefore, that the unrestricted production of opium should not be permitted and that the cultivation of the opium poppy should be limited to a point where there is no danger that the product will be available for other than medicinal and scientific purposes."

That, I think, is the passage which has caused the difficulty. He goes on, in developing the argument, to make it quite clear that the position he is taking is that the Hague Convention must be considered as a whole, and its various provisions treated as merely sections of one document, and he argued that it is the ordinary legal principle that one section of an instrument cannot be so construed as to defeat the purpose of the whole document.

He winds up by saying: "There can be no doubt that, bearing these principles in mind, the Signatories to the Hague Convention were called upon to enact efficacious laws or regulations for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium in such a manner that the execution." I wish to lay special stress on these words "in such a manner that the execution of the provisions of the second and third chapters [of the Convention] would be assured".

I think you must interpret that as meaning that what he claims is that the production of raw opium in the world should be so controlled as to be consistent and to ensure the full execution of the provisions of Parts II and III of the Opium Convention.

Part II of the Convention, while it is based on the view that the use of opium for smoking is an abuse and ought to be suppressed, does not require its immediate suppression. It provides for the gradual and effective suppression of the use of opium for smoking in those countries where it is not possible for the time being to suppress it immediately. It seems to me quite clear, therefore, that, as Part II of the Convention permits the continued use, temporarily, of opium for smoking, the Convention equally permits the production and export of raw opium for that purpose, during the interval which elapses before the suppression of opium for smoking becomes complete. Otherwise, of course, the provisions of Part II would be nullified, and if it were unlawful, as Mr. Porter would seem to imply in one passage, to produce and export opium for smoking, it would be impossible to continue such use in those territories where its immediate suppression was impossible.

I think we may base ourselves on the principle which Mr. Porter himself laid down, that you must consider the document as a whole and you must interpret its provisions so as to ensure that effect is given to all its provisions. If that is so, and if, as I think must be the case, the American Delegation would accept that view and would say that they intended nothing to the contrary sense, it seems to me that the great difficulty in the way of acceptance of the American propositions as general principles on which the Convention is based and which should guide the Governments in dealing with the question of opium and dangerous drugs is removed. We must all agree, I think, that if the Convention had provided in Part II for the immediate suppression of the use of opium for smoking, on the Convention coming into operation, the production and export of opium for smoking would have been inconsistent with the Convention, and that Article I, by which the signatory Powers undertake to control the production of opium, would have required the signatory States immediately to suppress both the production and export of opium for that purpose. I do not believe any contrary view is taken by any member of the Committee. If that is so, what seemed a rather formidable difficulty between ourselves and the American Delegation would disappear.

There was one other difficulty which at first also seemed to be serious. There was some discussion, on one of the early days of the present session of the Committee, on the use of opium in India and other Oriental countries, not for smoking, but for what has been described here and at meetings of the Assembly as semi-medicinal purposes. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the attitude of the League on the subject. I think there has been especially a great deal of misunderstanding in the United States on the subject; but in the conversations which I have had with Mr. Porter, and to which I think I may fairly refer, he has made it quite clear to me that it is not the intention of the American Delegation or of the American Government to dictate or interfere in any way with what the Indian Government or any other Government similarly situated may regard as a proper semi-medicinal use of the drugs in countries where conditions such as that exist.



The American problem, as we all know, is a problem in the main — almost entirely, one might say — of the production of opium and the coca leaf for the manufacture of the drugs to which Part III of the Convention applies. The American problem, which, as we all know, is a very serious one indeed, is the problem of the excessive addiction of a large proportion of the American population to the use of these drugs, and one must feel with the American Delegation great sympathy in their desire that effective steps should be taken which would strike at the root of the evil in their country. Therefore, I have framed the motion which I have drawn up in three sections. In the first paragraph, I have to define what our attitude should be towards the American proposals. I suggest that we should accept those propositions as the general principles by which the Governments should be guided, and as being, in fact, the principles on which the Hague Convention is based. The second paragraph, which is not of the substance of my motion, I think will express the general feeling of the Committee that we welcome American collaboration and appreciate its value to us in our work here. In the third paragraph I propose to make it quite clear what we understand to be the bearing of the American proposals on the semi-medicinal use in India and Persia and other Oriental countries. Then in paragraph 4, I have attempted to make clear that the American proposals are really in line with what we have been endeavouring to do here in this Committee, and what the League has been endeavouring to do on the recommendations made by this Committee during the last two years, and I have briefly summarised, for the information of the Council and of the Assembly and of the general public, the measures we have been taking in our efforts to work towards the ends which the American propositions have in view. In the last paragraph, I have attempted to indicate what are the practical steps which the League might take in giving fuller effect to the American propositions, to our efforts and to the provisions of the Convention. The American propositions come before us at a time when we had ourselves reached, as the result of the enquiries and investigations made over the last two years, a point when some definite action is possible. We have been working in this Committee towards two ends. One has been the policy, shall I say, for giving effective application to the provisions of Part II of the Convention. The other has been a scheme or a suggestion for dealing with the evil arising from the over-production and the consequent abuse of the manufactured drugs. I have accordingly embodied in the fifth paragraph two suggestions. One of these suggestions the Committee has already been good enough to accept in the motion which they adopted yesterday, and the other was under consideration yesterday afternoon when the Committee decided to defer a decision upon it until we came to the consideration of the American proposals to-day, because we felt that the question we were discussing yesterday afternoon had an important bearing on the attitude and action we should take with regard to the American proposals.

As I said just now, the great problem for the United States, and the great problem, too, for the European countries represented here, especially France and England, is the question of the abuse of the manufactured drugs. France has, on more than one occasion, at the meetings of this Committee and of the Assembly, laid stress on the danger to which society in the West of Europe is exposed by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs and the widespread abuse of these drugs which is now prevalent in those countries. My own Government has taken the same view. It has been stated time after time in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for the Home Department that the only remedy for the danger which now threatens society in Western Europe and in the United States of America more especially, is the limitation of the production of the manufactured drugs. In speaking more especially of Western Europe, I do not forget what we, in this Committee, are not likely to forget — the terrible abuse of these drugs in China and in the Far East. We have been working steadily for the last two years, by means of special investigations through the Health Committee, and by the collection of information from the Governments themselves, with a view to determining, if possible, what would be a reasonable limitation to the production of the drugs, and I feel myself that we have still a long way to go before we can fix an accurate figure, but that, at any rate, we have got so far that we can reasonably ask the Governments of the manufacturing countries to get together and consider whether some understanding cannot be arrived at which will, at any rate, reduce the amount of the drugs which are being manufactured at the present time, and so cut off, in part, the amount of the drugs which is available for the illicit traffic.

That, I think is all I want to say. We all recognise the importance of the presence of the American Delegation here. We all recognise the importance of their collaboration, and we have the opportunity now, if we can only find a form which will both meet their views and at the same time be in accord with the action which we have been taking and are proposing to take, of bringing two very powerful agencies — the influence and action of the League and the influence and action of the United States Government — into collaboration for dealing with this problem.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was desired to give a definition of the words "licit", "legal" and "legitimate" which were to be found in the text of the Convention.

"Licit" meant that which was not forbidden by any law; "legal" meant prescribed by the law, or in conformity with the law; and "legitimate" had two meanings, the first a legal meaning, that the substance qualified possessed the characteristics required by the law. It was therefore the equivalent of the word "legal"; but the latter word was used only in connection with matters dealing with the internal laws of a country, while the word "legitimate" was reserved for questions relating to international agreements. It possessed a second meaning founded on reason, that which could not be violated without injustice or without reason. It was in this last sense that the word "legitimate" was employed in Article 9 of the Convention.

A distinction would have to be drawn between prepared opium and other narcotics. The use of narcotics for requirements other than medical and scientific was illegitimate in both senses of the word, that was to say, it was illegal and unreasonable. Article 9 had established this

principle. The use of prepared opium for other than medical and scientific purposes was illegitimate if the word "legitimate" merely qualified the word "abuse", which was used in the American proposals in its non-legal sense of unreasonable. This use, however, was legitimate if by the word "legitimate" licit or legal was meant, because the Convention, and, in consequence, the legislation of the signatory Powers, permitted this use during the period prior to the complete suppression of prepared opium. The date by which that suppression should be accomplished was left to the discretion of each Power.

The matter, therefore, was one of the simple meaning of words, since all were agreed on the interpretation of the Convention in the sense which he had just put forward. Further, this was the interpretation which had been given by the Legal Section of the Secretariat.

M. UCHINO (Japan) said that the question of the reduction of the amount of opium produced was of great importance. The whole opium problem was one of the most serious which existed in the world, especially in so far as the Far East was concerned. He desired to remind the Committee of the very valuable work which it had done during the past two years. This work had been very well summarised in paragraph 4 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution.

The ideals and principles contained in the American proposals were in reality in conformity with those of the Advisory Committee. Further, these proposals went to the whole root of the opium question and were in accordance with the policy which the Japanese had been following for many years.

In order to obtain results which would be beneficial to justice and humanity, Japan would not hesitate to make every effort and every sacrifice, and she would do her utmost in order to secure that international co-operation which was the key to the solution of the opium problem.

Although he had no special instructions from his Government with regard to the American proposals, he was sure it would fully agree with the principles which they contained and would wish to see them accepted by all.

It was quite clear that the complete suppression of the use of prepared opium was not the immediate, but the ultimate aim of the Convention. He therefore considered that, although it would be somewhat difficult to suppress the use of this drug immediately, it would certainly be a great and important step towards ultimate suppression if some agreement among the countries concerned could be reached by which production would be reduced.

He desired to support the American proposals on these grounds, and he hoped that they would meet with general approval.

Since the British proposals had been made to give effect to the American proposals, he also supported them.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the American proposals concerned the limitation of the production of opium and of the manufacture of morphia and other dangerous drugs. A large amount of the opium products which were manufactured at the present time was greatly in excess of legitimate requirements. It was therefore necessary to find some means by which production could be limited in order to check the surplus from finding its way into illicit channels.

The American Delegation was asking for international co-operation in the attempt to solve the opium problem, and he did not think that there was anything in its proposals which went beyond the terms of the Opium Convention.

The interpretation of the word "legitimate" as meaning medicinal and scientific was a most reasonable one, and it should be accepted. It was evident that this interpretation implied that opium-smoking was illegitimate in some of the Far Eastern countries. The Convention allowed smoking to continue temporarily in that it only provided for its gradual suppression.

He therefore recommended that the Committee should adopt the principles set forth in the proposals of the American Delegation as a basis upon which effective international co-operation might be secured.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had already expressed his agreement with the principles which were contained in the American proposals. He desired to add one remark, which referred both to these proposals and to those of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

As everyone was aware, the opium problem had its origin in China. Neither in the American proposals nor in the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne was there any mention of China. This appeared to be a very regrettable omission. If the problem was to be dealt with adequately, it must be dealt with as a whole and not merely as it affected the Far Eastern possessions.

China, according to the summary prepared by the Secretariat (Annex II), was at present producing more opium than all the rest of the world put together, and in his opinion, it would be no kindness to the Chinese people to ignore that situation. The proposal should be made known in China, and the desire very generally expressed that the Chinese people and the Chinese Government should adopt similar measures for the gradual reduction of the large amount of opium which was at present being produced in China. In the United States, as in England, there was a tendency to disregard the situation in China, and, with all due respect, he certainly considered that it was most necessary that the situation in China should at least form part of the scheme before the Committee in one way or another.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed with Sir John Jordan. He could not deny that opium was produced in China at the present time. Owing to the political situation, the Government was unable to control some of the provinces administered by military governors.

Sir John Jordan had said that China should be asked gradually to reduce the cultivation of the opium poppy. He himself desired that China should be asked *immediately* to suppress the production of opium, and not gradually, because she had had no right to produce after 1917, when the Anglo-Chinese Agreement had come to an end.

Sir John Jordan had been closely connected with this agreement and its enforcement in China, and he had done much to save the Chinese people, who owed him a debt of gratitude. He further agreed with Sir John Jordan that public opinion should be aroused against the opium traffic in China.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the first thing that struck him was the general wording of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals. He could not fully understand why it should be necessary for the Committee to put on record a kind of justification of what it had done. It had employed its best efforts to obtain the general enforcement of the Convention, and there was no reason that special mention of this should be made.

He could not agree with paragraph 1 of these proposals, since the American proposals, which that paragraph was designed to incorporate, were contrary to the Convention. He referred to what he had said at the third meeting and he entirely agreed with the interpretation given to the Convention by Mr. Campbell. He thought, however, that the actual wording of the proposals of the United States should be inserted into the resolution.

He also objected to paragraph 3. The use of prepared opium in the Netherlands Indies could not, generally speaking, be brought under the term medicinal. The Government of the Netherlands Indies frequently was ignorant of the reasons which led the population to smoke opium.

He also expressed some doubt concerning sub-paragraph 4 of paragraph 4. If it referred to the proposal put forward at the previous meeting by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and already accepted by the Committee, it was better to speak of the "possibility of reviewing", rather than "to review".

With regard to paragraph 5, he understood that Peru and Bolivia would also be invited. If the Committee did not do that, he was afraid that, the moment the production of cocaine was limited in Europe and Japan, factories would be established in Bolivia and Peru. Cocaine could be extracted from coca leaves in South America without the intricate machinery which was necessary for Java coca leaves. He objected to the wording of paragraph 5, the scope of which was far wider than the resolutions which had been previously submitted by Sir Malcolm Delevingne on the subject. The Committee could not recommend the adoption of the automatic reduction of the export of raw opium, since this implied an automatic reduction of its import, and was therefore contrary to the terms of the Convention.

Dr. POENSGEN (Germany) said that both the proposals made by the American Delegation had been incorporated in the German law concerning opium, and had been put into force by means of various administrative decrees. He desired to make the following statement regarding Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal:

"I have the honour to state that Germany, acting in concert with the States Members of the League of Nations, appreciates the collaboration of the United States in this humanitarian task. The Ministry of Public Health of the German Reich has already been instructed to enter into direct relations, because of the seizures and the smuggling of narcotics, with Mr. Carlton Simon, special representative on the question of narcotics attached to the New York police.

"When the Hague Convention was concluded, Germany possessed territory in China, and I can state from my own experience that at Kiangchow the use of opium for smoking was very severely controlled. Prepared opium of German origin was imported in view of the fact that Germany played no part in supplying Tsintao. Since Germany no longer has any territorial interest in China, and since the manufacture and export of prepared opium are forbidden in Germany, Chapter II of the Convention has no practical consequence for her.

"Germany is not a Member of the League of Nations, neither is the United States. When, however, Germany was invited to become a member of the Advisory Committee, she did not hesitate to collaborate in the efforts to find a solution for this humanitarian question. Because of the moral results which would be obtained, Germany would therefore welcome the interpreting of the preamble of the Convention in a humanitarian sense."

Germany would abstain from voting on the question, because she had no interest in prepared opium, either from a commercial or a territorial point of view.

In case the Hague Convention gave rise to difficulties of interpretation (should that Convention, for instance, be capable of being interpreted in different senses), the best procedure would be to draw up a new Convention, based on the excellent experience obtained by the Advisory Committee during its work.

## FOURTEENTH MEETING

*held Friday, June 1st, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present.

### 35. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. PROPOSALS OF THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE (*continued*).

MR. CAMPBELL (India) said that he was most anxious to reach an agreement, if possible, on the very important matter before the Committee. He felt that, after the explanations which he had given to the Committee regarding the practice obtaining in India concerning all questions connected with the opium traffic, there was nothing in that practice which separated his view and the view of his Government from that of the American Delegation. He did not think that, after the explanations which he had given, the American Delegation would desire to suggest any alterations in that practice, and it seemed to him that, if this were so, it would be deplorable if the Committee was unable to agree upon some form of words which would express the fact that an agreement had already, as regarded practice, been reached.

He had listened to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's statement of the case with the greatest interest and he entirely accepted it. On the other hand, he felt the gravest doubt as to whether paragraph 1 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution was in accordance with the principles which he had so clearly enunciated.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne had quoted various parts of Mr. Porter's speech which were not in accordance with the view which Sir Malcolm Delevingne held, and he would like to emphasise the importance of a proper settlement of this matter.

The Committee was now dealing with the fundamental document under which it had been called upon to act. The League had been entrusted, by the Treaty of Versailles, with the supervision of the execution of the Hague Opium Convention. The interpretation of that Convention formed the base of the Committee's labours, and it would be extremely inadvisable to allow any doubt or ambiguity whatever to exist regarding this.

There was one point, which had been raised by the German representative on the Committee, to which he desired to direct attention. M. Poensgen had suggested that, since doubt existed regarding the interpretation of the Convention, the Committee might perhaps consider it wiser either to convene a Conference to frame a new Convention or to find other means. The Indian Government had never adopted the view that the Hague Convention was sacrosanct, but had always thought that, so long as it existed, and so long as it was not replaced, under proper procedure, by something else, it was the only document to which the countries of the world had adhered and on which action could be taken.

In order to secure, if possible, the agreement of the American Delegation, he had drafted an amendment to the American proposals, which he desired to place before the Committee. The amendment followed the main lines of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's speech at the previous meeting as closely as possible, and stated what, in Mr. Campbell's opinion, was beyond all doubt the interpretation given by every member of the Committee to the Hague Convention. During numerous discussions in the Committee, opinions had been expressed which had been entirely in conformity with the views put forward by Sir Malcolm Delevingne in his speech at the previous meeting.

Mr. Campbell had therefore extracted statements from Mr. Porter's speech which appeared to him to cover adequately the whole ground under discussion. He had used Mr. Porter's wording in most cases, and where that was impossible, for reasons of form connected with the framing of a resolution, he had departed from that wording to the smallest extent possible. The result was a resolution composed almost entirely of Mr. Porter's own words.

The resolution was as follows :

"1. The Committee has carefully considered the propositions placed before it by the representatives of the Government of the United States; the Committee agrees with Mr. Porter that Article 1 of the Hague Convention necessitates such effective measures of control over the production of raw opium as will prevent the emergence of any surplus available for abusive purposes; it agrees with him that Chapter 1 of the Convention must be interpreted in such a manner that the execution of the provisions of Chapters II and III of that Convention can be assured; it agrees also with his view that the Convention binds the Contracting Powers ultimately to suppress the traffic in and the use of prepared or smoking opium in any form. It fully accepts his view that the Convention prohibits the manufacture, sale and use of the drugs referred to in Chapter III for other than medical and legitimate purposes, and it concurs in his opinion that producing countries must adopt effective means in order to co-operate fully with consuming countries in limiting their exports to these latter countries to the quantities which it is permissible for them to import in accordance with the Convention.

"2. The Committee appreciates the great benefits which will be derived from the co-operation of the Government of the United States in devising and enforcing the measures to be taken for the effective control of the opium traffic; they would again emphasise the view they

have already expressed that the Hague Convention cannot be really effective until it is universally accepted and strictly enforced; and it welcomes most cordially the assistance of the Government of the United States in securing this end. It recognises the influence of that Government and its enthusiastic support of the principles embodied in the Convention will have most important practical results."

This resolution would, if accepted, take the place of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's; he had no objection that paragraph 3 should also be covered by his draft.

In answer to Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had intended, in paragraph 3 of his resolution, to refer to the semi-medicinal use of the drugs in India, Persia and other Oriental countries.

Sir John JORDAN said that he could not accept Mr. Campbell's amendment. He decidedly preferred the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne. He knew that Mr. Porter was very anxious to come to a working arrangement with the Committee, and it would be deplorable if, through any lack of reciprocity on the part of the Committee, agreement was not reached on the question under discussion.

The United States Delegation had asked the Committee to accept its proposals, and had stated its arguments in support of them. Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution accepted the principles which were enunciated by the American representatives.

Mr. Campbell had reproduced Mr. Porter's statements almost verbatim, and had expressed the Committee's concurrence in them. This did not appear to Sir John Jordan to be an answer to the question put by the United States Delegation, which had asked the Committee either to accept its proposals or to submit a counter-proposal. Mr. Campbell had simply taken a number of extracts from Mr. Porter's remarks and claimed that, in expressing its concurrence in them, the Committee was replying to the proposals of the American Delegation. The Committee must either accept or reject these proposals, and Mr. Campbell's amendment did neither.

He did not even think that Mr. Porter had always been quoted quite accurately. For example, Mr. Campbell said: "The Committee agrees with Mr. Porter that Article 1 of the Hague Convention necessitates such effective measures of control over the production of raw opium as will prevent the emergence of any surplus available for abusive purposes." Mr. Porter had actually said: "The cultivation of the poppy should be limited to a point where there will be no available product other than for medicinal or scientific purposes." That was a totally different statement. Mr. Campbell's enumeration could not be considered as exhaustive unless the whole text of Mr. Porter's speech was quoted. It was impossible to lay emphasis on extracts only. Mr. Porter had said that the United States Government considered that opium cultivation should be limited so that there should be no danger of the drug being available for other than medical and scientific purposes. The terms which he had used were quite definite and clear and had a wider meaning than those employed by Mr. Campbell.

It was precisely on this particular point that the Committee would be most unlikely to give satisfaction to the United States. He therefore asked the members of the Committee to adhere to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that Sir John Jordan had suggested that, in view of the fact that the American Delegation desired to receive a definite answer to its proposals, it would be preferable for the Committee not to accept Mr. Campbell's amendment. He did not think that this was the way in which the matter should be dealt with. It was, in his opinion, better to adopt (and he hoped it would be adopted unanimously) Mr. Campbell's resolution, which gave satisfaction regarding many points which had been raised by Mr. Porter. It would be better to follow this procedure than to adopt or reject the proposals of the American Delegation directly. If these proposals were rejected, the Committee would not be able to obtain the collaboration of the United States, and further, it would be impossible to secure a unanimous vote on the first paragraph of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal, nor had the Committee any guarantee that this proposal would be accepted by the American Delegation.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, although his proposal was now being considered paragraph by paragraph, it must be taken as a whole, and the first paragraph must be read in connection with the definite proposals for action contained in the last.

Further, the American proposals contained general principles and were not the text of a law or convention which would have to be regarded as a statement in precise terms of certain things which had to be done. It was for this reason that he had made it clear in the first paragraph of his resolution that the Committee accepted the American proposals as the expression of the general principles by which the Governments should be guided, and on which the Convention of 1912 had been based.

M. BRENIER pointed out a mis-translation in the French text of paragraph 1 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that paragraph 1 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution correctly represented the ideas of the Siamese Government, with the reservation conceived in the terms employed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne when explaining the resolution to the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that Mr. Campbell's amendment would, if carried, obliterate the first two paragraphs of his motion. He therefore desired that the Committee should first vote on Mr. Campbell's amendment and then on his resolution.



Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that his object in proposing the amendment had been to secure some form of wording which might possibly obtain the unanimous vote of the Committee. He frankly admitted the force of Sir John Jordan's objections. It was perfectly correct to say that he had not accepted the American proposals, and the reason was that he could not accept them in their present form. He felt, and he was quite convinced that his opinion was shared in this matter by other members of the Committee, that the American proposals as they stood were contrary to the Hague Convention. If they were accepted, together with the explanations which had been furnished by Mr. Porter and Bishop Brent, the Committee would be adopting something which it had no right to adopt, and, further, which neither the Council nor the Assembly had any right to adopt. By an acceptance of the American proposals, the League would be placing on the Convention an authoritative interpretation which was incorrect and which it possessed no power to make.

The procedure suggested in Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution was unsatisfactory. An ambiguity of a very serious nature was contained in his proposals. Mr. Campbell unreservedly accepted the explanation of the position as given in Sir Malcolm Delevingne's speech, and, in his opinion, if the American Delegation had been present, and if its members had risen and declared that they accepted Sir Malcolm Delevingne's exposition of the case, the problem would have been solved. It was, however, useless to attempt to disguise the facts, which had been clearly evidenced by the reservations which had been made by Prince Charoon on behalf of the Siamese Government and by all or almost all the other delegates.

It would be reprehensible in the highest degree if the Committee accepted a principle, while it refused to accept the logical consequences of that principle.

If Mr. Porter's interpretation of the Hague Convention was accepted, the whole of Part II was obviously stultified.

Not one member of the Committee had accepted the view put forward by Mr. Porter in dealing with the question which was now before the Committee. If the Committee recommended the adoption of a principle whose logical consequences it refused to accept, he thought it would be an extremely undesirable action, and one which would lay up a great heritage of future trouble.

He earnestly hoped that some form of wording would be found which would be acceptable both to America and to India. He was convinced that the actual practice of the Indian Government was entirely in accordance with the proposals of the American Delegation. If that were so, and if no suggestion for an alteration in the present practice was forthcoming, then the Indian Government could do no more than it had done up to the present. It would be lamentable if the persons concerned in this matter could not agree upon some form of wording which would cover the whole question. It had been in order to find a form of wording based solely on Mr. Porter's statement, and therefore likely to commend itself to the American Delegation, that he had proposed his amendment. He would like to remind the Committee of what Mr. van Wettum had said. His resolution contained nothing to which any member of the Committee had ever raised any objection. It was also possible that his amendment might be accepted by America, since it was confined entirely to the statements which had been made by Mr. Porter himself. In that case, the Committee would have reached a solution; if his amendment were not accepted by America, then the Committee could begin again.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he could see no reason for not adopting the American proposals. The Americans had quite correctly interpreted the word "legitimate" used in the Convention to mean medicinal and scientific. He saw no harm in accepting that interpretation. Further, the proposals were in harmony with the spirit and letter of the Convention.

The Committee's principal aim was to secure international co-operation. That end would be furthered by accepting the American proposals. He had no objection, on the other hand, to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals, which included the American proposals. He thought, however, that the Committee should accept the principle of the American proposals and embody them in its report, as this procedure would be more direct.

Sir John JORDAN desired to modify his previous statement that Mr. Campbell's amendment neither accepted nor rejected the American proposals. On hearing Mr. Campbell's explanations, it seemed to him perfectly clear that Mr. Campbell's amendment did reject those proposals. It would be a very serious step indeed for the Committee to take if they were rejected. He hoped that it would not do so. It was rather remarkable to see two representatives of the British Empire, both members of the Committee, and both supporting different views. He was glad to see that the representative of Great Britain desired to conciliate America. Mr. Campbell did not appear to show a proper conception of the great interests at stake in the matter.

Mr. UCHINO (Japan) said that, as far as the interpretation of the Hague Convention was concerned, he thought that Mr. Campbell's interpretation was correct. He was, however, most anxious that further steps should be taken in the matter and, for that reason, he supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said, with reference to Sir John Jordan's remark, that the two representatives of the British Empire on the Committee were fully agreed in substance. They only disagreed as to the manner in which the American proposals should be regarded. He proposed therefore to ask that, should his proposals be adopted, the Chairman, in sending their text to the American Delegation, should include the text of the remarks which he had made explaining his proposals at the previous meeting.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne.



The CHAIRMAN said that he accepted the general lines of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals in the sense of the following remarks. Paragraph 1 contained the idea of a progressive suppression of the use of narcotic drugs. He desired to emphasise again the meaning which should be attached to the word "legitimate". There should be no misunderstanding on the point as far as concerned drugs such as morphine, heroin and cocaine. Any requirements other than medical or scientific were illegitimate in both senses of the word, that was to say, both unreasonable and illegal. Regarding prepared opium, its use was not "legitimate" if the word "legitimate" qualified simply the word "abuse". If, however, the word "legitimate" was taken to mean "legal" or "licit", "in conformity with the Convention", then that use was legitimate, because the Convention permitted the use of prepared opium until its complete suppression had been decreed. This could only be done at the discretion of each signatory Power. It was important, therefore, that the Committee should retain the idea of steady progression in the suppression of the use of narcotic drugs in any resolutions which it adopted.

As regarded the American Delegation's second proposal, the stocks in hand would not disappear immediately. They would disappear gradually in accordance with the gradual diminution provided for by the Convention.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he agreed entirely with the Chairman.

*Mr. Campbell's amendment was put to the vote and rejected by 6 votes to 2 with one abstention.*

#### Paragraph 1.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed the following amendment to paragraph 1 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal:

*"That the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium generally approves the proposals of the United States representatives as embodying the principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing ultimately with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs. Those principles are, in fact, those on which the International Convention of 1912 is based."*

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he could not agree with Mr. Campbell's amendment. He thought that the original text as proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne was preferable.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he could not accept Mr. Campbell's amendment. The words: "should be guided in dealing ultimately with the question" would, he thought, be construed by the American Delegation to mean the indefinite postponement of the application of its principles.

Sir John JORDAN associated himself with the remarks of Sir Malcolm Delevingne and Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu. There was a great difference between accepting a proposal and merely generally approving it. Further, the use of the word "ultimately" meant the postponing of the acceptance of the principles laid down in the American proposals to an indefinite date.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) withdrew his amendment, as there seemed no chance that it would be accepted. In doing so, however, he desired to make it quite clear that he hoped the Committee would decide, in forwarding the proposals before it, after adoption, to the American Delegation, to forward also the text of the speech made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne at the previous meeting and the reservations made by Prince Charoon, the Chairman, M. Ferreira and others, and to read Sir Malcolm Delevingne's speech with his resolution.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Minutes of the meetings would be forwarded to the American Delegation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he desired more than that. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had, in his opinion, been emphatic on the point that his speech of explanation had to be read with his proposals.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that that was his intention.

The CHAIRMAN thought that Mr. Campbell attached too great an importance to the necessity of insisting on the reservations made by certain members of the Committee to which allusion had already been made. No one contemplated that total suppression should take place immediately. The idea of progressive suppression was admitted by everyone and was contained in the proposals. There could be no misunderstanding.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to insist on the point.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he understood the reservations made by the Chairman and by Prince Charoon to be in the same sense as the explanations which he had given at the previous meeting. He thought that it would be sufficient, therefore, if his explanatory remarks were sent to the American Delegation, who would thus be enabled to understand the point of view adopted by the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) repeated that Sir Malcolm Delevingne's explanations and the similar statements made by Prince Charoon, the Chairman, M. Ferreira and others seemed to him completely to alter the character of the proposal before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be quite sufficient if the Minutes of both meetings were sent to the American Delegation in order fully to inform it of the discussion which had taken place, and in order to remove any misunderstanding.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that this did not meet his point and that, in the circumstances, he would abstain from voting.

*The first paragraph of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with one abstention. The paragraph was adopted in the following form:*

"That the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium accepts the proposals of the United States representatives as embodying the general principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs and on which the International Convention of 1912 is based."

*Paragraph 2.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to make a small amendment to paragraph 2 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal. He thought that the word "now" was unnecessary and the word "they" should be replaced by "the States first mentioned above".

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the phrase "States Members of the League" would not include Germany which was co-operating in the matter. Some other form of words appeared therefore, to be necessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the words "States Members of the League" should be deleted and the words "all the Governments concerned" inserted in the third line.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) accepted these suggestions.

M. BRENIER said that, as the resolution now read, mention had only been made of the States Members of the League, whereas other Governments had been active in suppressing the traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) desired to keep the word "League".

M. BRENIER did not insist on his amendment.

*The second paragraph was unanimously adopted in the following form:*

"The Committee, appreciating the 'great value of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has, for the past two years, been making to deal with the question, expresses the belief that all the Governments concerned will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention."

*Paragraph 3.*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired that the words: "in accordance with the provisions of the Hague Convention, and subject to these provisions", should be inserted in paragraph 3 after the word "decide". His amendment particularly referred to Article 9 of the Convention concerning the enactment of pharmacy laws, etc.

The CHAIRMAN said he was opposed to the third paragraph, and desired to move, as an amendment, its entire deletion.

Dr. POENSGEN (Germany) said that he would accept the paragraph, making a reservation regarding the meaning of the words "medicinal use". The words "medicinal use" must be taken to mean that the consumption of opium was, in certain cases, permissible. He would abstain from voting, however, for the reasons which he had given at the previous meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said that he desired the deletion of paragraph 3 because it was contrary to the last paragraph of Article 24 of the Convention, which stated:

"In the event of questions arising relative to the ratification of the present Convention, or to the enforcement either of the Convention or of the laws, regulations or measures resulting therefrom, the Government of the Netherlands will, if these questions cannot be settled by other means, invite all the Contracting Powers to appoint delegates to meet at The Hague in order to arrive at an immediate agreement on the question."

If paragraph 3 were retained, the Committee would adopt a principle contrary to the Convention and of which the far-reaching effects could not be gauged.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) supported the Chairman's amendment.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) appealed very strongly to the Committee to retain paragraph 3. That paragraph had been drafted in order to make clear the attitude of the Committee in regard to the semi-medicinal use of opium in India, Persia and other Oriental countries. If the Committee rejected the paragraph, the whole matter would be thrown once more into confusion, and the Committee would run the grave risk of failing to secure the ultimate assent of these Governments to the proposal. That would be a very great mistake. He did not know how far the American Delegation would accept the particular wording of the paragraph as it stood, but he knew from what it had told him that it was prepared to recognise the right of any country, such as India or Persia, to decide for itself whether that use was a use which could properly be regarded as medicinal or not. He could not agree with the Chairman that paragraph 3 was in any way contrary to article 24 of the Convention. That Article referred to questions relating not to the application of the Convention, but to the ratification of the Convention and to its enforcement and the enforcement of the laws, regulations or measures resulting from it. The word "interpretation" did not occur in Article 24 and, though it might be argued that paragraph 3 raised a question of the enforcement of the Convention, he doubted whether Article 24 covered the point. He appealed to the Committee not to adopt too precise an attitude towards his proposals but to consider their broad effect.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether paragraph 3 did not run counter to Article 6 of the Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that, in his opinion, paragraph 3 had nothing to do with Part II of the Convention.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the amendment which he had proposed to paragraph 3, and which had been accepted by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, had been drafted to meet the objections raised by Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu and Mr. van Wettum. The insertion of those words seemed to him entirely to meet their point, because they placed the matter definitely on the basis of the Convention itself, and if any question should arise in that connection it would be possible to have recourse to Article 24.

The CHAIRMAN said that, on the pretext of accepting the American proposals, it was proposed to make the eating of opium in certain countries legitimate. He thought that would have a most deplorable effect on the world in general, which would consider that, in accepting the American proposals, the Committee had at the same time opened the door to one of the greatest of abuses and had struck at the roots of the Convention.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT agreed with the Chairman that it would be most dangerous for the Committee to adopt the paragraph. It was quite obvious that every nation had a right to determine its own policy within its own borders. The paragraph, however, extended that right and would give rise to many difficulties.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with Mr. Campbell. As far as he had understood, the American Delegation was quite prepared to recognise the situation in India, and a paragraph of this sort appeared absolutely necessary in order to cover the eating of opium in India. It seemed to him to be merely a question of wording.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) desired to emphasise most strongly that he regarded paragraph 3 as an integral part of his proposal and that his views would be considerably altered if it were deleted.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT repeated that the paragraph was dangerous. While admitting India's right to do as she pleased in her own borders, the Committee could not apply such a principle to other nations.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the opinion of the Indian Government was, and always had been, that the use of opium in India was semi-medicinal, that it was entirely legitimate, that the Convention was framed largely with a view to covering that use in India, that the Convention did cover that use, and that, as far as he knew, the contention that the Convention did not cover that use had now been raised for the first time. The use of opium in India was on the most moderate scale and the consumption per head was much lower than in other countries of the world. It was a fact that, in India, so strictly was the consumption regulated that it had been for 30 years less than in other countries, both European and Oriental.

The CHAIRMAN said that he could not accept Mr. Campbell's point of view. Paragraph 3 seemed to have been introduced in order that the Advisory Committee should give a definite sanction to the practice of eating opium. He could not accept this, nor could he see what the connection was between this paragraph and the American proposals.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) could not agree with the Chairman. He thought that the paragraph had a most vital connection with the American proposals and that it would be absolutely necessary for the Committee to make clear that, in accepting, as it had done, the American proposals, there was no idea of raising the question of the semi-medicinal use of opium in India and other Oriental countries. If a paragraph to this effect were not inserted, it would be made to appear that the Committee had condemned such use. This would result

in the Committee failing to secure the adhesion of India, Persia and other Oriental countries to the proposals.

M. BRENIER said that, as far as the Convention of 1912 was concerned, and it was still the law governing the parties, the question of the semi-medicinal use of opium had never been raised. He had assisted in the drafting of the Convention. He had even been Chairman of the Drafting Committee at the second session of the Hague Conference after the Christmas recess, and, as far as his recollection went, there had never been any question of inserting the word "semi-medicinal" in the Convention. The Committee was now asked solemnly to declare that the semi-medicinal use of opium was legitimate. Personally he could not agree to that.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the question had been raised two years ago at the Assembly, and it appeared to him vital to refer to it because the American proposal was intended to restrict the use of drugs to medical and scientific purposes. The American proposal stated:

"It must be recognised that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate."

It was to remove any ambiguity as to the meaning of this phrase that he had introduced the paragraph. Without the paragraph, the Committee would appear to have accepted the American proposals as referring entirely to a strict medicinal use, and that would involve the danger that the proposals would not be accepted.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that America had never accepted the principle of the semi-medicinal use of opium. The Convention did not state it and it would be a great mistake to raise it.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the Committee had adopted two paragraphs of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution and that these paragraphs fully embodied the American proposals. It was therefore, in his opinion, quite unnecessary to adopt any further resolutions on the subject. As far as paragraph 3 was concerned, the Committee seemed to have reached a deadlock. It did not appear to him to be necessary to include it in the resolution of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, since the two resolutions already adopted entirely covered the American proposals. When an artist drew a snake he did not add feet to that snake, because a snake did not possess feet. That was what the Committee seemed to be trying to do at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had never understood that the Hague Convention allowed the eating of opium. In his opinion, the Convention had never allowed it. It was a most dangerous practice, for, while a smoker of opium consumed but a tenth part of the morphia contained in opium, an eater consumed the whole of it. The eating of opium was a form of addiction to the drug worse than the smoking of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, when the Hague Convention was being drafted, a long reasoned statement on this question had been presented to the Conference by the late Sir William Meyer. The Convention had been drafted with that statement before the Conference and in such a way as to cover the special difficulties of India. The view of the Indian Government was that the Convention fully covered in its present form the use of opium in India, and that position had never been challenged until the present moment.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT repeated that the Committee did not desire to interfere with the rights of India, but the rest of the world could not be expected to accept that principle.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that India could not be expected to accept the principle and not carry it out. If the Government of India accepted the principles in the resolution and did not carry them out, what would be its position?

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) repeated that his Government's case was clear and precise. In its view, the use of opium in India had been, and still was, covered by the Hague Convention as it stood. If any doubt existed, the Permanent Court of International Justice could be called upon to give an opinion. Although he could not bind his Government, he felt not the smallest doubt that it would raise no objections to referring the question to the Court and abiding by its decision. If this procedure did not prove acceptable, he had no doubt that the Government of India would be willing to submit the matter for decision in the manner provided for in Article 24 of the Convention. He hoped that the discussion would show the Committee that it had got into a hopeless bog, because it had proposed to accept principles which were inconsistent with the clear meaning of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Part II of the Convention was concerned with "prepared opium" and not with chandu, that was to say, as much opium prepared for eating as opium prepared for smoking. He repeated that, in his opinion, the Committee could not insert a paragraph that would appear to sanction the use of chandu. He reminded the Committee of the grave nature of the decision it was about to take.

*The amendment proposed by the Chairman to delete paragraph 3 was adopted by 4 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.*

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, as a result of this decision, the situation was altered and he would have to reconsider the position.

FIFTEENTH MEETING

*held Saturday, June 2nd, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors were present, M. Uchino, the Japanese representative, being replaced by M. Usami.

36. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.  
PROPOSALS OF THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE. (*continued*).

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the difficulty in which the Committee now found itself was due to the majority of the Committee accepting principles which were contrary to the terms of the International Opium Convention. Some countries had safeguarded their position by making reserves of great importance, and the representative of one State had gone so far as to express the desire that a paragraph should be inserted in the proposals, the terms of which, in Mr. van Wettum's opinion, were outside the scope of the Convention. It would not be easy to solve the difficulties which had arisen, but he thought that Sir Malcolm Delevingne should be asked to withdraw the first three paragraphs of his resolution and that the Committee should then reconsider Mr. Campbell's amendment, which it had rejected at the previous meeting.

Mr. Campbell's amendment had the great advantage of obtaining agreement on those principles of Mr. Porter's speech upon which unanimous consent could be obtained, while not accepting the American proposals in their entirety.

The CHAIRMAN said that a question of procedure appeared to be involved. The first two proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne had been accepted by the Committee, and it would therefore have to continue the discussion of the others. After voting the final paragraph (No. 5), a vote would have to be taken on the resolution as a whole.

He desired, moreover, shortly to submit to the Committee a new amendment, which would be voted on after the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, and which would, he hoped, serve to make the position clearer.

Mr. Mc KINNON WOOD (Legal Section of the Secretariat) said that, as regarded the question whether a member of the Committee possessed the right to withdraw a motion which had already been laid before the Committee, and certain paragraphs of which had already been voted, the procedure in the British House of Commons was that such a motion could only be withdrawn with the consent of the entire House, and with no negative vote.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he would certainly claim the right to withdraw his proposal in the event of it being altered so as to make it no longer of such a nature as to allow him to support it. To attempt to force him to continue to propose a motion which had been seriously transformed in its meaning and its object would be absurd.

He still hoped, however, that the Committee would be able to find some form of words which would meet with the approval of the majority of the members, and he proposed to make another suggestion to replace paragraph 3, which had been rejected by the Committee at the previous meeting.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with the course proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The Committee had accepted paragraphs 1 and 2 and should now continue to discuss the remainder of the resolution, including the alternative to the original paragraph 3 which Sir Malcolm Delevingne desired to propose.

The CHAIRMAN said that the position appeared to be that Sir Malcolm Delevingne would present an amendment to his proposal, but that no vote would be taken on that amendment unless the Committee definitely decided to do so. The principle that a vote once recorded could not be withdrawn was unalterable. That was the opinion of the Legal Section of the Secretariat.

He consequently asked Sir Malcolm Delevingne to present his amendment and then proposed to ask the Committee whether it desired to vote upon it.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, as far as he understood the Committee's discussion, it had been felt at the last meeting that the third paragraph of his original proposals was inconsistent with the terms of the Convention, or, rather, that it appeared to give an interpretation to those terms which was perhaps outside the power of the Committee. His sole desire was to make quite clear the attitude which the Committee was adopting towards the American proposals.

There were two matters on which he thought it was desirable to avoid any misunderstanding. The first was the gradual suppression of the use of prepared opium in the Far East. This was dealt with implicitly in the suggestions for action which were contained in paragraph 5. The second was the semi-medicinal use of opium in Oriental countries, and he had already informed the Committee that, as a result of his conversations with the American delegates, he had formed the opinion that their proposals were not in any way designed to interfere with what the Govern-

ments of India, Persia, or any other country might consider to be the proper medicinal or semi-medicinal use of opium in the peculiar conditions obtaining in those countries, one of those conditions being that there was no adequate medical service to meet the needs of the great mass of the population.

By rejecting paragraph 3 of his proposals, the Committee had removed a safeguard which he had considered necessary and, unless something were put in its place, he would have the greatest hesitation in maintaining the resolution which he had submitted to the Committee. He therefore suggested that the following paragraph should be inserted in the place of paragraph 3:

“That the Committee understands that the propositions submitted by the Delegation of the United States of America are not intended to prevent the semi-medicinal use of raw opium in small quantities, according to local usage, in certain Oriental countries where the services of skilled medical practitioners are not available for the mass of the population.”

The Committee would note that the words suggested avoided any reference to the interpretation of the provisions of the Convention. It merely defined the sense in which the Committee accepted the American proposals, and safeguarded the point on which it was essential that its attitude should be safeguarded if future misunderstandings were to be avoided and the universal acceptance of the American proposals to be obtained. The words reaffirmed the attitude which he thought had been adopted by the Assembly of 1921 when the matter had been raised in the meetings of the Fifth Committee. He earnestly appealed to the Committee to adopt the amendment.

It was necessary to find some way out of the difficulty, and he was perfectly convinced that explanations on this point were required. He noted with pleasure that Sir John Jordan agreed with him, and said that the Committee could not expect the Government of India, Persia or any other country, in such circumstances, to accept the motion for the adoption of the American proposals if it was unable to carry them out in the manner in which they would be interpreted.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the American Government had repeatedly refused to accept the principle that the eating of opium was a medicinal necessity.

The Committee was not concerned with the internal affairs of India or Persia, and it could not proclaim to the world that the eating of opium was legitimate. The medical profession had repudiated this idea, and it would never be agreed to by the United States.

In her opinion, therefore, it would be wiser to delete the whole of the third paragraph of the resolution, and thus avoid complications or misunderstanding.

Sir John JORDAN was sorry to differ from Mrs. Hamilton Wright. He had been led to believe, in conversations with Mr. Porter, that the American Delegation had no intention of interfering with the internal practice in India or any other Oriental country. It was indeed unfortunate that the Committee did not possess full explanations on this subject by Mr. Porter, but all the impressions which he had gathered pointed to the fact that the American Delegation did not intend to interfere with the well-established use of raw opium in India and he only supported the amendment to meet the American point of view. It was most important that the Committee should accept the American Delegation's proposals, and it was on that account that he was prepared to support anything which would meet the attitude of the American delegates. He saw no other alternative than that the Government of India should make a reservation, as had the representatives on the Committee of other Governments. No one imagined that the principles contained in the American proposals could be translated into action immediately. Time was necessary, and therefore he did not see why the Government of India could not make a reservation and thus settle the whole question.

He supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment, since he believed that it would meet with the approval of the American Delegation.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that Sir John Jordan's suggestion was the most practical solution. The Committee could recognise India's right to do as she wished with regard to her own population, but that right could not be accepted as a general principle. If India wished to make a reservation, she was at liberty to do so, but America could not be expected to state that a legitimate right to use opium semi-medicinally existed in Persia, Turkey and other countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) did not desire to see a new term “semi-medical” established. The consumption of opium as a popular remedy in certain countries seemed to fall under the category of medical use. If Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution only covered the consumption of opium, and not its smoking, in India and in other Asiatic countries, which possessed a large population, and also the custom to cure illnesses by means unknown in Europe (that was to say, by taking opium as a remedy in amounts not conducive to abuse), then it could be discussed,

The CHAIRMAN said that Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal drew a distinction between opium prepared for smoking and opium prepared for eating, a distinction which the Convention itself had refused to make, since it had defined prepared opium as follows:

“By prepared opium is understood the product of raw opium... destined for consumption.”

To eat was the same as to consume. The Advisory Committee was desired to sanction the eating of opium, a method of consuming it which the Convention had expressly refused to legalise. Sir Malcolm Delevingne should endeavour to find some other method of meeting the special case of India.



Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Hague Convention defined prepared opium at the beginning of Part II. The definition was as follows:

“By prepared opium is understood: the product of raw opium, obtained by a series of special operations, especially by dissolving, boiling, roasting and fermentation, designed to transform it into an extract suitable for consumption.”

Further, the Convention had defined raw opium as follows :

“By raw opium is understood: the spontaneously coagulated juice obtained from the capsules of the papaver somniferum, which has only to be submitted to the necessary manipulation for packing and transport”.

He desired to state as emphatically as possible, in order to remove any doubt, that the opium which existed in India was opium which came under the definition of raw opium, and which could not conceivably be defined as prepared opium. The reason for this was that, when the opium was taken from the fields, it was collected from all parts of the country at a central factory. In that factory it was simply mixed in order to secure a uniform consistency of substance. Then it was dried in the sun in shallow pans, without the aid even of a vacuum extraction. No machinery of any kind was used. When the extract was sufficiently evaporated, the opium was again mixed so as to secure uniformity, and made into cakes, which were distributed for consumption. The opium was neither dissolved, boiled, roasted, nor fermented, and no extract was prepared therefrom. It was thus beyond all possible doubt that the only opium which was employed in India was raw opium and not prepared opium.

With regard to the Chairman's second point, Mr. Campbell repeated that the contention of the Government of India was that the use of raw opium in that country was absolutely covered by the provisions of the Hague Convention. It contended that the Hague Convention had been drawn up largely with the case of India in view, and that it, in fact, fully covered the use of opium in India sanctioned by the Government. He would therefore be extremely surprised if his Government were to sanction any action of his by which he accepted as a favour what that Government already possessed as an indubitable right.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the medical profession had reached the conclusion that the eating of opium was as pernicious as its smoking. How could the Committee state that its eating was legitimate, or expect the co-operation of the United States if it did so? India could, of course, retain her special position, but that position could not be extended to cover the rest of the world.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) saw no objection to the semi-medicinal use of opium in British India, which was, in his opinion, fully in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. For that reason, he did not think that it was necessary to safeguard British India's position in the manner proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The Convention made no mention of the semi-medicinal use of opium, and if Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment was adopted, the Committee would accept something which was contrary to the terms of the Convention.

M. BRENIER agreed with Mr. van Wettum. If the use of opium in India was permitted by the Convention, as India maintained, he failed to understand why it should be necessary to express a general opinion regarding that use, an opinion which should apply not only to India, but also to other countries, like Persia, Siam and Burma, where opium was eaten.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he could not accept Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment. It had been very clearly stated by Mr. Campbell that the use of raw opium was allowed in India by the terms of the Convention. India's case was therefore fully covered by the provisions of the Convention, and no further explanation, by additional resolutions, was necessary. It would be ridiculous for the Committee, when the Convention had been in existence for ten years, to propose a resolution announcing to the world that it legalised the eating of opium. An Indian Prince, during a meeting of the Assembly of the League, had stated that a dose of opium to an Indian was equivalent to a glass of beer to an Englishman, and that opium-eating was a necessity of life in India. That was the Indian opinion, and the League had recognised that it could not interfere with the internal practice in India, which the Convention permitted. This, however, did not imply that the League should authorise the extension of that practice to other countries.

The CHAIRMAN said that he must make a reservation regarding Mr. Campbell's interpretation of the definition of the words “prepared opium” as used in the Convention. Mr. Campbell had said that prepared opium meant opium prepared for smoking, that was to say, chandu. If this were so, why had the framers of the Convention refused to entitle Part II “Opium prepared for Smoking”? That had been the original title, but it had been amended and the words “for smoking” deleted.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he was not responsible for the attitude or the precise language adopted by the framers of the Convention. He could only deal with the Convention as it stood, and there seemed to be no possible doubt that the position of his Government under the Convention, as it stood, was correct.

The CHAIRMAN said that the framers of the Convention had changed the title “Opium prepared for Smoking” into “Prepared Opium” in order to express very clearly that Part II covered

opium prepared for eating and that they intended that it should be treated in the same way as opium prepared for smoking.

*The Committee decided by 4 votes to 2 to vote on Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment.*

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that his amendment should be voted on in principle and that, if it was adopted, the members of the Committee should be free to propose any drafting changes which they might desire to make.

The CHAIRMAN said that he could not accept this proposal. He could only agree to an amendment proposed in definite terms.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) reiterated that he thought it should be left open to the members to propose drafting amendments, should they desire to do so. This could not be done conveniently before his amendment had been put to the vote, since it would not be known whether it would be adopted.

The Committee ought first to decide on the substance of the proposal, and then, if that were adopted, the wording which might be suggested.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he only accepted the principle of the amendment if the word "medicinal" were substituted for the word "semi-medicinal."

The CHAIRMAN desired to propose an amendment to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal. He hoped that this amendment might give satisfaction to Sir Malcolm Delevingne regarding the situation in India, since Sir Malcolm Delevingne considered it to be safeguarded by the Hague Convention. His proposal, which was very short, covered all the points of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's original proposal. He would put his amendment which was in the following terms, to the vote, when the Committee had finished discussing Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolution.

"This Advisory Committee of the League of Nations, having closely considered the two American proposals, being profoundly convinced of the importance of the co-operation of the United States, and earnestly desirous of at once assuring itself of this co-operation, decides to accept these two proposals; at the same time, the Advisory Committee is of the opinion that, in the first proposal, the word "legitimate" does not mean "legal", and that the application of the second should be carried out in such a manner that the reduction of the surplus available for non-medicinal purposes will only be gradual."

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, since the Committee had decided to vote on his amendment, he proposed that the vote should now be taken.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, in voting in favour of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's motion, he did so on the distinct understanding that it was simply a statement of fact explaining the proposals of the American Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN, in putting Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment to the vote, added that, in his opinion, the very gravest consequences would result were it adopted.

*Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 3.*

---

## SIXTEENTH MEETING

*held Saturday, June 2nd, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee, except M. FERREIRA, and the Assessors were present. M. Uchino, the Japanese representative, was replaced by M. Usami.

### 37. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (continued). TEXT OF A NEW PARAGRAPH, PROPOSED BY SIR JOHN JORDAN, IN PLACE OF PARAGRAPH I OF THE PROPOSAL OF THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had a resolution to propose, with which Sir Malcolm Delevingne fully concurred. He wished to express his warm appreciation of the efforts which the Committee had made to secure the co-operation of the United States, and he thought that everyone would agree that Sir Malcolm Delevingne had been particularly active in this respect. There had been very real difficulties, but he had now drawn up a resolution, after consulting various members of the Committee, which he hoped would meet with entire approval. The resolution was as follows:

"The Committee accepts the principles stated by the American Delegation, subject, however, to the fact that certain States represented on the Committee have made the following reservations:

- "(1) The use of raw opium, according to the established usage in India, is legitimate under the Convention;
- "(2) The use of prepared opium is legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention;
- "(3) The production and export of raw opium for the purposes stated in (1) and (2) above is legitimate under the Convention."

He claimed that this was an honest and straightforward statement of the case as it stood at the moment, and one which he thought would commend itself to the sympathetic approval of the American Delegation. This motion was intended as a substitute for paragraph 1 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN asked Sir Malcolm Delevingne whether he was willing to withdraw paragraph 1 of his proposal.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had taken no part in the framing of the new motion, but that if, as he understood, it would secure the unanimous support of the Committee and if it also secured the acceptance of the American Delegation, he was quite prepared to withdraw the first paragraph of his proposal in its favour. If either of these conditions was not fulfilled, he would wish to revive his original proposal.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that it was very unfortunate if Sir Malcolm Delevingne's resolutions were to be replaced by others, since they would undoubtedly have been accepted. The Committee had worked hard, and it was difficult to reach a unanimous agreement. She was not authorised to speak on behalf of the American Delegation, but she considered that paragraph 1 would raise difficulties because it established a principle and an interpretation of the Convention which it would not be easy to get accepted. Paragraphs 2 and 3 appeared to her to be acceptable.

Mr. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he was prepared to withdraw the proposal which he had made at the previous meeting, provided it could be revived if the proposal of Sir John Jordan was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN thought that no member of the Committee would raise any opposition to the proposals of Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Van Wettum.

He proposed to replace the words "subject" (*en tenant compte*) by the word "noting" (*enregistrant*); this would give satisfaction to Mrs. Hamilton Wright, and would not imply in any way the general acceptance, by all the members of the Committee, of paragraphs 1, 2, and 3. The word "enregistrant" (*noting*) would be the word employed in the French text, which was authentic. The Committee would leave it to the drafting committee to decide what was the English word meaning "enregistrant."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the amendment which had been suggested by the Chairman altered the sense of the resolution.

Sir John JORDAN said that he preferred to retain the word "subject", because it expressed a condition. It was a stronger and more appropriate word than "noting."

He urged the Committee to vote on his resolution without delay, in order to avoid any unnecessary discussion. The problem with which the Committee had been dealing was extremely intricate and it had done its utmost. He took no credit for his resolution, which had been reached after consultation with his colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN said that he very strongly opposed the resolution, which simply re-established paragraph 3 of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal in another form.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT wished to suggest the following amendment, which she thought would cover Mr. Campbell's objection:

"The use of raw opium is an established habit in India and is accepted as legitimate in that country."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) objected to the amendment, since it did not meet his fundamental point.

He was prepared to accept Sir John Jordan's resolution as it stood.

The CHAIRMAN said that the words "*en tenant compte*" were ambiguous and that he wished to remove that ambiguity.

Sir John JORDAN said that he could think of no clearer word than "subject" in English. He did not know exactly what the French words "*en tenant compte*" meant.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the words "*en tenant compte*" implied the recognition, by all the members of the Committee, of paragraph 3 which the Committee had already rejected on two occasions by two votes.

Sir John JORDAN said that the meaning of the words was perfectly clear. Those who had made the reservations, as for instance India, were responsible.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) considered that India, Great Britain and France, were responsible for sub-paragraphs (1) and (3); Siam, Portugal, the Netherlands and Germany were responsible for sub-paragraphs (2) and (3).

Sir John JORDAN said that this was clearly what the words meant. The Committee was not responsible for any one of the reservations.

The CHAIRMAN desired to know why the Committee objected to the word "enregistrant," which was much clearer in its meaning.

Sir John JORDAN said that it was a casual expression and an implied condition.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked whether the English text, which was the original, could be accepted as definitive and the French text made to correspond. Would this meet the Chairman's point?

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be a matter for great regret if, when the Committee appeared to have reached an agreement, that agreement should be destroyed by what was probably a mere matter of form. He asked his colleagues, in order to reach a solution with the least possible delay, to agree to a suspension of the meeting for a few minutes, during which the members of the Committee could discuss the question amongst themselves.

*The Committee agreed to this procedure, and the meeting was suspended for ten minutes.*

The CHAIRMAN, continuing, said that agreement had been reached. He would accept the French text drafted as follows: "en tenant compte du fait que certains Etats représentés dans la Commission ont fait les réserves suivantes." The English text would be made to conform with the French.

M. BRENIER thought that "subject to the fact" would be the correct translation.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the word "however" should be deleted.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed to the suppression of the word "however", and Sir John JORDAN said that he would accept this.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mrs. Hamilton Wright had an amendment to make in regard to paragraph 1 of Sir John Jordan's resolution.

The SECRETARY read Mrs. Hamilton Wright's amendment, which was as follows:

"The use of raw opium is an established habit in India, and is accepted as legitimate in that country."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) was quite unable to accept the amendment and failed to understand on what grounds it had been made. The text of Sir John Jordan's resolution rendered it clear that it was a plain statement of reservations which had been made. The reservation in regard to India had been made in consultation with Mr. Campbell himself and he alone was responsible for it. No member or assessor of the Committee possessed any real right to make an amendment in such a matter in the circumstances. The other reservations had similarly been made by the representatives on the Committee of the Governments concerned.

He thought that Mrs. Hamilton Wright had misunderstood the position and hoped that she would withdraw her amendment after the statement which he had made.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that Mr. Campbell declared that he was responsible for the phrase "legitimate under the Convention", and that the responsibility lay with India and no other country.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he alone had the right to accept the responsibility for the reservation, since he was the sole representative of the Government of India on the Committee. He thought he could assure Mrs. Hamilton Wright — and he believed that he was voicing the opinion of the other members of the Committee — that she had no responsibility whatsoever in the matter.

Sir John JORDAN said that the reservation only applied to India.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) corroborated this assertion and said that he alone could assume any responsibility in regard to India.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mrs. Hamilton Wright, whether, in view of Mr. Campbell's explanations, she wished to maintain her amendment.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said she would withdraw it.

M. USAMI (Japan) wished to state that he was obliged to make the same reservations as were indicated in the text of the resolution in regard to sub-paragraphs (2) and (3).

*These reservations were accepted.*

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with all three reservations.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands), Prince CHAROON (Siam) and Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that they also made reservations as regarded sub-paragraphs (2) and (3).

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China would not associate herself with any of the three reservations.

The CHAIRMAN read Sir John Jordan's resolution:

"The Committee accepts the principles stated by the American Delegation, subject to the fact that the following reservations have been made by certain States represented on the Committee:

- (1) The use of raw opium, according to the established usage in India, is legitimate under the Convention.
- (2) The use of prepared opium is legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention.
- (3) The production and export of raw opium for the purposes stated in (1) and (2) above are legitimate under the Convention."

*The resolution was put to the vote in this form, the representatives of the following countries voting in its favour: Great Britain, India, France, Japan, Germany, Siam, the Netherlands; the representative of China abstained.*

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Ferreira was absent, but he thought that he would have voted in favour of Sir John Jordan's text.

*The resolution was adopted by 7 votes, with one abstention.*

#### 38. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE PROPOSAL OF THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE.

The CHAIRMAN stated that paragraph 2 had been adopted at the preceding meeting. The resolution would therefore be composed of paragraph 1, as proposed by Sir John Jordan, paragraph 2, which had already been adopted, and paragraph 4 of the original text submitted by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, which would now become paragraph 3. This paragraph had now to be discussed by the members of the Committee.

M. BRENIER pointed out that paragraph 3 consisted in a mere statement of facts and contained no principle. It would not, therefore, give rise to long discussion.

The new paragraph 3 was read. Its text was as follows:

"That, in bringing these proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adhesion of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medical and scientific uses, with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) establishing the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures, for securing international co-operation in suppressing the illicit traffic in the drugs; (4) inviting the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions to review their requirements of opium and submitting proposals for the investigation of the conditions in China, with a view to the more effective application of Part II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic, with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention."

The CHAIRMAN proposed a modification of form in regard to (3) of paragraph 3. He asked that the words "recommending the system" ("recommandant le système") should be substituted for the words "establishing the system" ("établissant le système"), because not all the States had yet accepted the system of Import Certificates.

*The Committee agreed to the Chairman's amendment.*

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China was referred to in this paragraph of the proposal. He noticed a dangerous reference — "and submitting proposals for the investigation of the conditions in China." He saw no reason why the Chinese question should enter into the proposal at all, since it was entirely separate from it.

M. BRENIER said that it was a matter of fact.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that it was not so. He had made the position very clear in a private conversation which he had had with Sir Malcolm Delevingne, who had assured him that the proposal had nothing whatever to do with China.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he did not understand Mr. Chu's point, and that he had no recollection of the conversation to which Mr. Chu had alluded. Throughout the Committee's discussions at the present session in regard to the Far Eastern problem, he had insisted most strongly that the position in China had a very important bearing on its solution, and on the effective application of Part II of the Convention. In his proposal he gave voice to no expression of opinion; it was merely a statement of the Committee's past work. The Committee had undoubtedly submitted proposals to the Council for the investigation of the conditions prevailing in China, proposals to which Mr. Chu himself had agreed at the Third Session of the Committee, and which had been accepted by the Assembly and by the Chinese Government. He failed to see, therefore, why there should be any objection to the insertion in the motion before the Committee of words which were a mere recapitulation of the action which had been taken by the League with the approval of Mr. Chu and the Chinese Government.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the projected Conference was for the purpose of permitting all the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions to consult with each other with a view to discovering a means whereby the gradual suppression of opium-smoking in the Far Eastern colonies might be obtained. China was not to be represented at the Conference, and therefore the Chinese question did not fall within its scope. China did not desire to be involved in such a Conference. The Powers might question and criticise China with regard to investigations in that country, but the Conference had nothing to do with China. He had made a definite declaration before the Committee that the opium traffic would never be legalised by China, and therefore she did not wish to be involved in any way in this question. The situation in China at the present time was bad, but that situation would be ameliorated when a stable government had been set up. China's sovereign rights should be respected, and she objected to interference. If he were not sincere in his statements, he could very easily afford an opportunity at the present moment to the authorities in China to legalise the opium traffic. He had no desire to do this, on the contrary, he wished to declare emphatically once again that China would never legalise the traffic in opium. She would do her utmost to suppress totally the production of opium immediately when her Government should be in a position to do so.

He wished to delete the words: "and submitting proposals for the investigation of the conditions in China." He did not think that such a deletion could do any harm.

M. BRENIER thought that, if Mr. Chu insisted that no allusion should be made to the fact contained in this sentence of the proposal, the result would be that China would not be associated with the efforts which had been made by the other countries for the suppression of opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed with M. Brenier, but said that China reported to the League. That had no connection with the projected Conference.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he could not accept the deletion suggested by Mr. Chu, because the sentence in question contained a reference to a very important part of the action which had been taken by the Committee. He pointed out to Mr. Chu that the sentence was not in any way connected with the conference, or conferences referred to in paragraph 5.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China had already been mentioned in the resolutions passed by the Committee on previous occasions.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that paragraph 5 of his proposal did not refer to China in any way whatever. No reference to the participation of China had been made in the motion, which had been before the Committee at a previous meeting, in regard to Far Eastern Possessions. As M. Brenier had pointed out, the reference in the present proposal was merely to the investigations which had been undertaken, by collaboration between the Chinese Government and the League of Nations, in order to ascertain the true state of affairs in China.

The omission of this reference would render the statement of the action which had been taken in regard to the Far Eastern problem very incomplete. If he could add any words which would make it clear that the investigation was being undertaken by the Chinese Government in collaboration with the League of Nations, he would be very ready to do so, but he could not agree to the deletion of any mention of the investigation. He asked whether Mr. Chu could accept the sentence if it were made to read as follows: "and submitting proposals for the investigation by the Chinese Government, *in collaboration with certain authorities*, of the conditions in China."

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) preferred that the sentence should be omitted altogether. The information contained therein had been recorded in the Minutes and Resolutions, and it was not necessary to re-state it.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the words "in lending its aid in the investigation undertaken by the Chinese Government" ("en prêtant son aide à l'enquête menée par le Gouvernement chinois").

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) wished that it should be made quite clear that the investigation in regard to the provinces in which poppy cultivation was reported should be made by the Chinese Commissioners, together with the representatives of the International Anti-Opium Association.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the following amendment: "in inviting the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions to examine their requirements of opium." ("en invitant les Puissances qui ont des possessions en Extrême Orient à vérifier leurs besoins en opium.")

M. BRENIER thought that this would give an entirely false impression of the Committee's work and the attitude of the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions. He could not accept the suppression



of a sentence which referred to a definite and accurate fact, to the effect that an investigation had been made in China as to the recrudescence of poppy cultivation.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that China was not the only country mentioned in the proposal; the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions were also included.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that it was not so. The wording was very clever and possessed a hidden meaning. He could not allow China to be criticised in that way.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that China was not being criticised.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission to take into account the position of the representative of China, and to consider whether it would be possible to afford him satisfaction.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that unanimity would be required in order to pass the resolution in the Council. Difficulty would then undoubtedly arise, because his Government had officially and repeatedly instructed him to the effect that no special reference to China was to be made.

After some discussion, M. Chao-Hsin Chu accepted the following text, which was proposed by the Chairman:

"Inviting the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions to review their requirements of opium and submitting proposals for an enquiry into certain countries in the Far East with a view to the more effective application of Part II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, in his opinion, this text would be misleading.

*A vote was taken, and the text proposed by the Chairman was rejected by 4 votes (Great Britain, India, Japan and the Netherlands) to 3 (China, France, Siam).*

The meeting was suspended, and on its resumption the CHAIRMAN proposed the following redraft, which was accepted by M. Chao-Hsin Chu and Sir Malcolm Delevingne:

"Inviting the Powers with Far Eastern Possessions to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for the investigation by the Chinese Government of the conditions in China."

*A vote was taken and the new text was adopted by 7 votes, with one abstention (Siam) and one absence (Portugal).*

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested a textual alteration, which Prince Charoon had proposed to him, namely, that the words "Far Eastern Possessions" should be replaced by the words "Far Eastern territories", because the Kingdom of Siam was not a Possession, but could accurately be described as a territory.

*The alteration was adopted.*

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed the deletion of the words "definite," which occurred in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), and "automatically", which occurred at the end of sub-paragraph (b).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) was prepared to accept the suppression of these two words, and he was also prepared to adopt the suggestion which had been made to him by Bishop Brent that in the second line of the paragraph the word "recommend" should be substituted for the word "suggest"; further in the sixth line the word "Territories" should replace the word "Possessions."

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) assumed that it was also intended that Peru and Bolivia would be invited to take part in the negotiations mentioned in the paragraph under discussion.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that it would be better first to dispose of the textual changes.

The CHAIRMAN asked that the word "control" should be substituted in sub-paragraph (a) for the word "limitation."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) was afraid that he could not possibly accept this amendment.

Sir John JORDAN said that he would like to see the phraseology strengthened. He would like to retain the word "definite" and to add the words "and progressive reduction." He did not wish to put this to the vote, but merely to express his opinion on the point. He imagined that nothing less would satisfy the American Delegation.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the text of his motion had not been quite clearly reproduced in the document before the Committee. The last four lines of paragraph 4, beginning "either on the lines of the suggestions submitted by the Committee in their other resolutions, or on other lines; so bringing about automatically a reduction in the quantities of raw opium and the coca leaf produced for export" were intended to apply to both (a) and (b). The suggestions therein referred to covered those which had already been adopted in regard to the use of prepared opium in the Far East, and were also intended to cover any suggestions which might be adopted at the present meeting in regard to the importation and the production of the

manufactured drugs. He had made various suggestions in regard to the latter point on which no final decision had yet been reached.

The CHAIRMAN asked what was meant in the final sub-paragraph (b) by the words "on the lines of the suggestions submitted by the Committee in their other resolutions."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that it referred to the resolution already adopted under Item 5 of the Agenda and the suggestions, if they were adopted, which he had proposed under Item 6.

He asked the Committee to accept the text as it stood.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had not voted in favour of these proposals. He could not contradict himself. He further pointed that, it was useless to combine the two resolutions; that corresponding to the American proposals would have to be sufficient by itself. It was entirely complete without this superfluous addition.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) had no objection to an alteration in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN said that, since Sir Malcolm Delevingne agreed, the words "either on the lines of the suggestions submitted by the Committee in their other resolutions, or on other lines" could be omitted.

*The deletion of these words was adopted.*

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be of interest to recall the fact that the negotiations would take place on the basis of the Convention of 1912.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) had no objection to the insertion after the words "to consider whether agreements could not now be reached" of the words "with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912."

The CHAIRMAN accepted this proposal.

The following definitive text of the resolution proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne was read:

"I. The Committee accepts the principles stated by the American Delegation, subject to the fact that the following reservations have been made by certain States represented on the Committee.

- "1. The use of raw opium, according to the established usage in India, is legitimate under the Convention.
- "2. The use of prepared opium is legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention.
- "3. The production and export of raw opium for the purposes stated in (1) and (2) above are legitimate under the Convention.

"II. That the Committee appreciating the great value of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has for the past two years been making to deal with the questions of the abuses of dangerous drugs, expresses the belief that all the Governments concerned will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention.

"III. That, in bringing the American proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adherence of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medical and scientific uses, with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) recommending the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures for securing international co-operation in suppressing that traffic; (4) inviting the Powers with territories in the Far East to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for an investigation by the Chinese Government of the conditions in China with a view to the more effective application of Chapter II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention.

"IV. That, having regard to the information now available, the Committee recommends to the Council the advisability of inviting:

- (a) the Governments of the States in which the manufactured drugs are produced;
- (b) the Governments having territories in which the use of prepared opium is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention,

to enter into immediate negotiations (by nominating representatives to form a committee or committees or otherwise) to consider whether, with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912, agreements could not now be reached between them:—

- (a) as to a limitation of the amounts of manufactured drugs to be produced, and, therefore, of the amounts of the raw material to be imported for that purpose.
- (b) as to a reduction of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those territories where it is temporarily continued,

so bringing about a reduction in the quantities of raw opium and the coca leaf produced for export."

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 4, as it had been read.

*The text of paragraph 4 was unanimously adopted.*

The CHAIRMAN put the whole text of the resolution to the vote.

*The text was unanimously adopted.*

39. TELEGRAM FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

The SECRETARY read the following telegram from the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland:

“Dame Rachel Crowdy,  
League of Nations,  
Geneva.

“General Assembly United Free Church of Scotland deplore increase of opium curse in China. Deprecate possible opium monopoly. Will urge British Government to use influence with Government of India for restriction of opium production in India to medicinal requirements. Minute follows.

“ HARVEY AND SUTHERLAND.”  
“ Clerks Assembly.”

40. COVERING LETTER TO THE AMERICAN DELEGATION, TO ACCOMPANY THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE.

The SECRETARY read the following text of the letter to be addressed to Mr. Porter.

“I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of a resolution adopted to-day by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs, together with the speech of Sir Malcolm Delevingne in explanation thereof. The full Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting will be forwarded to you as soon as they are available.”

*This letter was adopted.*

---

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

*held Monday, June 4th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee with the exception of M. Ferreira, and the assessors were present.

41. REPLACEMENT OF M. FERREIRA (Portugal).

The place of M. Ferreira, who had been called to the Conference at Lausanne, was taken by M. Diaz D'OLIVEIRA of the Portuguese Embassy at Berne.

42. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
(continued).

M. PORTER (United States) desired to acknowledge the receipt of the resolutions adopted by the Committee regarding the American proposals, and to inform the Committee that the American Delegation would be able to make a statement upon these resolutions at the next meeting.

In reply to a question of the CHAIRMAN, Surgeon-General BLUE (United States) said that it would be impossible for the American Delegation to take part in the present meeting, since it required time in which to examine the Committee's resolutions.

43. MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Minutes of the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th meetings were adopted, under the reserve that, should the Chairman find it necessary to make any changes of principle in his statement contained in the Minutes of the seventh meeting, that statement would be placed before the Committee for adoption at a later meeting.

44. WORLD CULTIVATION AND PRODUCTION OF OPIUM (ANNEX II).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the document before the Committee contained such information as the Secretariat had been able to collect with regard to the world production of raw opium. The document was interesting and of value from several points of view. It showed how wide-spread was the production of opium and, consequently, how difficult was the problem of controlling that production.

He had submitted two Memoranda to the Committee containing further information on the position in China. The statement in the document before the Committee that the production in that country was, at the moment, greater than the combined production of India, Persia and Turkey, seemed to him to underestimate considerably the actual position of affairs.

He was in the position to give the following information regarding the situation in Persia. In 1922, the production of opium for export purposes in the province of Fars had been about 190,000 lbs. This represented approximately 1,177 chests, and was in addition to the amount produced for internal consumption, which had also been estimated at a very high figure. Further, the production in that province only equalled about one-quarter or one-fifth of the production in the province of Ispahan. Production also had considerably increased in the province of Khorasan and in Persian Irak. If this information was correct, it would show that the figure of 450,000 lbs quoted in the table fell very far short of the actual total production of opium in Persia, for export purposes alone.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she possessed further information regarding Persia and Turkey, which she would lay before the Committee at a future meeting.

Sir John JORDAN said that, while making no reflection on the Secretariat, he thought that it ought to be supplied with far more information regarding the production of opium than appeared in the document before the Committee. It was extremely difficult for the Secretariat to work on the little information which it had received. The governments of the Far East ought to supply fuller information. When he had been British Minister at Peking, reports on every province in China had been sent in each year. The fullest reports ought to be made available to the Secretariat which did not, at present, appear to be the case.

With reference to the tables on the Chinese provinces contained in the document, Sir John Jordan said that, for the province of Anhui there was no report for 1922. The China Year-Book for 1923, however, gave a very full report on the position in that province in 1922.

The reports in the table relating to Shansi were quite correct. Shansi was the one province in China which had carried out the laws concerning the prohibition of opium. It had been one of the most important producing provinces, but, in spite of all difficulties, the Governor of Shansi continued faithfully to maintain the prohibition which had been enforced ten or twelve years previously. If all the provinces in China were under the governorship of men such as his friend M. Yan Hsi Han, the Governor of Shansi, China would be entirely free from opium.

With regard to the province of Hupeh, the Shihnan district was very bad in 1920, and he believed that the situation had not altered in 1922.

He could not quite understand the position of the province of Fukien. He thought that the Secretariat had received information regarding this province from the National Missionary Association in London. Many full statements had been made by that Association about the situation in Fukien during the present opium season. The document prepared by the Secretariat mentioned the work carried out in 1921 by Wang Tai Chen. Unfortunately, however, since that date, there had been a very great relapse and Fukien was now back in its old state. The report by the Secretariat did not show this.

A letter from Amoy dated February 10th, 1923, from Mr. George M. Wales to the National Christian Council, in Shanghai states that opium cultivation was being carried on very widely in five administrative districts in Fukien with the full cognisance of the controlling authorities. Further, the following appeal, from missionaries in Amoy, to the National Christian Council in Shanghai, had also recently been made:

“We feel that the National Christian Council is the most suitable organisation through which such a protest can properly be made, inasmuch as it represents the Christian forces of the whole Church, and may therefore fittingly serve as its mouthpiece. We do not venture to suggest exactly what course of action should be taken, but desire that this and similar protests should be brought to the notice of the Central Government or other responsible authority as quickly as possible. We fully appreciate the anomaly of a situation in which an appeal is made to authority for action in a sphere over which control has been lost, but would leave it to the wisdom of the Council to decide upon the most suitable course of action. This letter is being shown to members of the two other Missions at work in the South Fukien districts, who may possibly add force by similar individual protests.”

The report about Kweichow for 1921 was fairly accurate, but there was no report for 1922. The 1921 report, however, might be taken as applying equally to 1922. A well-known lady, Miss Kamp, however, who had travelled very extensively in the province had informed Sir John Jordan that two or three years ago 80 % of the land in Kweichow was under poppy cultivation.

With regard to Szechuan, the report for 1921 could not be regarded as accurate, nor could it apply at all to 1922. The British Consular authorities in the upper Yangtze provinces, had given him full information regarding that region. The Consuls had stated that opium was coming down the Yangtze in such large quantities that the customs authorities had ceased to exercise any supervision.

The Consul General who had been resident in Yunnan for five years reported as follows:

“In the winter of the year 1920-21, an Opium Suppression Bureau was established in connection with the Provincial Finance Department of Yunnan Province. The penalty for the cultivation of poppy was \$2.00 a mow, but, for practical purposes, the penalty was a euphemism for a licence. In the spring of the year 1921, the price of opium dropped to one-quarter of what it had been in the previous year, and was about 20 cents an ounce. In the spring of the year 1922, an enquiry, instituted by the Provincial Government, solicited the information that a stock of about 180 tons of opium was available in the Province over and above that required for local consumption. In the summer of that year, it was reported that steps would be taken to bring the surplus available for export of the 1921-22 crop to at least 220 tons.”

This report was dated May 15th, 1923, and therefore contained the latest available information.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that the estimate given at the end of the document prepared by the Secretariat was, deeply to his regret, far too low. The present production in China was far higher than 10% of the prohibition years. The figure in that document appeared to have been taken from the International Anti-Opium Association in Peking, which, in his opinion, had persistently minimised the cultivation in China. The published figures of that Association alone showed that 10% was an under-estimate. He himself had on several occasions attempted to estimate the production, which was always extremely difficult to do, and he had always put it at from one-quarter to one-third of the pre-prohibition period.

He made this statement with a view to considering the interest of the Chinese people themselves. It was well that the Chinese situation should be known as widely as possible, and that through public opinion, or any other available means, the situation might be frankly and fully understood in order that a remedy should be found.

M. BRENIER desired to draw the Committee's attention to one or two points concerning the question of opium production in China. He had had occasion many years ago to travel for two years through three of the most important opium producing provinces, Yunnan, Kweichow and Szechuan. While he did not pretend to accurate knowledge regarding the present situation he was in a position to place before the Committee the difficulties which attended the suppression of the cultivation of the poppy in China. It had, as the members of the Committee knew, broken out again on an immense scale, and to one conversant with the geographical, agricultural and economic reasons which explained the part played by the cultivation of the poppy in Chinese economics before the suppressive movement, the importance of those factors, now, that the previous situation had been revived, could not be overlooked.

The document before the Committee (Annex II) showed on the other hand, how difficult it was to obtain accurate information. To take only one instance, that of the province of Fukien, there was (page 190) complete contradiction in the information supplied for the same year (1921).

The following extracts, moreover, from the official British document “Correspondence respecting the Cultivation of opium in China” (China No. 1, 1921) abundantly showed how difficult it had been in the past to suppress the cultivation of opium; or rather what very drastic measures had had to be taken in order to effect it. The following instances had been taken from reports on different years and different provinces:

*Report on Opium Inspection Journey in Chekiang during April and May 1914.*

“Père Boisard, from whom I derived the above information, told me that the magistrate had made himself a veritable scourge of the people in the matter of suppression — not entirely from altruistic motives. During the past two months he had inflicted fines to the extent of some 50,000 dollars, of which he kept two-thirds for himself. In order to increase his profits, he had been employing men to go round with opium plants and place them in the fields of unoffending farmers. Shortly afterwards they would be followed by soldiers, who would haul the unfortunate cultivator before the magistrate. Two months before, five men had been shot for growing opium, and 100 houses in the neighbourhood were burnt down. Père Boisard had good reason for believing that the men were innocent, and that no opium had been grown in the place. The magistrate's harshness and injustice in the matter generally had made him so unpopular that gentry and people alike were working to obtain his dismissal. He had offered 2 dollars for each plant brought to him, and the day previous to my arrival country people had brought over 1000 to the yamen. They had, however, been sent away without any reward whatever. These reports were on Chinese information, but Père Boisard believed them to be true.”

*Report on a Journey of Investigation into the Cultivation of the Opium Poppy in the province of Kiangsi, July 28th, 1917.*

“I did not enter that district, as I had received information at Kan Hsien that opium poppy had been eradicated in that region in 1916, after a severe fight between the troops and the people, in the course of which several persons had been killed and wounded and many houses burned.”

*Report by Mr. Teichman on Joint Opium Inspection in Province of Shensi, July 28th, 1917.*

"Any infraction of the prohibition is punished by death, the land under poppy being confiscated by the Government, or given to the informer, and in some cases the offender's neighbours are executed as well for not informing against him."

*Provincial Anti-Opium Campaign (Kiangsi), July 28th, 1917.*

"Proclamations threatening poppy growers with death and offering rewards ranging from 50 to 500 dollars for information as to opium-growing localities have been affixed everywhere in the country towns and villages. I have noted such proclamations in every district on our overland route.

Before the poppy was finally exterminated, persons defying the regulations were, in some instances, shot; in others their houses were burned and their land confiscated. In the Yu Tu district such heavy fines were inflicted by the former magistrates that the offenders were forced to sell their children."

From the foregoing, the necessity of taking the difficulties which underlay the suppression of opium in China into account was demonstrated. The Committee would therefore, in his opinion, have to be careful, in recommending the suppression of opium, not to suggest too rapid a course; he considered that it was a question which was the lesser evil; that which was attendant on a suppression of opium of the kind regarding which he had given some instances or that which resulted from the least harmful manner of absorbing what was bad in opium, *i. e.* morphia, by smoking.

45. CONSIDERATION OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION. MEMORANDUM ON EXEMPTIONS  
SUBMITTED BY THE SIAMESE DELEGATE.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that the question before the Committee was whether it would be more expedient for Siam, at least for the present moment, to adhere, as strictly as possible under existing legislation, to the list of exempted and restricted drugs and preparations laid down by the International Opium Convention, or to continue the present tentative policy of making exemptions for each individual preparation considered on its merits. For example, the International Opium Convention exempted preparations solely from the point of view of the percentage of harmful habit-forming drugs which they contained, although the only other ingredients might be the solvent. The disadvantages of this procedure were to be seen from his memorandum. On the other hand, if other ingredients of these substances, in sufficient proportion, were taken into consideration when making an exemption, the list of useful exemptions might be considerably enlarged. This would be an advantage in Siam, where competent dispensers and reliable physicians were relatively few in number. But the advantage of a uniform procedure throughout the world, and the fact that the assistance in the prevention of illicit import afforded by the recent introduction of the Import Certificate System would apparently not apply to drugs exempted by the terms of the Convention, weighed with the Siamese Government, which desired the valuable advice of the Committee on the point as to how far actual exemption should be made in view of the special situation in Siam. The Siamese Government neither wished to go too far, nor not far enough, and for this reason it would be very grateful if it could profit from the experience of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN said that the point raised by the Siamese representative had greatly interested the export departments concerned of the French Civil Service. Unfortunately those departments had not yet had time to study the question, which required a profound examination. This was probably the case in other countries also.

In the circumstances, he therefore desired to propose that each representative on the Committee should ask his government to study the question and send to the Secretariat any information or observations to which the memorandum by the Siamese Government might give rise.

Mr. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands law was the same for opium products having a percentage above that specified by the Convention as it was for products with a lower percentage than that specified.

The CHAIRMAN said that it would be of interest also to know the regulations which obtained in each country outside the Convention. Siam desired to obtain knowledge of the different laws passed by individual States on the matter.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he understood Prince Charoon wished to know whether any government besides Siam had experienced difficulties as a result of the exclusion from the International Opium Convention; of certain preparations containing morphine, heroin and cocaine. Prince Charoon had emphasised the fact that a quantity of morphine, or other drugs, might be so diluted by a solvent as to bring the percentage below .2%, and thus cause it to fall outside the scope and the control of the Convention, and he desired to know whether any difficulty arose as a result of exemptions of this kind.

This was a practical point and had been brought up in England during the discussions on the regulations made under the law passed in 1920. Objections had been raised on the ground that preparations might be diluted sufficiently to come below the prescribed limit of .2%, although they might contain a considerable quantity of the drug.



Sir Malcolm Delevingne supported the Chairman's proposal that other countries should inform the Secretariat as to whether they had experienced difficulties and what steps they had taken to meet them.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, until the new legislation concerning opium had been passed in Germany, export would be permitted in accordance with the laws in force on condition that the country of destination allowed the import. If the import of the drugs into any particular country was forbidden, export from Germany was automatically prohibited, but only, with regard to the preparations covered by the Convention.

With regard to the preparations not covered by the Convention, the responsibility lay with the importer. The system of Import Certificates was not applicable to preparations not covered by the Convention.

The acceptance of the Siamese proposal would therefore entail the redrafting of the Convention.

M. BRENIER pointed out that the Siamese memorandum merely contained a request for information.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided that each member should ask his Government to communicate any information in its possession on the subject to the Secretariat, and that the matter should be discussed at the next session.*

#### 46. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to acknowledge the receipt of this report.*

#### 47. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT BY DR. KNAFFL-LENZ ON THE ENQUIRIES OF THE HEALTH SECTION WITH REGARD TO THE WORLD REQUIREMENTS OF DRUGS.

The SECRETARY explained that the report of the Health Committee, dealing with the progress made in obtaining data under systems 2 and 3, had not yet been completed, because the Health Section had not yet been able to obtain sufficient information to reach any conclusions of value to the Committee. The moment that the necessary information had been secured, a report would be submitted.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided to postpone the discussion of this item until its next session.*

---

### EIGHTEENTH MEETING

*held Monday, June 4th, 1923, at 3 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

#### 48. PROPOSAL OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT REGARDING INCREASED PENALTIES.

The CHAIRMAN said that in February 1923 the French representative on the Council had drawn its attention to the necessity of increasing the penalties for illicit traffic in narcotics. The French Government attached great importance to this question. The smuggling of substances of so small a bulk as narcotics was practically impossible to prevent by means of direct measures. The customs officers estimated that only about 5% of the total amount of smuggled goods was captured and this even though their size was fairly considerable. Five per cent was a large overestimate in case of drugs. It would be readily seen, therefore, that a substance like heroin or cocaine, a large amount of which, sufficient to destroy many hundreds of lives, could be contained in a few cubic centimetres, was very difficult to detect when smuggled. It might, for instance, prove necessary to take to pieces an entire motor-car in order to examine the different parts for hiding places.

The most effective manner of suppressing the illicit trade had always appeared to the French Government to be by means of very energetic measures of repression, among which a mere fine was insufficient, since the profits realised by the traffickers were enormous. The only penalties which they feared were imprisonment and prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*). This latter penalty gravely interfered with their trade, since it obliged them to leave their sphere of operations and set up elsewhere in the most difficult conditions, owing to the fact that they were known and watched. The French Government thought it would be useful if the Committee

could inform the various governments of the efficacy of penalties, which provided for imprisonment, and, where the law of the country permitted, prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*). The information obtained by the Secretariat showed that at the moment only a small number of States had adopted the penalty of imprisonment and in most cases the term provided was only a short one.

Experience in France was conclusive. According to the Service "de la Sûreté," dealing with the traffic, thanks to the measures now in force, the traffic in narcotics in France was completely under control.

He therefore proposed a resolution which should invite countries to increase their penalties, and to adopt imprisonment and prohibition of local residence (*interdiction de séjour*), when their legislation permitted. Penalties in France attained five years' imprisonment, ten years' prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*), and a fine of 30,000 francs.

Further, the law courts ought to be requested to apply the laws severely, since, very frequently judges hesitated to inflict the newer penalties. The offender, whether he was a trafficker or a consumer, ought to be severely punished. Judges were often lenient with a consumer, because this latter class of offenders frequently possessed a certain social status, and because of the severity of the penalty. It must however be rigorous because the crime constituted a very serious social danger. He thought that the penalties should be severely applied precisely because the consumer belonged to a high social class and the bad example which he gave was therefore the more dangerous.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with the Chairman. Something more, however, than a short sentence of imprisonment was required if traffickers on a large scale were to be adequately dealt with. In Great Britain, under the Act of 1920 the maximum penalties imposed for a first offence were six months imprisonment or a fine of £200, or both. Imprisonment had often been inflicted, but it was found that it was not a sufficient deterrent, and Parliament had just raised the maximum penalty to penal servitude for ten years or a fine of £1000, or both in cases of sufficient gravity to merit trial on indictment. When the trial was on summary conviction, the penalty was imprisonment for twelve months or a fine of £250, or both. In wording the resolution, he thought the Chairman might indicate that what was required, as a maximum penalty, was a severe sentence of imprisonment, and that a short sentence was quite inadequate in the most serious cases.

Further, he wished to call attention to a provision which had been inserted in the new Act just passed by Parliament in Great Britain, to the effect that any person who in Great Britain aided, abetted, counselled or procured the commission in any place outside Great Britain of any offence punishable under the terms of any corresponding law in force in that place, or who did any act preparatory to or in furtherance of any act which, if committed in Great Britain, would constitute an offence against the British law, was also liable to those penalties. "Corresponding law" was defined as being a law providing for the control and regulation of the manufacture, sale, use, export or import of the drugs, in accordance with the International Opium Convention. This provision was very important, because it enabled the government of Great Britain to deal with persons within her jurisdiction who were arranging or negotiating illicit traffic in these drugs outside her territory. He considered it to be worth while for the Council to commend to the attention of other governments the importance of introducing such provisions into their own laws.

The CHAIRMAN said that the measures taken in Great Britain would certainly serve as an excellent example to other States.

Mr. PORTER (United States) enquired whether the law in Great Britain provided for a minimum or maximum sentence, or only for a maximum.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that it only provided for a maximum.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that the law of the United States provided for a maximum penalty of ten years, but that it was found that the Courts were occasionally too lenient towards this class of offender, and he had proposed, during the last congress, a bill fixing minimum and maximum sentences, in order to take away from the courts a part of their discretion in the passing of sentence. He desired to know whether any other countries had applied that rule and, if so, what results had been obtained.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that in England the principle of minimum sentences had in recent years not been regarded with favour and had, in general, been discarded.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that, in the United States, that principle had been discarded as far as banking laws were concerned, but that offences of trafficking were of such an extraordinary nature that it might perhaps be well to apply it.

Was an alien convicted and sentenced for violating the Dangerous Drugs Act liable to expulsion by the law of the United Kingdom?

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) replied in the affirmative. An alien could be, and frequently was, deported.

M. BRENIER explained that there was no provision in French law for expulsion.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee should make mention of the proposed minimum penalty to be inflicted in the United States. He did not consider that the Committee should go so far as to propose its adoption, because that would be interfering with the freedom of each State. Attention, however, could be drawn to it.

49. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
(continued).

Mr. PORTER (United States) asked that the discussion on reservation (I) should be postponed until the next meeting for two reasons, first because the American Delegation possessed no information regarding the established usage of opium in India, and secondly because the reservations referred to certain States without naming them. The Delegation was thus unable to know whether one State or all States were involved, and, inasmuch as it was its principal object in attending the session of the Committee to ascertain whether or not it could come to a working arrangement with the League, it was of very considerable importance for it to know the extent of the reservations and the number of States desiring to make them.

He therefore asked that paragraph 4 might be discussed at the present meeting. Paragraphs 2 and 3 were accepted by the American delegation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he would like to suggest that the discussion on the main point which was possibly the most controversial, should be taken as early as possible. The counter-proposal of the United States Government had only just reached him, but he was prepared to discuss it immediately, and also to answer any questions connected with the practice in India which the American Delegation might desire to put. It was possible that, in the light of the information which he could furnish, Mr. Porter might feel that he was in a position to discuss the first paragraph.

As regarded the point that the American Delegation did not know which States were making reservations, that fact was easily deducible from the Minutes, which were in the possession of that Delegation. Every State, except China, had made some reservation.

He had, unfortunately, to leave Geneva at latest by Wednesday evening, June 6th, and he very much hoped that the discussion of this important matter would be concluded before his departure. He appealed therefore to the Committee to do everything it could to hasten proceedings.

Mr. PORTER (United States) repeated that the American Delegation was trying to ascertain whether or not a workable plan could be agreed upon for combating the traffic in dangerous drugs. It was therefore a matter of great importance to that Delegation to know what nations desired to make reservations. While it was true that the names of these States appeared in the Minutes, the resolution merely mentioned certain States, which might mean two or all. It seemed to him that countries which desired to make reservations should disclose their identity, and state specifically what those reservations might be. The American Delegation could not express an opinion on them until it knew what they were.

Further, it would be of great satisfaction to the American Delegation if it could receive adequate information as to the meaning of the term "established usage in India." He would have to make a report to his Government, and he would naturally be asked what that usage was. The American Delegation would therefore very much appreciate it if Mr. Campbell could put very briefly in writing what was the established usage of opium in India. By that means it could obtain a much more intelligent idea of the effect of the reservations.

There would be very little delay in dealing with the question, since he felt sure that the whole matter could be quickly disposed of.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the Secretariat should communicate at once to the American Delegation a copy of the Indian Government's two despatches written about two years previously, a copy of the report of the Royal Commission of 1893-95 and a copy of the pamphlet entitled "The Truth About Indian Opium", issued by the India Office in 1922. These publications contained all the necessary information, and, if anything further was required, the Secretariat possessed a complete compilation of all the laws in India dealing with the subject. He would be happy to furnish any verbal explanations which might be required, but he would find very great difficulty in compressing within the limits of a brief written declaration to be presented within an hour or two a full and exact statement regarding the position of opium in India. All the essential facts were to be found in Chapters 3 and 4 of "The Truth About Indian Opium." These chapters were only a few pages long, but combined and summarised the information contained in the reports of the Royal Commission, and the Indian laws on the subject.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that he was very much disappointed that he could not obtain a specific statement from Mr. Campbell. As for the Royal Commission Report, that had been adopted in 1895, and the American Delegation desired information of a later date.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) hoped that it would meet Mr. Porter's point if he formally handed in Chapters 3 and 4 of "The Truth About Indian Opium", dated December 1922, as being the most recent official statement on the subject. He held himself at the disposal of Mr. Porter and of the Committee to answer any questions concerning the position in India. In the circumstances, he felt that he could not do more.

*The Committee decided to discuss paragraph 4 and to postpone the discussion of paragraph 1 to the next meeting.*

Before opening the discussion, Mr. PORTER (United States) asked whether the American Delegation could be furnished before the end of the meeting with the names of the countries which desired to make reservations and the character of their reservations. This knowledge would be of very great assistance to the American Delegation in framing its reply, and he thought

that it was entitled to know which countries objected to the principles of the American proposals, since it might be possible for it to remove those objections.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the information required by Mr. Porter was in the hands of the Secretariat and could be given at once.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that if all the information which it was possible to obtain was to be found in the Minutes, he would of course have to accept it, but he had thought that the countries represented on the Committee would be only too glad to state their reservations, rather than put the American Delegation in the difficulty of ascertaining the position of affairs from the records, which formed no part of the proposed agreement.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that he should ask each representative on the Committee in turn what reservations his country made.

Mr. PORTER (United States) expressed himself as satisfied with this procedure, and emphasised the fact that he would have to include in his report first and foremost the names of the countries which desired to make reservations and the nature of these reservations.

The CHAIRMAN consulted the representatives of the various countries on the Committee. From their replies, it appeared that Japan, Germany and Great Britain made reservations regarding points (1), (2) and (3), Japan, Portugal, Siam, France and the Netherlands (2) and (3) India (1) and (3), and China made no reservations whatsoever.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) asked the American Delegation to regard the reservations which he had made, in the light of his remarks which were recorded in the Minutes of the thirteenth meeting of the Committee

#### *Paragraph 4.*

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that, in the letter containing the amendments of the American Delegation to the resolutions adopted by the Committee, the amendments were to be found in brackets and the words deleted were underlined.

In the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 4, the words "as a means for putting into effect the principles herein adopted and", had been inserted so that the paragraph would read "That, as a means for putting into effect... the Committee recommends to the Council the advisability of inviting."

As regarded sub-paragraph (a) the words: "in which the manufactured drugs are produced" had been deleted and the words: "in which opium or coca leaf derivatives are produced" inserted. This amendment had been made because the words "drugs" appeared to be too general a term. There were many poisonous drugs, but, inasmuch as the Committee's efforts were directed towards the suppression of opium and coca leaf derivatives, the American Delegation had thought it better to be more specific.

Sub-paragraph (b) was accepted.

The American Delegation had added a new sub-paragraph (c) as follows: "the Government of those States in which raw opium or coca leaves are produced for export." The purpose of that amendment was obvious in view of the principles stated by the Delegation.

He desired to draw the Committee's attention specially to the following amendment: "in order to prevent the use of these, it is necessary to exercise the control of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medical and non-scientific purposes."

No change had been made in the next paragraph, except to insert the word "publicly" before the words "to consider", so that the sentence now read "to enter into immediate negotiations publicly to consider whether ..... between them."

The following sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) were accepted.

Sub-paragraph (c) had been suggested by the American Delegation to carry out the object of sub-paragraph (c) of the first paragraph above.

Mr. Porter added that the matter of the summoning of the conference went entirely beyond his instructions. In case, however, the Committee decided to summon a conference, the American representatives would urge their Government to accept the arrangements.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he would accept the American Delegation's amendment to the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 4 if it were made to read as follows: "That, as a means of giving effect to the principles submitted by the American representatives, and the policy which the League, on the recommendation of the Committee, had adopted..."

In reply to a question from Mr Porter as to the policy of the League he said that the words referred to paragraph (3), of his resolution, which summarised the line of action which the League had approved and had been taking.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that he had no objection to the proposed redraft, provided that the words "American representatives" were replaced by the words "representatives of the United States of America."

*The paragraph was adopted, with this alteration, and with the reservation that it would depend on the adoption of the first paragraph.*

#### *First sub-paragraphs (a) and (b).*

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) preferred that instead of the phrase "in which opium or coca leaves are produced" the phrase "in which opium derivatives or cocaine are produced" should be substituted. The Convention only made mention of cocaine and not of coca leaf derivatives.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed, but thought it would be better to say: "derivatives of opium or coca leaves to which the Convention applies." He personally however preferred the words "manufactured drugs", or "drugs to which Part III of the Convention applies", because they would indicate that reference was being made to morphine, cocaine and heroin, which were the drugs which the Committee had immediately in mind.

He proposed the following text: "in which the derivatives of opium or the coca leaf to which Part III of the Convention applies."

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that his object in suggesting the amendment had been to make the resolution more specific. Many dangerous drugs, such as belladonna, were not covered by the Convention.

He had no objection, however, to the text proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the phrase "cocaine and its salts" should be used.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, if these words were used, a list of all the opium derivatives to which the Convention applied would have to be inserted.

M. BRENIER said that it would be sufficient if allusion was made to Part III of the Convention.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that it was a principle of international law that the same words should always be used to express the same opinion.

The CHAIRMAN considered that the same words as those appearing in the Convention should be used. The final text could be submitted to a drafting committee.

*This proposal was adopted.*

*First sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) were adopted, subject to revision by the drafting committee.  
First sub-paragraph (c).*

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to explain the Position of India. The proposals in their original form had suggested that the Governments concerned should come together to consider what progress could be made. When these proposals had been laid before the Committee, he had made no suggestion that the Government of India should be invited to the Conference, because the position of that Government was that it was and always had been prepared to accept whatever reductions, even amounting to total prohibition, the consuming countries might think right to impose. There was no desire on the part of the Indian Government to be present at a Conference to restrict the use of opium. The consuming countries were entirely free to consider what would be best in their own interests, and the Government of India was ready to limit its exports to the certified requirements of the consuming countries. In the resolutions as originally worded, there had been no necessity for the representation of India at the Conference, and the necessity which now existed depended entirely on the adoption of the second sub-paragraph (c), a paragraph which could not be accepted by the Indian Government as it now stood. He desired to make it quite clear that his Government had no desire to be represented at a Conference which was to decide what limitations were possible. It was ready to give effect to any limitations, extending if desired to total prohibition, which the consuming countries might wish to impose.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that, as he understood Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal, no country was required to be represented — States were merely *invited* to attend the Conference.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that it was essential for the success of the two proposed Conferences that all interested countries should attend. If certain countries stood outside the Conferences they would be a failure.

He desired to ask Mr. Porter one question. What was the scope of the second sub-paragraph (c), which read: "as to the limitation of the cultivation and production of the raw materials from which these drugs are made to the quantity required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes." This appeared to him to refer to the drugs mentioned in sub-paragraph (a), namely, manufactured drugs, and if that was so there would be, he thought, no difficulty in reaching agreement. Personally, he saw no objection to adding to the Conference, which would be convened to consider the question of the limitation of the production of morphine, heroin and cocaine, such countries as Turkey and Persia, which produced opium, and Java, Peru and Bolivia, which produced the coca leaf, for export to be used in the manufacture of drugs. It might be very useful indeed to include those countries. Sub-paragraph (c) could not very well apply to sub-paragraph (b) as the temporary production of opium for smoking purposes remained legitimate under the Convention until the complete suppression had been effected.

As regarded the second sub-paragraph (c), he suggested that the Committee should add this to sub-paragraph (a) in order that it might be made quite clear to what it referred.

Mr. PORTER (United States) joined with Sir Malcolm Delevingne in expressing the very sincere hope that every country which produced opium or coca leaves or manufactured their derivatives would attend the Conference. He further agreed that success could only be attained if co-operation of that kind was obtained.

He would prefer to postpone the discussion of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's second suggestion until later.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, although he had received no instructions from his Government on the subject, he did not think it would refuse an invitation to attend such a conference. All that he had wished to do was to make it quite clear that the Government of India had no desire



whatever to claim that it should attend such a Conference, because it was quite willing to leave the question of the amount of drugs required to the consuming Governments.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) enquired whether China would be invited to the Conference.

Mr. PORTER (United States) replied that as China was more interested than any other nation in the world, the Drafting Committee should be instructed to include China in the invitation.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that if China were included it would alter the nature of the Conference, for if every State interested in the use of drugs were invited half of the countries of the world at least would be included. Every important country, for instance, was very much interested at the moment in the consumption of the manufactured drugs and his proposal only contemplated a Conference of the Powers actually engaged in the manufacture of these drugs. If China or any other interested country was therefore added a very large number of other States would have to be included as well. The hoped-for agreement would be made only between the Powers engaged in the manufacture or production because they were the countries which would have to limit themselves.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China did not manufacture any drugs containing opium nor did she allow opium smoking or opium production by law. She produced no coca leaf. He desired, however, that China should be invited to the Conference.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the manufacture of the drugs to which sub-paragraph (a) applied, was in fact limited to a very few countries and in those countries was further limited to a very few factories. The principal drug producing countries were the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland and, to a minor extent, France. If the problem were confined to these countries as was originally intended, it would be possible to have a small and therefore more effective Conference which would cover the whole ground. On the other hand, if every country directly or indirectly concerned with the consumption of these drugs were invited, a Conference of about 51 States would be the result, and it would be extremely difficult to reach any definite decisions. He therefore agreed that the Conference should be limited to the countries directly concerned. The number would not probably exceed ten.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) was unable to understand why the Conference should be limited to ten countries. There were nine or ten countries represented on the Committee and according to sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) all countries, except China, would be invited to the Conference, since nearly all of them were involved, except China. If the majority of the States represented on the Committee were not to be invited then he would not insist on China being invited. China was particularly interested in the question because some 90 % of the number of opium smokers in Far Eastern territories and possessions were Chinese.

Sir John JORDAN thought it would have a very important effect on the Far East, if China were invited to the Conference. Public opinion in China must be influenced and if it were desired to reduce the production of opium China could not be excluded, since, according to the document prepared by the Secretariat, she produced more opium than all the rest of the world put together.

M. BRENIER thought that China should attend the Conference which would discuss the limitation and the manufacture of drugs which were after all derivatives of the raw material. This raw material was produced in great quantities in China and she could therefore in effect figure as a producing country. It was impossible to deal with manufacturing countries if no account were taken of countries producing the raw material.

Mr. PORTER (United States) thought that as China occupied such an exceptional position she could safely be invited to attend the Conference. He agreed with Sir John Jordan that the effect of an invitation in the Far East would be very great.

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain), *it was decided to postpone the discussion of the invitation to China until the next meeting.*

Mr. PORTER (United States) in supporting the following amendment "to enter into immediate negotiations *publicly* to consider whether, with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912 agreements could not now be reached between them", said that the consideration of the proposed agenda of the Conference should, in his opinion, be in public, in view of the great benefits derived from the publicity of the Washington Conference on the limitation of armaments. It had been the view of every one who had attended this Conference that the publicity connected with it had very materially assisted in bringing about the results achieved.

Sir John JORDAN associated himself whole-heartedly with Mr. Porter's views.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether all meetings of the Washington Conference had been held in public.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that about ten plenary sessions of the Conference had been held and the agenda had been divided up among various Committees which had sat in secret and had reported publicly at the plenary sessions. This plan had met with the approval of everyone who had attended the Conference. The controversy, for instance, between Japan and China over Shantung had been debated in private, the details worked out in private, and then reported in public at a plenary session.



Bishop BRENT (United States) pointed out that at no time would the Conference be prevented from sitting in private, if it so desired. Publicity should be laid down as a general principle, but the Conference should always be left the right to sit in private, if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Conference should be left free to decide on this point for itself.

Sir John JORDAN said that he had taken a small part in the Washington Conference, but that it had enabled him to see the very good effect obtained by publicity. Very full communiqués were issued to the newspapers nearly every day. He had never realised until that Conference how great was the force of publicity.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that if the Committee invited Governments to consider the questions publicly, it was implied that the Conference would have to be held in public. He agreed with the Chairman that it was desirable to leave the Conference full liberty in regard to its proceedings. It was, in fact, hardly for the Advisory Committee to prescribe to the Powers how they should conduct their proceedings and it was also clear to him that a part of them would have to be held in private. If, for instance, the principle of the limitation of morphine, heroin and cocaine were adopted, the Conference would still have to consider in what proportions the limited amount of these drugs was to be divided between the manufacturing countries. This would probably involve the discovery of particulars of trade interests and the manufacturing firms concerned would certainly desire that such meetings should be held in private. For those reasons, he would urge Mr. Porter not to insist on the amendment, because it was not concerned with the substance of the resolutions.

Mr. PORTER (United States) said that not much importance could be attached to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's objection that information might be given to the business interests engaged in the production of opium and the manufacture of its derivatives.

It had been his experience in the United States that, whatever endeavours were made to withhold information from the public, the interested parties usually obtained it and sometimes a few days in advance. This was particularly true in regard to the United States tariff laws which exercised a noticeable influence on prices. There were, for instance, about 11,000 items in the last tariff-bill. He did not, however, desire to press his amendment and, if the Committee wished to hold it over for further consideration, he would not oppose such a course.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Committee would be only recommending publicity for the Conference to the Council and, in this case, he thought it could easily suggest that the meetings could be held in public. What Bishop Brent had said appeared fully to cover the situation. Meetings could be held privately if it were desired to do so at any time. Sir Malcolm Delevingne's objections carried very little weight with him. For two years the Committee had decided that it had no right to hold its meetings in public. The Council, when asked to decide the question, had replied that the Advisory Committee could do as it pleased and was quite justified in holding its meetings in public if it wished. In the circumstances, therefore, he thought the Committee should pass a mild recommendation of this kind. Apparently no great inconvenience had been caused by the fact that the meetings of the present session of the Committee had been held in public.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the example given by the Advisory Committee in holding its present session in public was sufficient and that it would be unnecessary to insert the word "publicly" in the resolution.

Mr. PORTER (United States) hoped that the Committee would accept the principle of public meetings on the same lines as those held during the Washington Conference. As a member of that Conference, he had been very much impressed with the benefits that had resulted from publicity. He did not, however, desire to insist. The Committee, however, was acting as an advisory one, and this paragraph of the resolution concerned all the details of the Conference. Publicity was one of the most important details and it seemed to him clearly within the powers of the Committee to make such a recommendation on the matter. Further, the traffic in opium was only vaguely understood by a large majority of the world and there was a considerable balance of opinion which thought that the more publicity was secured, the quicker would the end be reached.

Bishop BRENT (United States) said that at the Hague Conference it had been decided that the meetings should be held in private. Some of the delegates including the American representatives had been very strongly in favour of publicity, but they had deferred to the wishes of the others, and the Conference had held secret sessions while issuing a communiqué every evening. As a matter of fact, the leakages of information were so bad that it had been the unfortunate duty of the President of the Conference, much against his will, to rebuke it for allowing information to escape.

Mr. PORTER added that the United States would be quite content with whatever the Committee decided concerning the matter of publicity.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was strongly of the opinion that if the word "publicly" were inserted it would be made to appear that the Committee did not trust the Governments concerned to conduct their proceedings in a proper manner. He thought that those Governments could be trusted to do what was right in the matter especially as one of them was the Government of the United States.

*The word "publicly" was deleted from the resolution.*

*Second sub-paragraphs (a) and (b).*

*These were adopted subject to final revision by the Drafting Committee.*

*Second sub-paragraph (c).*

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) reminded the Committee that he had proposed that the first sub-paragraph (a) and the second sub-paragraph (c) should be combined.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the second sub-paragraph (c) raised much more than a question of form as far as he was concerned. He understood, however, that it would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee, but he wished to make it quite clear that so far as his Government was concerned this paragraph appeared to involve questions which were matters of principle.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) associated himself with Mr. Campbell's remarks.

The Committee appointed a drafting Committee consisting of the following members, to redraft paragraph 4 in accordance with the decisions reached by the Committee:

Mr. PORTER (United States),

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain),

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands),

M. BRENIER,

M. BOURGOIS (France),

Mr. NEVILLE (United States).

It was understood that the Drafting Committee should not deal with sub-paragraph (c) but only with the points upon which decisions had been taken, and that the draft so prepared should come before the Committee at a future meeting for final adoption.

---

NINETEENTH MEETING

*held Tuesday, June 5th, 1923, at 10 a.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

50. MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH MEETING.

The Minutes of the twelfth meeting were adopted.

51. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES (*continued*).

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the drafting committee should discuss paragraph 1 of the resolutions concerning the American proposals.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, in the circumstances of which the Committee were aware, the drafting committee would, he thought, have little chance of success in finding a text on which agreement could be reached, unless India was directly represented upon it.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. Campbell (India) was added to the drafting committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in adhering to the third reservation, he had done so only with reference to reservation (2).

---

## TWENTIETH MEETING

*held Tuesday, June 5th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present.

### 52. DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSALS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (continued).

The CHAIRMAN laid before the Committee the resolutions proposed by the drafting committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the representative of China had expressed the desire that China should be represented at the conference which was to consider the limitation of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those territories where its use in this way was temporarily continued. He had already pointed out that the object of this conference was that the Powers interested should meet and reach an agreement among themselves regarding the steps to be taken to give more effective application to Part II of the Convention. In a conference of this nature, the Powers, which would assume responsibility, would be those who would agree, if they could, to certain stipulations which it might be possible for them to put into effect. It was obvious that Powers not in that position could not take the same part in such a conference. He had, however, frequently emphasised the fact during the session that the question of a gradual and effective suppression of the use of opium for smoking in the Far East, as provided by the Hague Convention, was closely bound up at the moment with the situation in China. It had occurred to him since the discussion on the previous day that, if the conference could combine with the consideration of this question, as far as it affected Far Eastern territories, the consideration of the situation in China, it would be facing the problem as a whole. He suggested, therefore, that the Committee should recommend that one item on the agenda of the proposed conference should be the means which should be taken to bring about the suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China, and that China should be one of the constituent Powers of the conference.

If the Committee adopted this proposal, it would be necessary to add to the first sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 4 "and the Government of the Republic of China" and to the second sub-paragraph (b) "and as to the measures which should be taken to bring about the suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China."

Sir John JORDAN entirely agreed with the proposal. He had already pointed out that the omission of China from the proposed conference was unfortunate, and he had always been of the opinion that the limitation of the consumption of prepared opium in the Far Eastern Possessions of European Powers was part of the Committee's programme. He was glad to see this point included in the general scheme. It would be most unfortunate, therefore, if China were left out.

He would have preferred that the amendment should read "in consultation with the Government of the Chinese Republic." Since the Chinese Government was to have a say in what was being done in reducing the consumption of opium in all the Far Eastern Possessions, it would seem equally fair that the Powers should have some say as to what should be done in China. These questions were closely related, and unless the situation in China improved, would become still more so, owing to the great amount of smuggling from China.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) desired most strongly to express, on behalf of his Government, the opinion that there must be no outside interference whatever with the internal affairs of China in connection with the question.

It was indeed necessary to provide for the consultation of the Chinese Government, but its sovereign rights must at the same time be respected. China had been suffering for decades from foreign interference, and her hands had been bound by foreign Powers. Treaties, for instance, with some Powers compelled her not to raise import duty higher than 5%. China would therefore never agree to any proposal which implied foreign interference, and he had the instructions of his Government to make this quite clear.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that his proposal implied no foreign intervention in China. Full liberty of action was left to each State in the matter. The proposal only provided for the summoning of various interested Powers, of which China could be one, to ascertain the possibility of reaching an agreement. China would be in a position to agree or disagree with any proposal which might be put forward. He thought, therefore, that China's position would not in any way be prejudiced if the Chinese representative accepted this form of words. It would be a mistake to limit the suggestion in the way proposed.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had not, unfortunately, the authority to accept the amendment as it stood. His Government had instructed him to oppose any resolution implying foreign interference, and he could not therefore accept the amendment. He saw no harm in the form of words which he had suggested. The conference would discuss the different

measures to be taken by all the Powers attending it, including the Chinese Government. It should therefore be quite clear that it was not proposed to interfere with this Government's action in the matter.

Two years previously the Committee had passed a resolution recommending consular intervention and the suppression of the opium traffic in China; that resolution had been rejected by the Council and the Assembly. The present case was similar.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Chinese representative could accept the words: "by, or in concert with the Chinese Government."

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) replied that he did not like the phrase "in concert with." That seemed to him to imply foreign interference, which the Chinese Government would never accept.

He proposed that the amendment should be "and as to the measures which should be taken by the Government of the Republic of China to bring about a suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China."

*The Committee accepted the amendment proposed by M. Chao-Hsin Chu.*

*In view of the new resolutions proposed by the drafting committee, the Committee unanimously decided to withdraw the resolutions which it had previously adopted concerning the proposals of the United States of America.*

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he accepted the new text subject to a reservation in regard to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 4, concerning coca leaves. His Government considered that coca leaves were not covered by the Hague Convention. He thought, however, that it would have no objection to participating in the proposed conference.

*The resolutions proposed by the drafting committee were unanimously adopted, and the Committee decided to communicate them officially to the American Delegation.*

The resolutions were as follows:

I. That the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium accepts and recommends to the League of Nations the propositions of the United States' representatives as embodying the general principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs, and on which, in fact, the International Convention of 1912 is based, subject to the fact that the following reservation has been made by the representatives of the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal and Siam:

The use of prepared opium and the production, export and import of raw opium for that purpose are legitimate, so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention.

II. That the Committee, appreciating the great value of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has for the past two years been making to deal with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs, expresses the belief that all the Governments concerned will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention.

III. That, in bringing the American proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adhesion of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medical and scientific uses, with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) recommending the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures for securing international co-operation in suppressing that traffic; (4) inviting the Powers with territories in the Far East to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for an investigation by the Chinese Government of the conditions in China, with a view to the more effective application of Chapter II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic, with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention.

IV. That, as a means of giving effect to the principles submitted by the representatives of the United States and the policy which the League, on the recommendation of the Committee, has adopted, and having regard to the information now available, the Committee recommends to the Council the advisability of inviting:

- (a) the Governments of the States in which morphine, heroin, or cocaine, and their respective salts, are manufactured and the Governments of the States in which raw opium or the coca leaf are produced for export for the purpose of such manufacture,
- (b) the Governments having territories in which the use of prepared opium is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention and the Government of the Republic of China,

to enter into immediate negotiations (by nominating representatives to form a committee, or committees, or otherwise) to consider whether, with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912, agreements could not now be reached between them:

- (a) as to a limitation of the amounts of morphine, heroin or cocaine, and their respective salts, to be manufactured; as to a limitation of the amounts of raw opium and the coca leaf to be imported for that purpose and for other medicinal and scientific purposes; and as to a limitation of the production of raw opium and the coca leaf for export to the amount required for such medicinal and scientific purposes. The latter limitation is not to be deemed to apply to the production and export of raw opium for the purpose of smoking in those territories where that practice is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention,
- (b) as to a reduction of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those territories where it is temporarily continued, and as to the measures which should be taken by the Government of the Republic of China to bring about a suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China.

*Reservation by the Representative of the Government of India.*

The representative of the Government of India associates himself with the foregoing resolution, subject to the following reservation regarding paragraph 1:

- "The use of raw opium, according to the established practice in India, and its production for such use are not illegitimate under the Convention."

53. STATEMENT BY BISHOP BRENT.

Bishop BRENT (United States) said that this was the third occasion upon which he had assisted at the birth pangs of progress in relation to the most important question of traffic in opium and other narcotics, which the Committee was striving to solve.

In 1909, at the Changhai Conference, after several days of storm, there had been fair weather, and work on this problem had begun in a formal manner; since then it had been realised that only by standing shoulder to shoulder could decisive results be obtained.

After an interval of three years the Conference, of nearly two months duration, had met at the Hague. Once again there had been storms, but a haven had been reached, and the conclusions of that Conference were to be found in the Convention upon which action was now being taken through the League of Nations, and in conjunction with the representatives of the United States present at the Committee.

For the third time he had been present when another step forward had been taken, and he thought that the degree of unanimity which had been attained in the Committee marked perhaps the greatest progress which had been made since the question had first become an international responsibility.

He was an idealist and he had had but one goal in view for twenty years. He believed that, if this goal was kept clearly in view, it would be reached in a far shorter space of time than at present seemed possible.

A great figure in the League of Nations, Lord Robert Cecil, during his visit to America, had proudly said that he was an idealist and that he was not ashamed of it. Bishop Brent desired to repeat that remark in the home of the League of Nations. He too was an idealist, and he was not ashamed of it. At the close of the session of the Committee he remained one.

He had nothing to add, nothing to retract and nothing to modify in the speech which he had made at the opening of the session. He realised the tendency in human affairs generally to allow the abstract to obscure the personal and of the letter to kill the spirit. All great organisations and associations ran this risk, and it had constantly to be guarded against.

He desired, however, in thanking the Committee for its welcome to the American Delegation and for its unvarying courtesy, to remind it once more of the goal to be obtained. That goal was to give the weak, the innocent and the ignorant the widest possible protection against that temptation to soil, abuse and harm the body, a temptation which was in itself an indignity to human nature and an insult to God. He knew that this ideal was in the heart of everyone present, and that it was the secret of the zeal with which the problem was being attacked and of the hope with which all looked forward to its complete and happy solution.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Bishop Brent for his remarks. On his return to the United States, Bishop Brent would be able to explain what the Committee was doing, and to say with what zeal and assiduity it was accomplishing its task and travelling along the road which he had first pointed out in 1909. He could return to the United States satisfied, for he had seen the seed which he had sown in 1909 beginning to bear fruit.

54. POSITION OF BONDED WAREHOUSES.

M. BRENIER said that it appeared from the document before the Committee<sup>1</sup> that the customs procedure followed with regard to bonded warehouses varied in different countries. He proposed that the Secretariat should send the note which had been submitted by the British representative

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix D to Annex 14, page 213.

on the subject to all Governments, in order to obtain further information, since the question was of a technical nature.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with the proposal. The sub-committee appointed by the Committee to consider the question of customs statistics had also taken into account the position of bonded warehouses. The Chairman of the sub-committee had drafted a report, which, if approved by the Committee, could be circulated to the Governments for their observations.

*M. Brenier's proposal and that of Sir Malcolm Delevingne were adopted.*

55. ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION REGARDING COUNTRIES FAILING TO RATIFY THE CONVENTION OR TO ADOPT THE IMPORT AND EXPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

M. van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he did not know what would be the opinion of his government on this question. He thought that the procedure recommended in the Assembly's resolution would not be acceptable to many Governments for two reasons: first because it would establish a monopoly in favour of British India, and secondly an augmented price in the legitimate market would ensue. The fear that the price would rise would be removed if, as he assumed, the Indian Government agreed to export opium in compliance with the terms of the Convention to the quantity and quality required by any Government, at a price not higher than 4000 rupees per chest, or lower than the price asked by any country, colony or protectorate, whether it was under British rule or not.

As regarded the creation of a monopoly, he supposed that a Government adhering to the system could make it a condition that, if British India did not carry out the stipulations and did not furnish the opium asked for by the importing country, that country was at liberty to break the contract after a very short delay.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he had very little to add to what he had said at the last session. His Government in no sense proposed the adoption of the proposal, but if unanimity on it were attained by the consuming Governments, then he would be prepared to suggest to his Government that it should agree to sell opium to these Governments at a price not exceeding that now charged at the moment, namely, 4,000 rupees a chest.

He thought that the Indian Government would have no difficulty in accepting the conditions put forward by Mr. van Wettum, that was to say, the same price should be charged to all Government. If India entered into any agreement which it might be impossible to carry out, the importing Governments would be quite free to seek their supplies of opium elsewhere.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the situation would be made clearer and the Committee enabled to form a better judgment on the question if the Indian representative would inform it what countries obtained their opium exclusively from India and what amount of Turkish and Persian opium was imported into the Far Eastern Possessions of the Governments represented on the Committee.

M. BRENIER said that the information requested by Sir John Jordan had already been examined by the Committee, which had found that the exporting countries gave the place of destination and the importing countries the place of origin. All the information was to be found in the documents before the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the Indian Government had pursued the same policy for many years. When a producing country entered into an agreement with the Government of India, one of the articles provided that that government should obtain the bulk of its supplies from India. The object of the article was not commercial, but was in order to obtain some measures of control over the amount of opium exported from India. If a British colony obtained the greater part of its supplies from India, the Indian Government knew exactly how much it received, and it did not admit export from India of any opium other than that for which the importing Government had an agreement. In the case of the Straits Settlements, he thought that there was an arrangement under which it Government imported a certain quantity of Persian opium, because Indian opium alone did not suit the taste of its consumers. He believed that the whole of the imports into Hong-Kong for consumption were from India, and that Hong-Kong used only a small quantity of contraband opium. The Dutch East Indies, British North Borneo, Siam and Ceylon obtained all their opium from India. French Indo-China, Formosa and Japan were not covered by any agreement with the Government of India.

Sir John JORDAN said that, from this statement it appeared that the Persian opium went entirely to Formosa, Japan and French Indo-China.

The CHAIRMAN desired to make clear the position of the French Government with regard to import and export certificates.

Article 13 of the Convention stipulated that measures should be taken to ensure that morphine, cocaine and their respective salts should not be exported, except to persons furnished with licences by the importing country. The French Government was at the moment taking steps to put into effect this recommendation and was examining the system contained in paragraph 2 of Article 13, the communication to the Governments of exporting countries of lists of persons drawn up by the Governments of importing countries who were duly authorised by these to import the rugs. This procedure afforded the same guarantees as that established by the Import Certificate System



and possessed the advantage of fulfilling the measures stipulated by the Convention and of interfering in a lesser degree with the legitimate trade.

With regard to retaliative measures against these countries which did not adopt the system, he could only maintain the attitude which he had taken up at the last session. He thought it useless at the moment to renew the discussion which had taken place at that date.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, in his opinion, if France did not accept the Import Certificate System, and if she established a different system on her own, the international arrangements would be thrown into very great confusion. Two systems would be in existence side by side which, in spite of what the Chairman had said, would differ widely in practice. The Import Certificate System would, in consequence, largely fail to produce the results for which the Committee had hoped.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the guarantees provided by the French system seemed to him to be much the same as those provided by the Import Certificate System. At any rate, the system now under consideration in France justified the criticisms which he had made at the last session, concerning the statement of some of his colleagues that a system of control of imports and exports would break down and the effect of the Hague Convention be threatened if the Import Certificate System proposed by the Advisory Committee was not adopted, since a method was now about to be put into practice which differed from the Import Certificate System, but which, nevertheless, afforded a very similar guarantee of protection and control.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the fact that a number of States had not so far adopted the Import Certificate System had led to great difficulties in practice, such as the diversion of the traffic to those countries where the system was not in force. Illicit traffickers, who were carrying on their activities throughout the world, were taking as their centres those countries where the system was not established. The Committee had considered this question at its first session in 1921, and had unanimously agreed that the Import Certificate System was the most effective way of carrying out the obligations regarding export and import which the signatory Powers to the Convention had accepted. He thought, however, that it was not possible at the end of the present session to discuss this question at any length, and he therefore did not desire to make any proposal on the subject. It was clear, however, that the Committee would have to review the position at its next session and to consider very seriously what steps ought to be taken if it was found that any important country was still outside the system.

The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to countries which had not yet adopted the Import Certificate System, or which had not ratified the Convention, a letter had been received from the Federal Political Department in Switzerland, which he would lay before the Committee.

The letter was read (Annex 12).

*The Committee decided to discuss the question at its next session.*

#### 56. PROPOSAL BY THE PORTUGUESE DELEGATE REGARDING THE USE OF HEROIN.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) proposed the following resolution:

“In view of the existing medical evidence tending to show the possibility of completely doing away with the use of heroin in medical and surgical practice, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium recommends the Council:

- (a) to request each Government to appoint a committee of enquiry with a view to ascertaining the possibility of completely abolishing the manufacture of heroin and its use; and
- (b) in the event of the committees of enquiry deciding that the manufacture of heroin cannot be done away with entirely, to enquire into the possibility of its use being limited to certain types of cases, or any particular type of case.”

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee should ask each Government for its opinion on this question. The proposal could be drafted in the form of a recommendation to the Council. Governments could be invited to make an enquiry in their own countries and send the result to the Secretariat.

*The Chairman's proposal was adopted.*

---

### TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

*held Wednesday, June 6th, 1923, at 3.30 p.m.*

---

All the members and assessors were present, with the exception of M. Bourgois (Chairman). M. FERREIRA (Portugal) was replaced by M. Diaz OLIVEIRA.

Prince CHAROON, Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

57. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Minutes of the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th meetings were adopted.

58. STATEMENT BY MRS. HAMILTON WRIGHT ON THE SITUATION IN PERSIA AND TURKEY.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT informed the Committee that she would circulate a statement regarding the situation in Persia and Turkey (Annex 13).

She had gone to Turkey to ascertain the actual state of affairs and whether the Turkish Government was ready to co-operate or not. She had desired further to find out whether it would be possible to substitute other crops for opium, which would produce the revenue required by the Turkish Government. As a result of the war many poppy fields had been destroyed, and in consequence the present moment was most opportune for the substitution of other crops.

In Constantinople she had explained the whole situation and had pointed out how essential it was that the co-operation of Persia and Turkey should be secured, since it was not to be expected that India would reduce her cultivation if Persia and Turkey continued to produce as much opium as they desired. She had met many influential persons in Constantinople, who had informed her that Turkey was not interested in opium, except as an article of revenue, and that if it were possible to work out some constructive programme whereby other crops might be substituted for opium, there was no reason why a considerable reduction should not be effected.

She had discussed the opium question also with the Turkish Delegation at Lausanne, and had pointed out that it would be far better for Turkey to obtain foreign capital in order to develop her silk and other industries, rather than to continue to grow opium, which was disastrous from every point of view, and which was endangering the Turkish reputation. The Turkish Delegation in Lausanne had agreed with the views expressed by their countrymen in Constantinople and had authorised Mrs. Hamilton Wright to say this to the Committee.

In connection with the substitution in practice of other crops for opium she desired to bring to the attention of the Committee an interesting article in the January number of the *Nineteenth Century* by Lord Ronaldshay, late Governor of Bengal, relative to India's undeveloped resources, which might be substituted for poppy cultivation.

Persia was seriously considering the withdrawal of the reservations which she had made when signing the Convention. Mrs. Hamilton Wright had received telegrams from the Financial Adviser to the Persian Government and from the Persian Minister in America stating that Persia was contemplating co-operation with the League. The Persian budget was being readjusted at the moment and the Government had under consideration the possibility of replacing the revenue obtained from opium by substituting other crops for the poppy, such as silk, tobacco, wheat, etc. She thought that the Committee might possibly make some recommendation to this effect.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked Mrs. Hamilton Wright for a copy of the article by the late Governor of Bengal.

*The Committee decided that the reports, together with the article, submitted by Mrs. Hamilton Wright should be annexed to the Minutes.*

The VICE-CHAIRMAN thanked Mrs. Hamilton Wright for her statement.

---

TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

*held Friday, June 8th, 1923, at 2.30 p.m.*

---

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present, except the representatives of China, Portugal and India, and Sir John Jordan and M. Brenier.

59. DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT TO THE COUNCIL.

The CHAIRMAN laid before the Committee a draft report prepared by Prince Charoon, Vice-Chairman.

After making some amendments, *the Committee adopted the report (Annex 14).*

*The Committee further adopted a series of resolutions, covering all the action which the Committee desired to recommend to the Council.*

60. VOTE OF THANKS TO THE CHAIRMAN.

Mr. van WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, *which was carried unanimously.*

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking the Committee, proposed a vote of thanks to the Secretariat, *which was carried unanimously.*

The Chairman hoped that the United States, which had taken so large a part in the discussions of the Committee, would continue to be represented upon it in the future.

Mr. NEVILLE (United States) associated himself with the remarks of the Chairman. He too hoped that the United States would be frequently represented on the Committee. The United States' Delegation was grateful for the efforts which were being made to carry out the measures provided for in the International Opium Convention, and considered that the work being done was of a very able nature.

---

**Annex 1.**

---

LETTER FROM THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (May 23rd, 1923).

I have the honour to inform you that, by direction of the Secretary of State, and in company with the Right Reverend Charles H. Brent and Dr. Rupert Blue, Assistant Surgeon-General of the United States Public Health Service, I desire to lay before the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium of the League of Nations certain proposals concerning the traffic in narcotic drugs.

These proposals represent the views of the United States in regard to this question, and we should appreciate it if an early opportunity is afforded to present them to the Committee, and to give a short account of the legislation and control which the United States has put into effect in regard to the narcotic drugs subject to regulation under the Hague Opium Convention.

Mr. Neville, who accompanies us, will be at the disposal of the Committee for the discussion of any technical details in regard to American legislation which the Committee may desire to bring up.

We trust that the session of the Committee will result in a mutual understanding and the clarification of any doubtful points that may have arisen in regard to the interpretation of the Hague Opium Convention or the position of the United States in relation to the traffic in narcotic drugs.

(Signed) STEPHEN G. PORTER.

---

**Annex 2.**

---

REPLY OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO ANNEX 1.

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of May 23rd, informing me that by direction of the Secretary of State, and in company with the Right Reverend Charles H. Brent and Dr. Rupert Blue, Assistant Surgeon-General of the United States Public Health Service, you desire to lay before the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium of the League of Nations, certain proposals concerning the traffic in narcotic drugs.

I have immediately transmitted this letter to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium to bring before the members of the Committee at the earliest possible moment, and feel confident that its offer of American collaboration and co-operation in the work of the Committee will be most welcome, and that the Committee will accede with pleasure to the request that an early opportunity be afforded to present the views of the United States concerning the traffic in narcotic drugs and to give a short account of the legislation and control which the United States has put into effect in regard to the narcotic drugs subject to regulation under the Hague Opium Convention.

In this connection, I also feel sure that the Committee will be glad to avail themselves of the information which Mr. Neville is able to place at its disposal in the discussion of any technical details in regard to American legislation which the meeting may desire to bring up.

May I reciprocate most warmly the hope expressed in the last paragraph of your letter that the session of the Committee will result in a mutual understanding in relation to the traffic in narcotic drugs. I may perhaps recall in this connection, that both the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations have laid great stress on the value of American co-operation in this international effort and that the presence of so complete an American representation leads one to hope that very real progress may be made at the present session.

(Signed) ERIC DRUMMOND.

---

**Annex 3.**

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY ON THE WORK ACCOMPLISHED  
SINCE THE LAST SESSION.

GENEVA, May 24th, 1923.

I. SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION.

At the last session of the Advisory Committee, certain resolutions were passed and the Report of the Advisory Committee, having been unanimously adopted by the Council, the Secretary-General was instructed to invite the Governments to give effect to this resolution:

*Resolution 2:* — "That the Council be asked, in the meantime, to take all possible steps with the Governments of the States in question to secure their adhesion to the Convention and acceptance of the import certificate system. Special enquiries would be desirable in regard to the abstention of the South and Central American States."

A letter was sent to all Governments on March 16th, 1923, requesting those who were not already Parties to the Convention to take the necessary action without delay. No replies have been received. The members of the Committee will notice in Annex 1 to this report, that the only change in the situation since the last meeting of the Advisory Committee in January, is the ratification of the Convention by the Government of Chile.

Out of fifty-two members of the League fifty-one have signed the Convention and of these forty-two have ratified; the following nine countries have not done so:

- |               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1. Argentine  | 4. Esthonia  | 7. Paraguay    |
| 2. Colombia   | 5. Latvia    | 8. Persia      |
| 3. Costa Rica | 6. Lithuania | 9. Switzerland |

The position with regard to Turkey, Persia and Switzerland which were specially mentioned at the last session of the Committee, is as follows:

*Persia.* — No further communication has been received.

*Turkey.* — Owing to the fact that the Peace negotiations were suspended, no more news has been received as to the signature by Turkey of the Opium Convention, but it is understood that the matter is again under consideration.

*Switzerland.* — The attitude of the Swiss Press shows that public opinion is bringing very definite pressure to bear upon the Swiss Government to induce it to ratify the Opium Convention. It is understood that at the coming Parliamentary session, the Government is to be challenged as to what action it is pursuing and purposes to pursue in the matter.

*South American States.* — In accordance with the recommendation of the Council, a special letter was sent to the Governments of the South and Central American States and a member of the South American Bureau of the League, at present visiting South America, has been asked to draw the attention of the Government of any States he was visiting, to this resolution. No answers have, as yet, been received.

II. IMPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

A letter was despatched on March 16th 1923, to all States who had not adopted the system. A list is given below of the States who have accepted the system and put it into force. Also a list of those countries who have accepted the principle of the system, but have not yet put it into force.

*List of those States who have accepted the system and put it into force.*

Albania	From September 1st, 1922.
Austria	From September 1st, 1922.
Czechoslovakia	From September 1st, 1922.
Denmark	From October 1st, 1922.
Esthonia	From January 1st, 1923.
Great Britain	From September 1st, 1922.
Greece	From September 1st, 1922.
India	From January 1st, 1923.
Italy	From January 1st, 1923.
Japan	From January 1st, 1923.
Latvia	From April 1st, 1923.
Luxemburg	From April 28th, 1922.
Mexico	No date given, but already in force.

New Zealand	From April 1922.
Norway	No date given, but already in force.
Panama	From March 1922.
Poland	From September 1st, 1922.
Siam	From January 1st, 1923.
South Africa	From September 28th, 1921.
Spain	From November 1st, 1922.

*List of those States which have accepted the principle of the system, but have not yet put in into force.*

Australia	Haiti	Newfoundland
Bulgaria	Hungary	Peru
China	Lithuania	Sweden
Cuba	Netherlands	Switzerland
Germany		

*United States of America.* — Details as to the rules governing the import and export of drugs into and from the United States of America will be found in Document O. C. 101.

Since the last session therefore eight countries have been added to the list of those in which the system is in force and one more country, the Netherlands, has agreed to accept the principle of the system.

NOTE. — A list of departments authorised to issue Import Certificates in various countries, will be found in Appendix I.

#### *Action taken by the Council in February 1923.*

M. Hymans, the representative of Belgium, acted as Rapporteur to the Council for the report of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium. The French representative proposed that in M. Hymans' report<sup>1</sup>, in the following sentence regarding the Import Certificate System "its adoption is essential not merely to enable the country concerned to control its imports and exports but also to enable other countries to control theirs" the words "is essentials" should be replaced by the words "is perhaps advisable."

The French representative also proposed the suppression of the phrase "and that without co-operation on these lines, there is a danger of the whole system of control devised in the Convention, breaking down."

He felt it was dangerous to give the impression that unless the League of Nations took certain steps it would cause an international Convention already in force for a considerable period and already producing results, to break down.

The report of M. Hymans' to the Council was amended in accordance with the suggestions of the French representative.

### III. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Since the last Progress Report to the Advisory Committee in January 1923, the following countries have sent in reports:

South Africa	For the calendar year 1922.
French Colonies	For the year 1921.
French Mandated Areas	For the year 1921.
United States of America	For the year ended June 30th, 1922.
Gibraltar	For the year 1922.
Czechoslovakia	For the year ended September 1922.
Austria	For the year ended September 1922.
Japan	For the year 1921.
Belgium	For the year 1921.

*Finland.* — A letter was received dated March 31st, 1923, stating that as the Convention had only recently been signed for Finland, the necessary statistics were not available, but that the Government would forward a report annually to the League from 1923 onwards.

*Siam.* — A letter was received dated December 28th, 1922, stating that the Siamese report had left Bangkok. It has, however, not yet been received in the Secretariat.

*Guatemala.* — A letter dated March 10th, 1923, stated that the Government of Guatemala would forward the Annual Report for 1921 in a short time.

*Canada.* — A letter dated April 7th, 1923, states that the Annual Report for 1922 is in course of preparation and will be forwarded as soon as possible.

<sup>1</sup> M. Hymans' report was circulated to the Committee with the agenda.

Out of nine Governments represented on the Committee, five — India, Siam, Portugal, Netherlands and Germany — have not as yet sent in reports for 1921, and only one report for the year 1922 — that of the United States of America — has been received.

A list of all States, including British and French Colonies, who have sent in their Annual Reports for 1921 and 1922, is attached.

*List of States, including British, French, Japanese and Portuguese Colonies, that have sent in reports for either 1921 or 1922.*

1921	1922
Australia	* Austria
Belgium	British Colonies:
British Colonies:	Gibraltar
* Basutoland	St. Lucia
* Bechuanaland	Straits Settlements
* Ceylon	Canada
* Cyprus	Czechoslovakia
Fiji	Portuguese colonies:
Gambia	West Africa
* Gold Coast	India
* Jamaica	Mozambique
* Leeward Isles	Timor
* Malay States (Federated)	Union of Sud Africa
* Malay States (Unfederated)	United States of America
* Mauritius	Preliminary Statistics for 1922 have been
* Nyasaland	forwarded by:
* Rhodesia (Northern and Southern)	Belgium
* St. Vincent	* Great Britain
* Seychelles	* Japan
* Solomon Isles	
Straits Settlements	
* Swaziland	
* Wei-hai-wai.	
* France: French Colonies:	
West Africa	
Equatorial Africa	
French Somaliland	
French Settlements in Oceania	
Guadaloupe	
Guana	
French India	
* Indo-China	
* St. Pierre et Miquelon Islands	
Madagascar	
Martinique	
New Caledonia	
Reunion Isles	
French Mandated Territories:	
Cameroon	
Togo	
* Great Britain	
* Italy	
* Japan	
Japanese Colonies:	
Chosen	
Formosa	
Kwantung	
* New Zealand	
* Poland	
Siam	
* Venezuela	

*Bolivia.* — States that the traffic in opium is so negligible that there are no statistics on the subject.

*Germany.* — Advance figures have been supplied by Dr. Anselmino. The Report is being forwarded through official channels.

*Liberia.* — States that there is no traffic in opium or other dangerous drugs in that country.

\* These Reports have been communicated in full to the Advisory Committee. The others have been summarised  
*Note.* Most of the Reports from the British Colonies contain only statistics for imports.



IV. TRAFFIC IN COCAINE.

At the session of the Committee in April 1922, the following resolution was passed:

- (a) "That the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible."  
 (b) "That the Council of the League should invite the Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries."

A letter was despatched to all Governments on June 1st, 1922, and before the last meeting of the Advisory Committee thirteen countries had replied, all of which gave details of manufacture, but only seven gave details of estimated requirements. Since then five more Governments have supplied the Secretariat with information on this subject:

*Manufacture:*

Australie  
 Austria  
 Denmark

*Estimated Requirements:*

Australia  
 Austria  
 Poland  
 United States of America

In April 1923, a letter was despatched to all Governments who had not sent in information regarding the traffic in cocaine. Special letters were sent to Switzerland, enquiring if that country was now in a position to supply the Secretariat with any details, and to Japan, asking that information promised with regard to the territorial Governments might be supplied by telegram, if possible. Letters were sent by the Secretary-General on April 12th to the Governments of Peru and Bolivia on the subject of cultivation and manufacture. Communication with the other South American States has been undertaken by the South American Bureau of the League.

The following is a complete list of those countries who have supplied the Secretariat with details of manufacture of cocaine and annual requirements for internal consumption:

*Manufacture:*

Australia  
 Austria  
 Belgium  
 Canada  
 China  
 Czechoslovakia  
 Denmark  
 Finland  
 Great Britain  
 Hungary  
 India  
 Japan  
 Luxemburg  
 Monaco  
 New Zealand  
 Norway  
 Persia  
 Siam  
 Union of South Africa  
 United States of America

*Estimated Requirements:*

Australia  
 Austria  
 Canada  
 Finland  
 Great Britain  
 Hungary  
 Japan  
 Luxemburg  
 New Zealand  
 Norway  
 Poland  
 United States of America

Switzerland has supplied figures of imports of coca leaves.

The following British Colonies have also supplied figures as to estimated annual requirements:

Antigua	Gold Coast	St. Kitts Nevis
Basutoland	Grenada	Sierra Leone
Bechuanaland	Leeward Islands	Somaliland
Bermuda	Malay States	Straits Settlements
Cyprus	Montserrat	Tanganyika
Gambia	Nigeria	Zanzibar
Gibraltar	St-Vincent	

V. TOTAL ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF OPIUM AND ITS DERIVATIVES FOR INTERNAL CONSUMPTION.

At the session of the Advisory Committee in April 1922, the following resolution was passed:

"That the Council should invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912 and other States Members of the League to furnish the Secretary-General of the

League with a statement of their countries, total requirements for internal consumption per annum of opium and its derivatives, indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required and in the case of opium derivatives the amount should be given in terms of morphine content.

“The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that, this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far Eastern countries, where the Chinese are the principal consumers should be available by that date.”

A letter was despatched to all Governments on May 30th, 1922, and before the last session of the Advisory Committee in January, four Governments had supplied details of their total annual consumption. Since then replies giving necessary figures have been received from the following ten other countries and ten British Colonies.

Albania  
Australia  
Austria  
Denmark  
Finland  
Great Britain  
New Zealand  
Poland  
Siam  
United States of America

British Colonies of :

Bermuda  
Gold Coast  
Leeward Islands  
Malay States (Fed.)  
Malay States (Unfed.)  
Nigeria  
Sierra Leone  
Straits Settlements  
Tanganyika  
Zanzibar

Letters have been received from the Netherlands, Peru, Belgium, Italy, China and Czechoslovakia, which may be summarised as follows:

*Netherlands*, January, 30th, 1923.

No estimates can be given as this would entail an increased staff which, owing to the present finances of the Government, could not be undertaken.

*Peru*, December 29th, 1922.

The matter has been referred to the proper authorities.

*China*, November 6th, 1922.

Until a central organ for the manufacture of drugs has been established and control centralised, it is impossible to give the statistics of annual consumption. For these purposes, the Chinese Government is planning to establish a Bureau to keep a close watch on all illicit drugs and also a factory for manufacturing drugs for legitimate use. As soon as these two institutions are in existence, the Chinese Government will give accurate statistics.

*Italy*, August 23rd, 1922.

The Government hoped to be able to send the desired information before January 1st, 1923. (A telegram has been despatched to the Italian Government drawing their attention to this statement.)

*Czechoslovakia*, November 13th, 1922.

There are no statistics available for manufacture or consumption. Enquiries are being made as to stocks, the results of which will be communicated as soon as possible. Enquiries are also being made with regard to the annual consumption.

*Belgium*, December 21st, 1922.

The Government has instituted an enquiry and hopes to be able to supply figures soon.

In April 1923, a further letter was despatched to all Governments who had not supplied this information, with the exception of the South American States, for whom the South American Bureau of the League undertook to be responsible.

The following is a complete list of all countries who have sent in replies on this subject:

British Colonies of:

Albania	India	Bermuda
Australia	Italy	Gold Coast
Austria	Luxemburg	Leeward Islands
Belgium	* Netherlands	Malay States (Fed.)
Canada	New Zealand	Malay States (Unfed.)
China	* Peru	Nigeria
Czecho-Slovakia	Poland	Sierra Leone
Denmark .	Siam	Straits Settlements
Finland	United States	Sudan
Great Britain	South Africa	Tanganyika
Hungary		Zanzibar.

VI. DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN RETURNS OF VARIOUS GOVERNMENTS.

A resolution was passed at the session of the Advisory Committee in April 1922, to the following effect:

“That it is desirable that the discrepancies between the Japanese import statistics and the export statistics of certain other countries should be cleared up.”

Letters were sent to the following countries, dated May 30th, 1922, on this subject: Great Britain, Japan, United States of America.

The British Government wrote on June 29th, 1922, stating that the Japanese Government had been approached and, when the necessary information had been received, the fullest possible investigation would be made and the result communicated to the Secretariat. No further communication has been received.

Through the Netherlands Government a letter was received from the United States of America, dated April 20th, 1923, stating that the figures given referred to a period when in transit and trans-shipment storage of opium was still permissible. It therefore seems possible that crude opium was sent to Japan via the United States and entered in the Japanese figures as imports from the United States. This letter further states that this procedure is no longer permissible

VII. CO-OPERATION BETWEEN JAPAN AND CHINA WITH REGARD TO ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

The following resolution was passed by the Advisory Committee in April last, and endorsed by the Council in July:

“That the Committee notes the promise of the Japanese Government, conveyed through its representative, to make the strictest possible investigation into the illicit traffic in morphine at present being carried on in the Far East; and it recommends that co-operation should be established between the Japanese authorities and the Chinese Maritime Customs, with a view to tracing the sources of contraband morphine.”

Letters were accordingly written to the Governments of Japan and China. The following reply has been received from the Chinese Government, dated March 26th, 1923 :

“The Chinese Government is in communication with the Japanese Ambassador at Peking and has suggested that a mixed commission be created, composed of both Chinese and Japanese. The Japanese Government has accepted this proposal and the details of this commission are to be arranged between the Chinese Foreign Office and the Japanese Embassy in Peking. Ways and means are being considered by the Chinese Government and, when concrete plans are available, the Chinese Government will request the Japanese Embassy to appoint persons to discuss them with a view to reaching a definite conclusion.”

In acknowledging this letter, the Chinese Government was requested to inform the Secretariat when this Commission was actually constituted.

VIII. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO SEIZURES OF DRUGS.

The following resolution was passed by the Advisory Committee in April 1922 and endorsed by the Council:

(c) “The Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police Authorities.”

Replies, not summarised in the Progress Report of January 1923, have been received from the following countries:

---

These countries have not supplied figures.

Albania	} Have agreed to exchange information }	Hungary
Australia		Latvia
Austria		Lithuania
Brazil		New Zealand
Bulgaria		Roumania
Canada		Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Chile		Siam
Czechoslovakia		Spain
France		Union of South Africa
Germany		United States of America
Greece		

*Peru.*

Has referred the matter to the competent authorities.

*Poland.*

Considers that the exchange of information should only take place with regard to cases where the offence constitutes an infraction of the law of the country to which the communication is made. Also that the information should be communicated to the Secretariat in an Annual Report.

At the session of the Advisory Committee in January 1923, it was decided to ask all Governments to:

“Extend the arrangement for the mutual exchange of information in regard to seizures to include information in regard to the proceedings and movements of persons who are known to the authorities to be engaged in carrying on an illicit international traffic in the drugs.”

This was approved by the Council and a letter communicating the resolution was forwarded to all Governments on March 16th, 1923. The following replies have been received:

*Switzerland.*

Until the question of the ratification of the Convention is decided which is now being considered, it is impossible to give any reply. The letters from the Secretariat have, however, been handed over to the Customs Bureau and the “Ministère public.”

*Albania.*

Will reply when the question of the signature and ratification of the Opium Convention, now being discussed, is decided.

*Canada.*

Agrees to the resolution.

*Great Britain.*

Agrees to the resolution.

NOTE 1. Particulars of seizures reported to the Secretariat during the past year will be found in Appendix 2.

NOTE 2. A list of departments in various countries authorised to receive information on seizures of drugs will be found in Appendix 1.

IX. ASSESSORS TO THE COMMITTEE. RE-APPOINTMENT BY THE COUNCIL FOR THE PERIOD OF ONE YEAR.

On April 17th, 1923, the Council re-appointed for one year the three present Assessors to the Advisory Committee.

The Secretary-General was instructed to convey to them the Council's high appreciation of the services they had rendered.

X. RESOLUTIONS OF VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS.

Resolutions from the following bodies have been circulated by the Secretariat to the members of the Advisory Committee:

- The International Anti-Opium Association.
- The Edinburgh Anti-Opium Association.
- The Harvard International Assembly.

It is for the Committee to decide whether these resolutions should be placed on the agenda.

Appendix A.

STATEMENT AS TO SIGNATURES AND RATIFICATIONS OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1912.

PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION (signed and ratified)		MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				NON-MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				
		States Parties to the Convention	States which have signed and ratified, but not signed the Protocol putting Convention into force.	States which have signed but not ratified.	Non-parties to the Convention.	States parties to the Convention.	States which have signed and ratified, but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force.	States which have not ratified the Convention	States non-parties to the Convention	
1. Africa, S. 2. America, U. S. of 3. Australia 4. Austria 5. Belgium 6. Bolivia 7. Brazil 8. Bulgaria 9. Canada 10. Chile 11. China 12. Cuba 13. Czecho-Slovakia 14. Danzig 15. Denmark 16. Ecuador 17. Finland 18. France 19. Germany 20. Great Britain 21. Greece 22. Guatemala 23. Haiti	24. Honduras 25. Hungary 26. India 27. Italy 28. Japan 29. Liberia 30. Luxemburg 31. Netherlands 32. N. Zealand 33. Nicaragua 34. Norway 35. Panama 36. Peru 37. Poland 38. Portugal 39. Roumania 40. Salvador 41. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Kingdom of 42. Siam 43. Spain 44. Sweden 45. Uruguay 46. Venezuela	1. Africa, S. 2. Australia 3. Austria 4. Belgium 5. Bolivia 6. Brazil 7. Bulgaria 8. Canada 9. China 10. Cuba 11. Czecho-slovakia <del>12. Danzig</del> 13. Denmark 14. Finland 15. France 16. Gt. Britain 17. Greece 18. Guatemala 19. Haiti 20. Honduras 21. Hungary 22. India 23. Italy 24. Japan 25. Liberia	26. Luxemburg 27. Netherlands 28. New Zealand 29. Nicaragua 30. Norway 31. Panama 32. Peru 33. Poland 34. Portugal 35. Roumania 36. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Kingdom of 37. Siam 38. Spain 39. Sweden 40. Uruguay 41. Venezuela	1. Chile 2. Salvador <i>S. Danzig. *</i> <i>Dg</i>	1. Argentine 2. Colombia 3. Costa Rica 4. Esthonia 5. Latvia 6. Lithuania 7. Paraguay 8. Persia 9. Switzerland	1. Albania	1. America, U. S. of 2. Germany	1. Ecuador	1. Dominican Republic 2. Mexico 3. Monaco 4. Russia	1. Abyssinia 2. Afghanistan 3. Lichtenstein 4. Turkey

\* Danzig is not a Member of the League but is under its special protection.

Appendix 1

I. LIST OF DEPARTMENTS IN THE DIFFERENT COUNTRIES AUTHORISED TO ISSUE IMPORT CERTIFICATES, RECEIVED UP TO DATE.

<i>Albania</i>	Direction générale de la Santé, Tirana.	
<i>Australia</i>	Collector of Customs in each State.	
<i>Austria.</i>	Ministère fédéral pour l'administration sociale, Département pour l'hygiène, Vienne.	
<i>Belgium</i>	Ministère de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, Bruxelles.	
<i>Bulgaria</i>	Direction de la Santé publique auprès du ministère de l'Intérieur du Royaume.	
<i>Canada</i>	Department of Health Ottawa.	
<i>Denmark</i>	Direction de la Santé publique, ministère de la Justice.	
<i>Great Britain</i>	Home Office, London.	
<i>India:</i>		
1. Madras	Board of Revenue, Separate Revenue	Madras
2. Bombay	Commissioner in Sind. Political Resident	Province of Sind; Aden Bombay Town et Island.
	Collector of Bombay Commissioner of Customs Salt and Excise	Rest of the Residency
3. Bengal	Excise Commissioner	Bengal
4. Burma	Excise Commissioner	Burma
5. Bihar and Orissa	Commissioner of Excise.	Bihar and Orissa
6. United Provinces	Excise Commissioner	United Provinces
7. Punjab	Secretary of the Financial Commissioners	Punjab
8. Central Provinces	Excise Commissioner	Central Provinces
9. Assam	Commissioner Assam Valley, Division, Gauhati	Assam Valley, Division
	Commissioner, Surma Valley and Hill Division Silchar	Surma Valley and Hill Division
	Political Officer Sadiya Political Officer Balipara	Sadiya Frontier Tract Balipara Frontier Tract
10. North West Frontier	Political Agent in Manipur Revenue Commissioner	Manipur North-West Frontier Province
11. Delhi	Chief Commissioner	Delhi
12. Ajmer-Merwara	Commissioner	Ajmer-Merwara
13. Goorg	Commissioner	Coorg
14. Baluchistan	The Revenue Commission	Baluschitan Quetta
<i>Japan</i>	Home Office Tokio	
<i>Latvia</i>	Pharmaceutical Section of Health Department	
<i>Luxemburg</i>	Service sanitaire	
<i>New Zealand</i>	Comptroller of Customs	
<i>Norway</i>	Ministère des Affaires sociales	
<i>Poland</i>	Ministère de l'Hygiène publique.	
<i>Siam</i>	Ministry of Finance (Smoking Opium), Department of Public Health (Medicinal Opium).	
<i>Sweden</i>	Direction générale des Services médicaux de Suède.	
<i>Union of South Africa</i>	Department of Public Health Union Building, Pretoria.	

2. LIST OF DEPARTMENTS AUTHORISED IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES TO EXCHANGE INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO SEIZURES OF DRUGS RECEIVED UP TO DATE.

<i>Albania</i>	Direction de la Santé publique, Tirana
<i>Australia</i>	Department of Trade et Customs, Melbourne
<i>Austria</i>	Volkgesundheitsrat im Bundesministerium für soziale Verwaltung, Wien 1, Hofgartenstrasse 3.
<i>Belgium</i>	Ministère des Finances, Administration des contributions directes, douanes et accise.
<i>Brazil</i>	Departamento Nacional de Sande Publica, Buenos Ayres.
<i>Canada</i>	Deputy Minister Department of Health, Ottawa.
<i>Chile</i>	Dirección General de Sanidad, Santiago.
<i>Denmark</i>	Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Copenhague.
<i>Finland</i>	Bureau de la Société des Nations du ministère finlandais des Affaires étrangères.



<i>France</i>	Direction des Affaires administratives et techniques (Sous-Direction des Unions) ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris.
<i>Germany</i>	Reichgesundheitsamt, Berlin.
<i>Great Britain</i>	Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, London.
<i>Greece</i>	Ministère de l'Agriculture, Athènes.
<i>Hungary</i>	Ministère Royal hongrois de la Prévoyance sociale et du Travail, Budapest.
<i>Italy</i>	Ministerio degli Interni Direzione Generale di Sanita.
<i>Latvia</i>	Département de l'Hygiène publique du ministère de l'Intérieur.
<i>New Zealand</i>	Comptroller of Customs, Wellington, N. Z.
<i>Roumania</i>	Direction générale du Service sanitaire, ministère royal du Travail et de la Santé publique
<i>Kingdom of the Serbes, Croats and Slovenes</i>	Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Section pour la Société des Nations, Belgrade.
<i>Siam</i>	Foreign Office, Bangkok.
<i>Spain</i>	Ministerio de Estado Oficina Española de la Sociedad de las Naciones, Madrid.
<i>Union of South Africa</i>	Secretary for Public Health, Dept. Of Public Health, Union Building Pretoria.

Appendice 2.

PARTICULARS OF SEIZURES REPORTED TO THE SECRETARIAT DURING THE PAST YEAR.

*St. Nazaire.*

In answer to an enquiry by the Secretariat regarding the seizures of drugs at St-Nazaire by the French Authorities, on the ships coming from Santander, the Spanish Government telegraphed on February 13th. 1923, asking for fuller particulars re date of sailings, names of vessels, description of labels, etc. A telegram was despatched in reply, stating that the Secretariat was approaching the French Government asking it to forward the desired information to the Spanish Government direct. A letter was also sent to the French Government, dated March 2nd, 1923, on the subject, and the Spanish Government notified. No more information has as yet been received on this particulars eizure.

*Santander.*

The Spanish Government informed the Secretariat in a letter dated March 7th., 1923, that the Spanish Authorities had lately seized at the Port of Santander the following drugs:

Opium	25 kilos
Morphia	} 400 bottles weighing 15 kilos.
Heroin	
Cocaine	

Part of these drugs came from a factory at Lyons and part from Germany.

*Barcelona.*

An enquiry had been instituted by the Spanish Government, at Barcelona, to discover the illicit traffickers, believed to be carrying on their trade from this port. The result of this enquiry has been the seizure of 500 kilos of opium, and fines have been imposed on several people, amounting to 6.800 pesetas. Three of these people have been committed for trial.

*Canada.*

The Canadian Government on January 9th, 1923, informed the Secretariat of a large seizure of drugs emanating from Switzerland. The shipment was forwarded by Messrs. Goth et Co., of Bâle, who acted merely as forwarding agents, and was packed and invoiced as Cocoa Powder. The total seizure was as follows:

52 8 1/2 lb packages morphine cubes	442 lbs
18 6 1/2 lb packages heroin	117 lbs
10 6 1/2 packages cocaine	65 lbs

There were four previous shipments which, in the opinion of the Canadian Government, presumably contained narcotics also. They were all consigned to fictitious companies and the first four delivered on the strength of a false "power of attorney." This information was communicated to the Swiss Government who replied that enquiries were being made. Partly as an outcome

of the publicity given to these seizures, the Swiss papers have lately been strongly urging the Swiss Government to ratify the Convention and take a strong line against this illicit traffic. A letter was received from the "Chambre Syndicale des Fabricants suisses de Chocolat" asking for particulars as they feared this kind of traffic might injure the chocolate trade. A reply was sent to the "Chambre Syndicale" referring them to the Swiss Government to whom all information in the possession of the Secretariat had been sent. A copy of the letter from the "Chambre Syndicale" was also forwarded to the Swiss Government, with a copy of the Secretary-General's reply.

*Saint Pierre et Miquelon.*

On January 13th, 1923, the Canadian Government informed the Secretariat that smuggling of narcotic drugs was being carried on from S. Pierre into Canada, the drugs being shipped from Germany to France, via Spain and then from France to S. Pierre. Further that French steam trawlers carry narcotic drugs from France to S. Pierre calling during the summer months at the ports of Sydney and N. Sydney and presumably landing the narcotics there. A reply was despatched to Canada stating that the French, Spanish and German Governments were being communicated with, but pointing out that without further details such as the name of the vessels, shipment in Spain and France, trade mark or name of manufacturer, it would be difficult to trace such shipments or ascertain their source. The Canadian Government replied that they had no further information. The Governments of France and Spain and the German Representative on the Advisory Committee were communicated with.

*Patras.*

A letter was sent to the Greek representative in Geneva, on August 11th, 1922, stating that from information received cocaine was apparently obtainable from small boats in the port of Patras. On March 29th, the Greek representative wrote stating that very strict measures were now being taken at Patras to combat the illicit traffic there. A minute inspection of all passenger's luggage was made in the Customs and also a strict survey of all the small boats plying between the shore and the larger vessels. A guard was placed on all the steam-ships up to the moment of their departure to ensure control. The local authorities had been warned, and there was every reason to believe that the most scrupulous care would be taken in the future to prevent further contravention of the law.

*China.*

The following tables of Statistics of seizures of narcotics made in China during the year 1922 by the Chinese Customs Administration show that individual seizures of narcotics have been made in very large quantities. Individual seizures of 1,120 lbs of heroin, of 3,450 ounces of heroin and of a secret consignment of 224 lbs have been made in China. Many of these seizures were of unlabelled narcotics and the Shanghai Commissioner's despatch of December 29th, 1922, to the Inspector General of Customs contains the suggestion that "all drugs and chemicals imported into China should be clearly labelled and bear the name and address of the manufacturer." This suggestion which the Inspector General recommends to the League for consideration is practically identical with the suggestion already made that containers should be distinctly marked and numbered so as to facilitate tracing from the time they actually leave the factory until finally used for medical or veterinary purposes. The Shanghai Customs Transport Officer states that "two large seizures of unlabelled narcotics have been made by the Shanghai Customs and it would appear that certain unprincipled firms of manufacturing chemists in Central Europe are specially manufacturing Morphia and Heroin for illicit importation into China. Labels are omitted so that, if the drugs are discovered by the Customs, the manufacturer's name remains unknown."

CHINESE MARITIME CUSTOMS.

*List of Drugs confiscated by the Chinese Maritime Customs during 1922.*

	Tons	Cwt.	Qrs.	Lbs.	Ozs.
Opium, Native . . . . .	27	4	2	13	
"    Foreign . . . . .	3	6	2	9	
"    Dross. . . . .	0	0	1	18	
Morphia . . . . .	0	4	3	23	
Cocaine and Heroine . . . . .	0	3	2	14	
Heroin . . . . .	0	13	0	12	8
Poppy Seed . . . . .	2	10	1	5	

Preparations containing Opium, Morphia, etc. Value: Hk. Tls. 8,824.

LIST OF SEIZURES MADE BY CHINESE CUSTOMS DURING THE YEAR 1922.

Opium (Raw).	Opium prepared.	Opium Ashes.	Poppy Seeds.	Morphia.	Cocaine.	Heroin.	Codeine.
77.056 OZS.	754 OZS.	174 OZS.	1,320 lbs.	40,006 OZS.	212 OZS.	1,906 OZS.	1 1/3 OZS.
Morphia Pills.	Morphia injections.	Morphia and Chintan Pdes.	Drugs (nature not given.)	Anti-Opium Pills.	Hypoderim Syringes.	Opium Lamps.	
1) 812 bags each containing 10,000 pills. 2) 329,449 pills. 3) 848 ozs.	5 doz. phials	13,866 OZS.	529 OZS.	3613.50 taels worth	1,189	1) Six 2) 97.1 taels worth	

Tables giving full details of these seizures are in the possession of the Secretariat and can be seen if desired.

Annex 4.

APPLICATION OF PART II OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

GENEVA,

May 11th 1923.

*Memorandum by the Secretariat, together with Tables recording Movements of Raw and Prepared Opium as well as Morphia, Heroin, Cocaine, etc., in the European Possessions and Countries in the Far East.*

Chapter II of the International Opium Convention defines "prepared opium" as "the product of raw opium, obtained by a series of special operations especially by dissolving, boiling, roasting and fermentation, designed to transform it into an extract suitable for consumption. Prepared opium includes dross and all other residues remaining when opium has been smoked".

This Chapter contains three articles, which read as follows:

*Article 6.*

"The Contracting Powers shall take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in, and use of, prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence.

*Article 7.*

"The Contracting Powers shall prohibit the import and export of prepared opium; those Powers, however, which are not yet ready to prohibit immediately the export of prepared opium shall prohibit it as soon as possible.

*Article 8.*

"The Contracting Powers which are not yet ready to prohibit immediately the export of prepared opium:

"(a) Shall restrict the number of towns, ports, or other localities through which prepared opium may be exported.

“(b) Shall prohibit the export of prepared opium to countries which now forbid, or which may hereafter forbid, the import thereof.

“(c) Shall, in the meanwhile, prohibit the consignment of prepared opium to a country which desires to restrict its entry, unless the exporter complies with the regulations of the importing country.

“(d) Shall take measures to ensure that every package exported containing prepared opium, bears a special mark indicating the nature of its contents.

“(e) Shall not permit the export of prepared opium except by specially authorised persons.”

In view of the wording of the definition of “prepared opium” as given in Chapter II of the Convention, it might be considered that any statistics intended to show the extent of the application of the provisions contained in that part of the Convention should include figures covering, not only opium prepared for smoking, but also opium for “consumption” whether by eating or smoking. However, in a report of the British Delegation to the International Opium Conference at The Hague, it is stated that:

“It may be added that, apart from this particular point, the definitions as they now stand follow the broad lines between opium eaten and opium smoked which has always been adopted in India. Opium which is eaten is ‘raw’ opium, while smoking preparations are ‘prepared’ opium.”

The figures in this memorandum, therefore, on prepared opium deal purely with opium prepared for smoking. No attempt has been made to touch upon what might be considered “the varying circumstances of each country concerned” beyond reproducing any information which has been found either in the replies to the Questionnaire or in the Annual Reports sent in by the various Governments. In some cases, such as China, no information is available concerning the amount of illicit opium smoking, whilst in the Leased Territory of Kwantung, where opium is not sold in the form of prepared opium but as raw opium and “prepared” for smoking subsequent to sale, no figures are available of the actual amount of prepared opium used for smoking. The following information is available concerning the European Possessions and countries in the Far East.

#### British North Borneo.

Smokers are not registered, and with a population of some 208,000 inhabitants, British North Borneo is credited with a total consumption of 7,729 kilos during the year 1920.

In 1914, a government monopoly for the purchase and preparation and sale of *chandu* (opium prepared for smoking) was established. The consumption of prepared opium has increased from an average of 6,600 kilos per annum in the years 1914 to 1916 to an average of 8,400 kilos per annum in the years 1918 to 1920, that is to say by 27%, while the Chinese adult male population has increased from 30,200 in 1915 to 37,600 in 1919, an increase of 21.2% only. This increased consumption per head has taken place in spite of successive increases in the sale price. The largest packet of prepared opium now sold contains 5 hun (equivalent to 1/20 of a tael) and costs 47 1/2 cents, a price of \$ 9.50 per tael compared with \$ 12 in the Straits Settlements and \$ 14.50 in Hong-Kong. Opium may be smoked in licensed houses or privately.

The Court of Directors of the British North Borneo Company consider that the Chinese population, to which the consumption of opium is entirely confined, is in effect rationed at a very moderate rate.

#### Burma.

As far as prepared opium is concerned, the report on the Administration of the Excise Department in Burma during the year ended March 31st, 1921, states that “at the end of the year under report the preparation of opium in shops ceased and the simpler method of fixing fees foreshadowed in the last report was introduced for the current year.” Hitherto the position was similar to that in India except that the sale of Opium in Upper Burma for other than medical purposes is absolutely forbidden, while in Lower Burma opium could only be sold to such Burmans as were registered as opium consumers. The number of registered consumers has been reduced from 12,000 in 1912 to 5,405 in 1920.

In the report on the Administration of the Excise Department in Burma during the year ended the March 31st, 1920, it was stated that “should it be decided to cease preparing opium in opium shops, a simpler method of fixing the fees payable by licensed vendors may be possible.” This decision has now definitely been taken, it would therefore appear that the sale of prepared opium has ceased in Burma since the 31st March 1921. There appears to have been a systematic reduction of smokers by the elimination of Burman smokers, and a systematic revision of allowances of opium per consumer which tended to reduce issues, which fell 4,264 seers as compared with the issues for the year 1919-1920. The figure for the licit consumption per 100 of the population is less than one pound of opium per annum or an allowance per head of less than one-sixth of an ounce of opium.

The sales of Excise opium fell in 1921 to 37,946 kilos as against 41,924 kilos in the preceding year. These statistics are here recorded under prepared opium, but there is nothing to show that the actual Excise opium issued was, at the time of issue, in the form of prepared opium; it has not therefore been made to figure in the table of prepared opium.

### Ceylon.

A decrease in sales both of eating and of prepared opium occurred in 1921, sales of the former having decreased from 5,950 lbs in the preceding year to 5,362 lbs in 1921; whilst the sales of prepared opium fell from a total of 713 lbs in 1920 to 675 in 1921. Decrease in consumption has followed upon the reduction of consumers through the death of a certain number of them, revision of the register of consumers and the reduction of the amount allowed to be purchased. The total number of persons who use only prepared opium has come down from 780 in 1920 to 690, approximately, in 1921.

There is no export of prepared opium from Ceylon.

### China.

There is no official data available of the clandestine manufacture, internal traffic in, and use of prepared opium in China, which is still forbidden by law.

### Dutch East Indies.

The statistics concerning the Dutch East Indies seem to show that the actual amount of raw opium imported has not only increased so that in 1920 the imports amounted to 172,932 kilos as against 115,907 kilos in 1916 and against an average for the six preceding years of 132,771 kilos, but an actual increase in the quantities of prepared opium manufactured is recorded in Table VII, O. C. 13 (W2).

This table shows that the quantity of prepared opium manufactured during the seven years 1914 to 1920 was:

	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920
Kilos	112,990	86,133	82,310	105,946	84,528	86,489	126,817

This gives an increase in 1920 of 54% over the figures for 1916 and of 41% over the average — *i. e.* 93,066 kilos — for the six preceding years. During the year 1920 the actual consumption of prepared opium amounted to 100,665 kilos as compared with an average consumption during the six preceding years of 92,712 kilos, showing an increase of consumption amounting to some 8 per cent.

### Federated Malay States.

The import figures for the year 1921 show an importation of prepared opium of 74,953 lbs but 2,108 lbs of this consisted of damaged *chandu* returned at various times during the year for re-preparation, leaving a net import of 72,845 lbs. Imports are from the Straits Settlements, which as the supplier to both the Federated and Unfederated Malay States reflects the position as to increase or decrease: the recorded figures of Straits Settlements consumption of prepared opium show that in the Straits Settlements the consumption rose from 138,163 lbs in 1910 to 151,322 lbs in 1920, showing a net quantitative increase of 13,159 lbs. A system of registration of opium smokers does not seem to be in operation. Converted into kilos, the consumption of opium shows that there were 33,111 kilos consumed amongst a population of 1,036,000 inhabitants or 32 grammes per head.

### Formosa.

From the reply received from the Japanese Government relative to the quantities of prepared opium manufactured in Formosa, it is seen that the quantities manufactured decreased from 233,654 lbs in 1910 to 143,975 lbs in 1920 which, figure converted into kilos, shows a total of 106,211 kilos as against 65,443 kilos in 1920. It may be worth recording that the manufacture of morphia has increased correspondingly with the decrease in manufacture of prepared opium, having risen from a nil recorded production in 1914 to some 3,644 kilos in 1920.

The consumption of prepared opium would appear to be limited and restricted to recognised opium addicts, new permits to smoke being refused.

There are regulations providing for the punishment of those who use prepared opium without permission. The actual amount consumed during 1920 was slightly in excess of the amount actually produced amounting to 66,517 kilos for a population of some 3,654,000 inhabitants or an average consumption of some 18.2 grammes *per capita*, whilst the number of consumers being 49,031 showed that the consumption amounted to 1.36 kilos per head of registered consumers.

The policy of gradual suppression is being pursued, licensed consumers decreasing from 169,064 in 1900 to 49,031 in 1920; non-issue of new licences and the decrease through deaths of registered smokers justify the assumption "that the complete suppression of licensed smokers may be effective within perhaps fifteen years."

### French Indo-China.

The figures for consumption during the year 1921 show that 73,211 kilos of prepared opium were consumed during the year, the estimated number of smokers being about 110,000 out of a population of 20,000,000 inhabitants.

A system of Government monopoly working very much on the lines of the Government monopoly of the Straits Settlements has gradually reduced its manufacture and sales of prepared opium with a result that the sales fell from 136,300 kilos in 1916 to 73,211 kilos in 1921, showing a quantitative reduction of 42% over a period of five years.

Compared with the figures for the years 1911, 1912, 1913, the consumption for the year 1921 shows an increase; similarly if compared with the figures for 1919 when the recorded consumption amounted to 57,000 kilos or with the figures for the year 1920 when the recorded consumption amounted to 63,000 kilos, the figures for 1921 show an increase of consumption. The year 1916, with which the comparison is made, is the one which shows the highest recorded consumption during the last eleven years.

The following figures show the consumption during the last eleven years in kilos:

1910 . . . . .	77,741
1911 . . . . .	62,728
1912 . . . . .	67,564
1913 . . . . .	68,428
1914 . . . . .	72,842
1915 . . . . .	75,466
1916 . . . . .	140,229
1917 . . . . .	113,461
1918 . . . . .	114,700
1919 . . . . .	57,000
1920 . . . . .	63,000
1921 . . . . .	73,211

This gives an average annual consumption for the period 1910-1920 inclusive of some 83,000 kilos and for the four years 1912 to 1915 inclusive an average of 71,075 kilos.

The consumption for 1921 works out, therefore, to an allowance of 3,660 milligrammes per head.

### Hong-Kong.

The total sales of prepared opium during the year 1921 amounted to:

Prepared Bengal opium . . . . .	261,059.4 taels
Prepared Persian opium . . . . .	1,074.0 "
Dross opium . . . . .	672.0 "

equal to 9,954.545 kilos amongst a population numbering in all 625,166 inhabitants, of which, according to the census of 1921, 610,368 were Chinese.

The measures which are being taken for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in, and use of prepared opium are as follows: (1) The system of raising the selling price of opium; (2) the limiting of purchases to one tael (=1 1/3 ons) at a time, except in the case of certain registered persons who are allowed to buy three-tael tins; and (3) the limiting of the amount which an individual may have in his possession to five taels. Hong-Kong is ready and willing to co-operate in the suppression of the traffic and it will have no hesitation in accepting any financial sacrifice that may be entailed in making suppression effective.

The public smoking resorts known as "opium divans" were finally abolished in 1910 and in 1914 the monopoly, which had previously been farmed out, was taken by the Government into its own hands.

The consumption of prepared opium per head amounts to some 16.3 grammes.

### India.

There are no statistics available either of the manufacture, sale or consumption of "prepared opium for smoking" in India and no Indian statistics, therefore, are included in this document, which deals solely with opium prepared for smoking.



**Japan.**

The use of prepared opium for smoking is prohibited.

**Korea.**

The importation and use of opium prepared for smoking are prohibited.

**Leased Territory of Kwantung.**

It would appear that the opium sold as prepared opium is actually prepared by the retailer and there are no statistics available of prepared opium.

**Macao.**

The figures available are those for the year 1920 and show that 20,500 kilos of prepared opium were manufactured in the Colony, of which 9,500 were exported to Chile, leaving available for consumption some 10,900 kilos. Of this amount 10,622 were actually consumed during the year in the Colony, whose population is 74,000. This shows the average consumption to be 147,297 milligrammes or 2,266 grains per head.

**Siam.**

The recorded amount of prepared opium available for consumption during the year 1920/1921 amounted to 70,054 kilos, which is in excess of the amount recorded as actually consumed during the years 1911, 1915 and 1919. The number of smokers is estimated to be 200,000 in a population of 9,121,000 inhabitants and the average consumption per smoker during the year 1920/1921 would appear to be 350,220 milligrammes or 7,680 milligrammes per head for the whole population. This would be equal to an allowance per head of 120 grains.

The statistics furnished by the Siamese Government for the years 1910-1911 to 1919-1920 show that, whilst the actual quantity of prepared opium consumed in Siam cannot be given, the quantity sold annually in the interior of the country is as follows:

	Kilos
1910-1911 . . . . .	67,296
1911-1912 . . . . .	70,677
1912-1913 . . . . .	74,293
1913-1914 . . . . .	76,421
1914-1915 . . . . .	71,421
1915-1916 . . . . .	68,023
1916-1917 . . . . .	71,466
1917-1918 . . . . .	76,693
1918-1919 . . . . .	69,743
1919-1920 . . . . .	71,281

**Straits Settlements.**

The manufacture, sale and distribution of prepared opium or *chandu* was made a Government monopoly from January 1st, 1910. The Government has made use of its monopoly since 1910 to discourage the smoking of *chandu* by gradually reducing the number of licensed opium smoking-room licences, which in 1922 numbered 211 as against 503 on December 31st, 1909, and by successive increases in the price of *chandu* wholesale and retail. The wholesale price was raised successively from \$ 3 to \$ 4.36 per tael in April 1910, and to \$ 5 in May 1912, \$ 6 in February 1913, \$ 8 in April 1916, \$ 10 in November 1916, and \$ 12 in October 1920.

At the beginning of 1920 an attempt was made to reduce the consumption of prepared opium by introducing a system of rationing whereby retailers were supplied with only 90% of their former average purchases. Great dissatisfaction was produced owing to hoarding and profiteering, which were natural results of the system. The attempt was abandoned at the end of April.

The figures for local manufacture of prepared opium show that the amount manufactured during the year 1920 was 170,000 kilos as against 163,000 during the previous year. 98,000 kilos were exported during the year 1920 to the Federated Malay States and the Unfederated Malay States, leaving a balance available for consumption in the Straits Settlements of 72,000 kilos and of these some 68,782 kilos were actually consumed amongst a population numbering some 881,000.

The figures supplied of the manufacture and consumption of prepared opium in the Straits Settlements for the years 1910 to 1920 are as follows :

Year	MANUFACTURE (in lbs)	CONSUMED (in lbs)
1910	323,633	138,163
1911	393,635	148,209
1912	414,579	141,926
1913	382,459	125,338
1914	309,065	117,688
1915	328,071	121,644
1916	353,938	121,551
1917	293,444	108,524
1918	335,038	131,255
1919	359,848	141,728
1920	370,688	151,322

During the same period the actual amount of prepared opium exported from the Straits Settlements to Johore, Selangor, Kedah, Perlis, Langkawi, Kuantan, Brunei, Kelantan, Trengganu and Perak amounted to :

#### EXPORTS

	lbs.
1910 . . . . .	101,806
1911 . . . . .	264,081
1912 . . . . .	274,767
1913 . . . . .	240,005
1914 . . . . .	194,728
1915 . . . . .	216,213
1916 . . . . .	225,429
1917 . . . . .	195,078
1918 . . . . .	221,815
1919 . . . . .	228,665
1920 . . . . .	216,385

It will be seen, therefore, that the methods adopted to obtain a reduction of consumption have not had the desired results inasmuch as there has been an increase of both manufacture and consumption since the coming into effect of the Government monopoly.

#### Tsing-Tao.

The amount of prepared opium manufactured during the year 1921 amounted to 1,578 kilos, none of which appears to have been exported, and 1,175 kilos of which were actually consumed amongst the registered smokers, which number 3,113 out of a total population of 211,000. A law was enforced from, January 1st 1921, aiming at complete suppression within five years. The only licensed smokers are Chinese and as their numbers diminish every year and no new licences are issued the object of the new law, namely gradual and effective suppression of opium smoking, seems likely to be realised.

The present consumption works out to an annual allowance of some 377,770 grammes per licensed smoker or 5.567 milligrammes per head of population representing an allowance per head of 97 grains.

#### Unfederated Malay States.

The supplies of prepared opium received in the Unfederated Malay States amounted to 20,991 kilos. These supplies originated in the Straits Settlements and represent the net amount available for consumption for a population of 984,000 inhabitants; this is equal to an allowance of 21,332 milligrammes per head of population representing an allowance per head of 348 grains of prepared opium.

## MOVEMENTS OF OPIUM, OPIUM DERIVATIVES AND COCAINE IN EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

The following summary of the movements of raw and prepared opium as well as of the movements for opium derivatives and cocaine in the European Possessions and countries in the Far East has been compiled from the statistics available. These statistics have been, wherever possible, extracted from the latest annual report received. No figures of stocks either at the beginning or end of the year are available. Attention is also drawn to the fact that the narcotic value or contents of opium shown in the statistics for raw opium, may later appear in the statistics for opium derivatives.

### RAW OPIUM.

The only countries or possessions which are shown as opium-producing countries for which statistics of production have been received are: Formosa, India, Indo-China, Japan, Korea and Siam, and the total production — taking the year 1921 where available and 1920 whenever no later report has been received — amounts to 564,155 kilos.

After deducting exports and re-exports from the total of imports plus production, there remained available for internal consumption in the various European Possessions and countries in the Far East 1,116,445 kilos of raw opium which was either consumed in the form of prepared opium or used for the manufacture of alkaloids. These figures show an average allowance of 1,170 milligrammes, or nearly 18½ grains per head. They do not, however, actually represent the average consumption per head. Account must be taken of the alkaloids which have in part been manufactured from such opium. The recorded amount of opium used for the manufacture of alkaloids was 56,648 kilos, which, if deducted from 1,116,445 kilos, leaves a net balance available for internal consumption in the form of opium of 1,059,797 kilos. This, again, cannot be considered as having been consumed purely in the form of opium either prepared for smoking, or eating as a small amount of such opium must have entered into the composition of medical preparations, although no particulars are available. No separate returns can be compiled of the amount used for veterinary purposes. Statistics of Korean imports are not available.

### PREPARED OPIUM.

The total imports plus manufacture of prepared opium in the European Possessions, and countries in the Far East amounted to 584,568 kilos—which, after deducting the exports, which amounted to 107,600 kilos, 476,968 kilos were left available for internal consumption amongst a total population of 954,486,000. Amongst the exports registered, 9,600 kilos were reported to have been exported out of the Far East. Again, the absence of data relative to stocks on hand at the beginning and end of the year and the absence of figures relative to China have to be recorded.

### MORPHIA.

#### *Importation of Morphia.*

Japan, with a population of 77,005,000, imports 5,926.719 kilos of morphia, thus showing the largest importation amongst the sixteen countries or Possessions in the Far East, the next largest importer being French Indo-China with 166 kilos.

#### *Manufacture.*

The manufacture of morphia is only recorded in Formosa, Japan, Korea and India, the three former manufacturing 9,230.481 kilos out of a total of 9,678.581 kilos, the amount manufactured in India during 1920 being 448.1 kilos.

#### *Imports plus manufacture of Morphia.*

Formosa, Japan and Korea show under this heading a grand total of 15,157.2 kilos, whilst the figures for India under this heading remain the same as the Indian figures of manufacture, *i. e.* 448.1 kilos.

#### *Exports including re-exports.*

The only exports registered of any importance are the exports from India, which amount to 340.9 kilos out of 448.1 manufactured, the Japanese combined exports and re-exports registering

only 5.303 kilos. The Japanese returns, unless the contrary is stated, do not take account of internal trade between Japan and her territorial possessions Formosa, Korea and part of Sakhalin. In the case of morphia, however, both Formosa and Korea are themselves manufacturers.

#### MEDICINAL OPIUM.

No special features are to be noted amongst the statistics relating to medicinal opium; 2,316 kilos represent the total of imports plus manufacture on all the European possessions and countries in the Far East. Of this amount 2,103 kilos represent the total of Japanese imports plus Japanese manufacture.

#### HEROIN.

##### *Imports and manufacture of Heroin.*

With the exception of 2 kilos recorded as imports during 1920 in China, the only other recorded imports are 125 kilos into the Leased Territory of Kwantung during the same period and 1,099 kilos imported into Japan in 1921 during which year that country manufactured 2,838 kilos of heroin.

##### *Exports.*

The only exports of heroin recorded amount to 4.073 kilos, leaving 3,933.668 kilos in Japan available for internal consumption in Japan proper and her territorial possessions.

#### CODEINE.

The statistics recording the imports of codeine show that the total imports into the Far East amount to 77 kilos, to which must be added 30 kilos manufactured in Japan. More than two-thirds of the recorded imports took place in the Leased Territory of Kwantung, the figures for imports being those for 1920, whilst those of manufacture are for 1921.

#### COCAINE.

##### *Imports.*

The total imports of cocaine including salts of cocaine into the European possessions and countries in the Far East amounted to 2,177 kilos, of which 2,132 kilos were imported into Japan, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and Tsingtao, the difference, some 43 kilos, being imported amongst the other countries and Possessions.

##### *Manufacture of Cocaine.*

The only country recorded as manufacturing cocaine in the Far East is Japan, which is recorded as having manufactured 2,324.700 kilos of cocaine. The total recorded imports of crude cocaine into Japan for the purpose of manufacture of cocaine amounted during the year 1921 to 1,530 kilos. As the amount actually manufactured was 2,324 kilos, it would seem that either crude cocaine was reaching Japan from some of her territorial Possessions which are not recorded as imports, or that stocks of crude cocaine existing at the beginning of the year were utilised for the manufacture of cocaine, or that manufacture from the coca leaf exists.

##### *Exports.*

Of the 4,387 kilos of cocaine representing the total imports plus manufacture, 17 kilos are recorded as having been exported, the balance, 4,370 kilos remaining available for internal consumption or export to the Japanese Possessions. There remained in Japan, therefore, after deduction of exports, 4,370 kilos of cocaine available for a population which, including that of the Japanese Territorial Possessions, amounted to 99,000,000 inhabitants.

---

# Raw Opium Statistics.

## EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally produced (Kilos)	Imports plus production (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption or manufacture of alkaloids (Kilos)	Estim. annual requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO	1920	12,364 4,772	India Persia	17,136		17,136		17,136			208	Figures included in Indian statistics. Sold in 1920, 39,709 kilos.
BURMA	1920	17,136										
CEYLON	1921	5,115	India	5,115	—	5,115	—	5,115			4,504	Including 25 kilos of seized opium.
CHINA	1920	—	—	—	Total illicit production unknown	—	—	—			436,094	No legal import, production or export.
DUTCH EAST INDIES	1920	172,932	India	172,932	—	172,932	—	172,932			49,161	
FEDERATED MALAY STATES	1921	—	—	—	—	—	—	—			1,036	No direct imports. Supplies received from Straits Settlements
INDIA	1920	—	—	—	549,818	549,818	669,582	Balance of reserve stock not stated		4,481*	319,075	* Estimated from quantity of morphia manufactured. Excess of exports over production due to balance of stock in hand at beginning of year.
JAPAN	1921	3,551 4,276 3,074 1,091	New York Constantin. Marseilles Formosa	11,992	4,898	16,890	—	16,890		15,722	77,005	Imports are all Turkish opium. Export of opium is prohibited.
KOREA	1920	11,992										
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG	1920	8,100	Persia	8,100	—	8,100	—	8,100			17,264	No information is given as to imports of opium.
MACAO	1920	40,320	India via Hong-Kong	40,320	—	40,320	—	40,320			600	As against 3,580 kilos in 1912.
SIAM	1920-1921	120,700 7,321	India China (Yunnan)	128,021	4,500	132,521	—	132,521	118,000		9,121	The production is but estimated and corresponds to the 1917 figures. The estimated requirements are for the use of smokers.
		128,021										

Raw Opium Statistics (continued).  
EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally produced (Kilos)	Imports plus production (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption or manufacture of alkalooids (Kilos)	Estim. annual requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	984	No direct imports.
FORMOSA . . . . .	1920	8,189 8,776 21,945 31,111 88,760	Hong-Kong India Persia England U. S. A.	158,781	84	158,865	—	158,865	—	36,445 *	3,654	As against 78,095 kilos in 1912 and an average annual import during the preceding ten years of 86,568 kilos.  * Calculated from morphia production figures.
HONG-KONG . . . . .	1920	65,527 6,788 31,060	India Turkey Persia	103,375	—	103,375	121a 41,891b 44,818c	16,545	—	—	625	(a) to Great Britain. (b) to Macao. (c) to Japan.
		103,375	86,830									
	1921	13,481 26,297 39,778	Persia India	39,778	—	39,778	13,481d 19,647e	6,650	—	—	—	(d) to Formosa. (e) to Macao.
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .	1921	218,909 3,491	India Persia	222,400	—	222,400	7,224	215,176	266,050	—	881	Exported in the form of chandu to Xmas Island, 339 kilos. Includes requirements of Federated and Unfederated Malay States.
		222,400										
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	73 2,182	Turkey Persia	2,255	—	2,255	—	2,255	—	—	200	
		2,255										
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1920	1,048 117,200	China India	118,248	6,000	124,248	—	124,248	—	—	20,000	The production of opium is stated to be insignificant, and amount produced is bought by the Government.
		118,248										
	1921	335,630	—	335,630	average for 10 years 4,700	340,330	—	340,330	—	—	—	Provenance not stated. Quantity is considerably in excess of previous importations.



# Prepared Opium Statistics.

## EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually consumed (Kilos)	Estimated requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Number of registered smokers	Remarks
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO	1920	—	—	—	8,435	8,435	—	8,435	7,729	—	208	—	Smokers not registered.
BURMA . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13,000	5,405	Registered smokers in 1919. No statistics as to quantity used. Only statistics refer to excise opium issued to retailers for ultimate preparation.
CEYLON . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	3,818	3,818	—	3,818	—	—	4,504	688	Registered consumers, 10,645.
CHINA . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	436,094	—	No legitimate trade. Amount of illicit consumption unknown.
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	126,817	126,817	—	126,817	100,665	—	49,161	—	As against an average annual consumption during the six preceding years of 92,712 kilos. Number of consumers unknown.
FEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	33,111	Straits Settl.	33,111	—	33,111	—	33,111	—	—	1,036	—	Export prohibited.
FORMOSA . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	65,443	65,443	—	65,443	66,517	—	3,654	49,036	Excess of consumption over manufacture due to stock on hand.
HONG-KONG . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	10,975	10,975	—	10,975	—	—	625	—	Smokers not registered.
INDIA . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	10,205	10,205	—	10,205	9,955	—	—	—	—
INDIA . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	319,075	—	No statistics of prepared opium for smoking.
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	77,005	—	Opium-smoking prohibited.
KOREA . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17,264	—	Importation and use of prepared opium prohibited.
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	600	2,808	Manufacture by retailers. Quantity consumed unknown.
MACAO . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	20,500	20,500	9,600	10,900	10,622	—	74	—	It has been assumed that each chest of raw opium yields 40 kilos of prepared opium. The export is authorised and is said to have been to Chile.
SIAM . . . . .	1920/21	—	—	—	70,054	70,054	—	70,054	—	—	9,121	200,000	Number of smokers is estimated only
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS	1920	—	—	—	170,000	170,000	98,000	72,000	68,782	—	881	—	Consumed in 1911, 67,367 kilos.
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	1,578	1,578	—	1,578	1,175	—	211	3,113	Licensed smokers are Chinese. Suppression within 5 years aimed at; law to this effect enforced from January 1st, 1921.
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	20,991	Straits Settl.	20,991	—	20,991	—	20,991	—	—	984	—	Export prohibited.
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	53,616	53,616	—	53,616	63,000	—	20,000	110,000	—
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	73,211	—	20,000	110,000	Smokers are not registered. Reduced from 136,300 kilos in 1916. No other data available.

## Medicinal Opium Statistics.

### EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually consumed (Kilos)	Estimated annual requirements (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .	1920										208	No records available.
BURMA . . . . .	1920										13,000	Negligible.
CEYLON . . . . .	1921	8	England	8	—	8	—	8			4,504	
CHINA . . . . .	1920	13	Hongkong									
		40	Great Britain									
		<u>53</u>		53	—	—	—	53			436,094	
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .	1920										49,161	Negligible: no statistics.
FEDERATED MALAY STATES	1921										1,036	
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1921										20,000	Quantities nil.
FORMOSA . . . . .	1920										3,654	
HONG-KONG . . . . .	1920	—	—	—	182	182	—	182	376		625	For sale to local chemists.
INDIA . . . . .	1920										319,075	Medicinal opium is regulated as "opium".
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	720	England									
		45	Germany									
		<u>765</u>		765	1,338	2,103	—	2,103	472		77,005	Exports under 1 kilo.
KOREA . . . . .	1920										17,264	No manufacture. Supplies received from Japan proper. Sales amounted to 12 kilos.
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	20	Japan	20	—	20	—	20			600	
MACAO . . . . .	1920										74	No statistics given.
SIAM . . . . .	1920/21										9,121	Movement controlled: quantities imported negligible.
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .	1921										881	Imports, etc. nil.
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	3	Germany	3	—	3	—	3			200	Imports from Japan negligible.
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921										984	

# Morphia Statistics.

## EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Total estimated annual requirements for internal consumption reduced to morphine contents (Kilos)	Population	Remarks
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .	1920									208	No records available.
BURMA . . . . .	1919/1920										
CEYLON . . . . .	1921	4,545	England	4,545	—	4,545	—	4,545		4,504	
CHINA . . . . .	1920	25	Japan	25	—	25	—	25		436,094	Mainly from Japan. Manufacture in China prohibited.
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .	1920									49,161	Consumed, 0.277 kilos.
FEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	1	England	1	—	1	—	1	8	1,036	
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1920	63	Mostly from France		—		—			53,582	
" "	1921	166			—		—	166			
FORMOSA . . . . .	1920	—			3,644.5	3,644.5				3,654	Shipments to Japan not treated as exports. Actually consumed, 95.9 kilos. Balance presumably shipped to Japan. No manufacture previous to 1915.
HONG-KONG . . . . .	1920										No figures available.
INDIA . . . . .	1920	—			448.1	448.1	340.9	107.2		319,075	Actually consumed. Value of imports of preparations £4,572.
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	1,703,819 941,771 876,410 773,720 720,039 456,300 408,451 34,540 11,669	England Netherlands Belgium Germany Switzerland U. S. A. France Spain Unknown		1,951,874 3,091,907					77,005	Of the morphia manufactured, 3,091,907 kilos were manufactured from crude morphine imported from Formosa which is not included under imports. Exact statistics of quantity consumed in Japan unknown. Total crude morphia imported into Japan from Formosa, 7,484 kilos.
		5,926,719			5,043,781	10,970.5	5,303	10,965,197			

Morphia Statistics (continued).

EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Total estimated annual requirements for internal consumption reduced to morphine contents (Kilos)	Population	Remarks
KOREA . . . . .	1920				542.2	542.2				17,264	No records of imports available. No figures of imports given. There is no provision to punish the person who illegally owns or possesses morphine.
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	33	Various	33	—	33	—	33		600	From England, 10 kilos; from Germany, 10 kilos.
MACAO . . . . .	1920									74	No statistics given.
SIAM . . . . .	1920/1921								10	9,121	No records available; movement controlled; quantities negligible.
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .	1921									881	Negligible.
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	0.707 2.700	Japan Germany								
		3.407		3.407	—	3.407	—	3.407	—	200	Seizures during the year amounted to 79 lbs.
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	16.585	England	16.585	—	16.585	—	16.585	8	984	

# Heroin Statistics

## EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually consumed (Kilos)	Estimated requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
CHINA . . . . .	1920	2	Japan	2	—	2	—	2			436,094	Exact statistics as to quantity consumed in Japan proper are unknown. Of the heroin manufactured, 1,934 kilos were manufactured from crude morphine imported from Formosa which is not shown under morphia imports. Seizures during the year amounted to 99 lbs.
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	86.819 38.161 672.760 301.441 560	Germany Belgium Switzerland U. S. A. Unknown								77,005	
		1,099.741		1,099.741	2,838	3,937.741	4.073	3,933.668				
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	125	England	125	—	125	—	125			600	
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	4 2 6	Japan Germany	6	—	6	—	6			200	
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .												<p>No figures available ; presumably negligible.</p> <p>Negligible.</p> <p>There is no provision to punish the person who illegally owns or possesses morphine, cocaine or their salts.</p>
BURMA . . . . .												
FORMOSA . . . . .												
HONG-KONG . . . . .												
INDIA . . . . .												
MACAO . . . . .												
SIAM . . . . .												
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .												
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .												
CEYLON . . . . .												
FEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .												
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .												
KOREA . . . . .												

## Codein Statistics.

### EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Import (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactures (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually Consumed (Kilos)	Estimated requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
CEYLON . . . . .	1921	1,363	England	1,363	—	1,363	—	1,363			4,504	
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	—	—	—	30	30	—	30			77,005	Manufactured from crude morphia not entered as an import.
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	76	England	76	—	76	—	76			600	
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .	}	Negligible.										
BURMA . . . . .												
FEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .												
HONG-KONG . . . . .												
INDIA . . . . .												
SIAM . . . . .												
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .												
TSING-TAO . . . . .												
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .												
CHINA . . . . .	}	No statistics given; presumably negligible.										
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .												
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .												
FORMOSA . . . . .												
KOREA . . . . .												
MACAO . . . . .												



## Cocaine Statistics (including Salts of Codeine).

### EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufacture (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually consumed (Kilos)	Estimated requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .	1920										208	No figures available, may be taken as negligible.
BURMA . . . . .	1919-1920								4		13,000	Other data not available.
CEYLON . . . . .	1921	1,559	England	1,559	—	1,559	—	1,559	1,729		4,504	Difference due presumably to stocks on hand.
CHINA . . . . .	1920	7	England	7	—	7	—	7			436,094	Imports in small quantities mainly from England.
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .	1920										49,161	Figures for manufacture, consumption, etc., unknown.
FEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	1,361	England								1,036	
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1921	31	France	31	—	31	—	31			20,000	Provenance not stated, but is probably France.
FORMOSA . . . . .	1920								245		3,654	No imports from foreign countries.
HONG-KONG . . . . .	1920											Negligible.
INDIA . . . . .	1919-1920	3,194		3,194	—	3,194	—	3,194	18,615		319,075	Seized, 4.82 kilos, which should be added to imports.

Cocaine Statistics (including Salts of Codeine) (continued).

EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST

Country or Possession	Year	Imports (Kilos)	From	Total imports (Kilos)	Locally manufactured (Kilos)	Imports plus manufactured (Kilos)	Exports including re-exports (Kilos)	Available for internal consumption (Kilos)	Actually consumed (Kilos)	Estimated requirements for internal consumption (Kilos)	Population (in thousands)	Remarks
JAPAN . . . . .	1921	75.015	England	2,062.952	2,324.700	4,387.652	17.76	4,370.576			77,055	Imported under licence.
		305.055	France									
		450.180	Germany									
		12.513	U. S. A.									
842.763												
83.694	England	2,062.952	2,324.700	4,387.652	17.76	4,370.576				77,055	1,330 kilos of crude cocaine were imported from Peru and 200 kilos from Switzerland. Used for manufacture of cocaine, they are not included under Imports.	
134.905	France											
603.621	Germany											
159.879	Switzerland											
169.221	Netherlands											
66.549	Spain											
1.499	U. S. A.											
821	unknown											
1,220.189												
KOREA . . . . .	1920										17,264	No figures available. Importations from Japan proper through Government general.
LEASED TERRITORY OF KWANTUNG . . . . .	1920	65	England	65	—	65	—	65			600	
MACAO . . . . .	1920										74	No statistics given.
SIAM . . . . .	1920-1921										9,121	Movements controlled: quantities imported too small to record.
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .	1920	0.198	England	0.198	—	0.198	0.226				881	Excess of exports over imports probably due to stock on hand.
TSING-TAO . . . . .	1921	3.825	Japan	4.725	—	4.725	—	4.725	3.289		200	Consumption includes garrison hospitals.
		0.900	Germany									
UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES . . . . .	1921	0.5	Straits Settl.	0.5	—	0.5	—	0.5			984	

**Annex 5.**

---

STATEMENT  
ON THE MANUFACTURE OF MORPHIA, OTHER OPIUM DERIVATIVES  
AND COCAINE, WITH STATISTICAL TABLES.

---

GENEVA,  
May 11th 1923.

MEMORANDUM BY THE SECRETARIAT.

To enable a comparison between the total world production of morphia, other opium derivatives and cocaine, and the estimated world requirements of these drugs, the following statistical tables have been compiled from information received by the Secretariat.

The statistics received from the following countries are so small that no separate digest has been considered necessary :

ALBANIA, BELGIUM, BRITISH COLONIES, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, DENMARK, FINLAND, FRENCH COLONIES, INDIA, ITALY, KWANTUNG, LUXEMBURG, NEW ZEALAND, PANAMA, PERSIA, POLAND, SIAM, TSING-TAO, UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, VENEZUELA.

Fuller reports have, however, been received from :

AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, CANADA, GERMANY, GREAT BRITAIN, INDO-CHINA, JAPAN, SWITZERLAND AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

from which the following abstracts have been taken.

**Australia.**

Imports of morphine into Australia during the year 1921 amounted to 5,880 ozs, of which only 272 ozs are shown as re-exports, leaving an available balance of 5,608 ozs against an estimated annual requirement of 649 lbs or 10,384 ozs.

Heroin was imported to the extent of 3,099 ozs — of which three-fourths came from the United States of America and the balance from the United Kingdom; there is no manufacture and exports did not exceed 1 lb. The estimated annual requirements are given as 89 ½ lbs.

No figures are given of either imports or exports of codein; the estimated figures for internal consumption are given as 534 ozs.

The total imports for the year 1921 are given as 2,876 ozs, none of which was re-exported ; of this amount, 53 ounces were imported from the United States, 10 ounces from Holland and the balance from the United Kingdom. The estimated annual requirements are given as 11,660 ozs.

Dionin imports in 1921 amounted to 36 ozs, which appears to have been internally used, as no exports are recorded.

**Austria.**

The recorded imports of morphia during the year 1922 amounted to 196 kilos, of which 50 kilos were re-exported, leaving available for internal consumption during 1922 146 kilos.

The total imports of heroin during the same period did not exceed 4 kilos, of which 1 ½ kilos were re-exported, leaving 3 ½ kilos available for internal consumption.

The estimated requirements for morphia was 250 kilos, and for heroin 5 kilos. No figures are given for any other opium derivative. With an estimated annual requirement of 200 kilos, Austria imported, during the year 1922, 411 kilos of cocaine, of which 251 kilos were re-exported, leaving 160 kilos available for internal consumption.

**Canada.**

Morphia imports during the year 1922 amounted to 8,774 ozs; exports were negligible. There is apparently no manufacture of morphia in Canada. The annual requirements are estimated at 593 lbs.

There is no record of any import or manufacture of heroin. Recorded exports did not exceed 2 ozs. The estimated requirements were no less than 93 lbs.

No imports or exports of dionin are recorded. The estimated requirements are 6 lbs 4 ozs.

Imports of cocaine amounted to 2,952 ozs during the year. Exports were negligible and there was no manufacture.

#### Germany.

The actual report on the traffic in narcotics for the year 1921 has not been received, but from advance figures supplied it would appear that the manufacture of morphia in Germany amounted during the year to 7,422 kilos, which, added to the amount imported, *i. e.* 128 kilos, gives a gross amount of imports plus manufacture amounting to 7,550 kilos. Of these 2,257 kilos were exported. The amount remaining available for internal consumption was 5,293 kilos against an estimated requirement of 1,260 kilos.

Heroin was manufactured to the extent of 1,140 kilos during the year 1921; no figures for imports of heroin are given. Exports are recorded as 907 kilos. The estimated requirements are given as 40 kilos per annum, against which there remained 233 kilos available for internal consumption after deduction of exports. The codein manufactured is recorded as amounting to 3,000 kilos, but this amount included dionin and other drugs which are not specially legislated for.

The amount exported is not shown.

During the year, 51 kilos of cocaine were imported. The manufacture amounted to 6,302 kilos. Exports amounted to over 5,000 kilos, and the net amount remaining available, after deducting exports, was 1,062 kilos, against an estimated annual internal requirement of some 500 kilos.

#### Great Britain.

The preliminary statistics for the year 1922 on import, export, manufacture, etc., of dangerous drugs in the United Kingdom are stated to be provisional and subject to correction. The figures have been embodied in the accompanying tables.

The manufacture of morphine during the year amounted to 315,342 ozs as against 147,790 during the preceding year. Of this amount 184,775 ozs were used in the manufacture of heroin, codein, other alkaloids or derivatives of opium and morphine, and medicinal preparations. For the manufacture of codein 146,086 ozs of morphine were used during the year compared with 32,056 ozs during the preceding year. The amount of codein manufactured therefrom is not shown.

155,766 lbs of opium from various sources were used during the year in the manufacture of alkaloids of opium. Exports amounted to 48,382 lbs, total imports to 141,291 lbs.

In the manufacture of heroin 26,304 ozs of morphine and salts of morphine were used, from which 681 ozs of heroin and 30,992 ozs of salts of heroin were manufactured, or a combined total of 31,673 ozs.

The amount of heroin manufactured rose from 12,157 ozs in 1921 to 31,673 ozs in 1922. Exports rose from 1,504 ozs in 1921 to 25,911 ozs.

The only cocaine imported was refined cocaine or its salts. The total amount imported during the year 1922 was 7,412 ozs of refined cocaine. The amount imported contained in preparations, admixtures, etc., amounted to 63 ozs.

#### Indo-China.

No figures are available for 1922. The recorded imports of morphia during the year 1921 in Indo-China amounted to 166 kilos. There was no manufacture and no recorded exports. The whole amount imported remained available for internal consumption.

There was no importation of either codein or dionin. The total importations of cocaine during the year 1921 did not exceed 31 kilos, none of which was re-exported.

#### Japan.

The figures for imports of morphine show a considerable falling off. The recorded imports for 1922 show a total import for Japan, exclusive of her Territories, amounting to 308 kilos as against 5,927 kilos in 1921. The manufacture shows a decrease of more than 50% as compared with the preceding year, the figure being 2,066 kilos in 1922 as compared with 5,043 in the preceding year. The largest difference, however, is seen between the totals for imports plus manufacture; the figures recorded show 2,374 kilos for 1922 as against 10,970 kilos for 1921.

The import and manufacture of heroin have decreased. The total of imports plus manufacture was 493 kilos in 1922 against 3,937 in 1921; exports remained at the same figure, 4 kilos only being exported.

No figures of manufacture of codein are given. Its manufacture in 1921 was 30 kilos.

The figures for imports of cocaine into Japan, exclusive of her Territories, show a marked falling-off. 195 kilos were imported in 1922 as against 2,063 in the preceding year. Production shows an increase of 1,356 kilos; 3,680 kilos were manufactured during the year against 2,324 kilos in 1921. The total recorded exports for 1922 amount to 9 kilos. It should be noted that, unless the contrary is stated, the Japanese returns do not take account of internal trade between Japan and her territorial Possessions: Formosa, Chosen, and a part of Sakhalin.

### Switzerland.

Some 2,500 kilos of morphine were manufactured during the year 1921.

The total amount of heroin manufactured was 774 kilos. The amount of alkaloids, not specifically enumerated, manufactured during the same year was some 200 kilos. This figure is reached by taking the quantity of opium used in manufacture.

During the year 1921, 881 kilos of cocaine were imported; 732 kilos were manufactured during the same period. No exports or re-exports are recorded. The amount given as actually consumed in 1921 is 255 kilos.

### United States of America.

The amount of cocaine manufactured during the year 1922 shows a decrease as compared with the preceding year. 58,000 ozs were manufactured in 1922 against 81,000 in 1921. The total for imports plus manufacture shows a decrease for the year as compared with 1921 of 19,000 ozs.

The imports of morphia rose from 317 ozs in 1921 to 2,124 ozs in 1922, but the manufacture fell from 321,715 ozs in 1921 to 183,671 ozs in 1922: exports remained stationary at about 2,500 ozs.

Heroin shows, under the heading imports plus manufacture, an increase over the preceding year. The total for 1922 was 18,300 ozs against 16,600 in 1921: exports amounted to 1,100 ozs and the amount remaining available for internal consumption was about the same as that for the preceding year, *i. e.*, 17,000 ozs. The actual amount manufactured during the year was 18,000 ozs.

The amount of dionin manufactured was 4,300 ozs against 5,500 during the previous year; exports were practically negligible.

Under the heading of opium alkaloids and derivatives not specifically enumerated, there is a decrease of over 6,000 ozs. The amounts for 1921 and 1922 were 10,422 ozs and 4,256 ozs respectively. Exports remained stationary at an almost negligible figure. The decrease is evenly divided between imports and manufacture, which shows a reduction of some 50%.

There was an increase of importation and manufacture of codein during the year. The manufacture rose from 94,507 ozs in 1921 to 107,408 ozs in 1922; exports were inconsiderable, amounting to 2,665 ozs in 1922 or some 1,000 ozs more than in the preceding year.

---

## Morphine and Salts of Morphine.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Used in manufacture of heroin		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population in thousands	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
ALBANIA . . . . .													1,400		6	
AUSTRALIA . . . . .	166.698		Nil		166.698				7.852		158.846		5,426		294.386	
AUSTRIA . . . . .		196		—		196				50		146	6,131		250	
BELGIUM . . . . .	53		Not stated		53				—		53		7,684			Statistics for December quarter 1921.
BRITISH COLONIES <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	2.438		—		2.438				—		2.438				130.312	
CANADA . . . . .		248.742		—		248.742				0.681			9,030		268.984	Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.
CEYLON . . . . .	5		—		5				—		5		4,504			
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .		61.436											13,595		242.134	
DENMARK . . . . .													3,289		170	
FINLAND . . . . .													3,335		0.450	In preparation form.
FRENCH COLONIES <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	1.141								—							
GERMANY . . . . .	128		7,422		7,550				2,257		5,293		59,857		1,260	
GREAT BRITAIN. . . . .	6.661	19.674	4,189.846	8,939.945	4,196.507	8,959.619	908.787	5,238.370	2,193.269	3,152.775	1,094.451	568.574	46,967	900.225*	1,387	* Approximate sales for home consumption.
INDIA . . . . .													319,075		13.608	
INDO-CHINA . . . . .	166		—		166				—		166		20,000			

<sup>1</sup> Including: Fiji, Gambia, Federated Malay States, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Gold Coast, Nyasaland, Mauritius, S. Vincent, Cyprus and Seychelles.

<sup>2</sup> Including: French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, Reunion, French Somaliland, French Settlements in India and Oceania, New Caledonia, St. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana.



Morphine and Salts of Morphine (continued).

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Used in manufacture of heroin		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
ITALY . . . . .	925												36,120			
JAPAN . . . . .	5,927.719	308	5,043.781	2,066	10,970.500	2,374			5,303	3	10,965.197	2,371	77,005			Figures exclusive of Japanese territories. Partly manufactured from Formosan imports.
KWANTUNG . . . . .	No figures	1	—	—		1				—		1	600			
LUXEMBURG . . . . .													263		6.822	Average consumption.
MALAY STATES (UNFED.)	16.585		—		16.585				—		16.585		984		8	
NEW ZEALAND . . . . .	16.329		—		16.329				—		16.329		1,218		52.617	
PANAMA . . . . .	1		—		1				—		1		401			
POLAND . . . . .	184		—		184				—		184		26,886		505	Approximate figures.
SIAM . . . . .		0.822	—	—		0.822				—		0.822	9,121		10	
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS .	Negligible												881			
SWITZERLAND . . . . .			2,500													
TSING-TAO . . . . .	4		—		4				—		4		200			
UNION OF S. AFRICA .		27.216	—	—		27.216			—			27.216	6,992			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . . .	8.986	60.215	9,120.619	5,207.072	9,129.605	5,267.287			72.831	78.387			105,710			
VENEZUELA . . . . .	4.258												2,411			

## Heroin and Salts of Heroin.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Used in the manufacture of preparations		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
ALBANIA . . . . .													1,400		3	
AUSTRALIA . . . . .	87.852		—		87.852				0.454		87.398		5,426		40.595	Imports from U. S. A. 65.658, from U. K. 22.194.
AUSTRIA . . . . .		4		—		4				1.5		3.5	6,131		5	
BELGIUM . . . . .	11		not stated		11				Nil		11		7,684			
BRITISH COLONIES <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	0.708		—		0.708				—		0.708					
BRITISH N. BORNEO . . . . .	No figures												208			
CANADA . . . . .		—		—		—				0.056		—	9,030		42.184	Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.
CEYLON . . . . .	91		—		91				—		91		4,504			
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .													13,595		7	
DENMARK . . . . .													3,289		20	
DUTCH EAST INDIES . . . . .	No figures												49,161			Unknown.
FINLAND . . . . .													3,335		9.6	
FRENCH COLONIES <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	0.4		—		0.4				—		0.4					

<sup>1</sup> Including: Fiji, Gambia, Federated Malay States, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Gold Coast, Nyasaland, Mauritius, S. Vincent, Cyprus and Seychelles.

<sup>2</sup> Including: French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, Reunion, French Somaliland, French Settlements in India and in Oceania, New Caledonia, S. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana.

Heroin and Salts of Heroin (continued).

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Used in manufacture of preparations		Exports including re-exports		Available for* internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
GREAT BRITAIN . . . .	8.107	Nil	344.640	897.929	352.747	897.929		71.810	42.638	734.576	310.109	91.543	46.967	87.885*	131	* Approximate sales for home consumption.
GERMANY . . . . .			1,140		1,140				907		233		59,857		40	No figures given for imports of heroin, though import figures given for all other alkaloids.
INDO-CHINA . . . . .	Nil												20,000			
ITALY . . . . .	51												36,120			
JAPAN . . . . .	1,099	380	2,838	113	3,937	493			4	4	3,933	489	77,005			Seizures 99 lbs.
KWANTUNG . . . . .		15		—		15				—		15	600			
LUXEMBURG . . . . .													263		0.401	
NEW ZEALAND . . . . .	26.337		—		26.337				—		26.337		1,218			
POLAND . . . . .	2		—		2				—		2		26,886		65.5	Figures approximate.
SIAM . . . . .	No figures												9,121			
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS .	65		—		65				—		65		881			Glyco-heroin.
SWITZERLAND . . . . .			774										3,880			
TSING-TAO . . . . .	6		—		6				—		6		200			
UNION OF S. AFRICA . .		0.567		—		0.567			—			0.567	6,922			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . . .	0.056	8.646	472	510.555	472.056	519.201			11.396	31.837	460.660	487.364	105,710			

## Morphine Preparations and Admixtures.

(WEIGHT OF MORPHINE CONTENTS GIVEN IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exported		Available for internal consumption		Sales for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922		
GREAT BRITAIN . . . .	24.522	Nil.		13.069	24.522	13.069		472				654	49,967	The amount of sales is approximate only.

## Heroin Preparations and Admixtures.

(WEIGHT OF HEROIN CONTENTS GIVEN IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exported		Available for internal consumption		Sales for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922		
GREAT BRITAIN . . . .		0.028		67	67.028			1.473		65.555		24.834	49,967	The amount of sales is approximate only.

## Codeine.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922			
ALBANIA . . . . .											1,400	6	
AUSTRALIA . . . . .											5,426	15,138	
AUSTRIA . . . . .		No figures		No figures		No figures		No figures		No figures	6,131		
BELGIUM . . . . .	No figures		No figures		No figures		No figures		No figures		7,684		
BRITISH COLONIES <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	1.899		—		1.899		—		1.899				
BRITISH N. BORNEO . . . . .	No records										208		
CANADA . . . . .								0.5			9,030	141.523	Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.
CEYLON . . . . .	1.363		—		1.363		—		1.363		4,504		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .		39.125									13,595	165	
FINLAND . . . . .											3,335	28	
FRENCH COLONIES <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	0.89		—		0.89		—		0.89				

<sup>1</sup> Including: Fiji, Gambia, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Gold Coast, Nyasaland, Mauritius, S. Vincent, Cyprus and Seychelles.

<sup>2</sup> Including Colonies of: French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, Reunion, French Somaliland, French Settlements in India, French Settlements in Oceania, New Caledonia, S. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana.

**Codeine (continued).**  
(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922			
FORMOSA . . . . .	No figures										3,654		
GERMANY . . . . .			3,000		3,000						59,857		Including dionine and other drugs not legislated for. Returns incomplete. Final figures likely to be higher.
INDO-CHINA . . . . .	No figures										20,000		
JAPAN . . . . .			30		30		—	30			77,005		Manufactured from crude morphine not entered as an import. . . . .
KOREA . . . . .											17,264		No figures available. Imports from Japan proper through Government General.
MALAY STATES (FED.) . .	Negligible										1,086		
NEW ZEALAND . . . . .	0.056		—		0.056		—		0.056		1,218		
SIAM . . . . .	No records										9,121		
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . .	Negligible										881		
TSING-TAO . . . . .	Negligible										200		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . . .	3.713	43.857	2,679.273	3,045.016	2,682.986	3,088.873	43.829	75.552	2,639.157	3,013.321	105,710		



## Dionine.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922			
ALBANIA . . . . .											1,400	6	
AUSTRALIA . . . . .	1.02		—		1.02		—		1.02		5,426		
CANADA . . . . .											9,030	2,835	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .											13,595	2,992	
FINLAND . . . . .											3,335	10,064	
INDO-CHINA . . . . .	Nil		Nil		Nil		Nil		Nil		20,000		
NEW ZEALAND . . . . .	Negligible										1,218		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . . .	0.028	3,118	156,264	121,961	156,292	125,079	2,324	0,708	153,968	124,371	105,710		

## Opium Alkaloids and Derivatives not specifically enumerated.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922			
INDIA . . . . .											319,075	777-393*	* Provisional estimate. Based on amount of opium used — i. e. 2000 kgs.
SWITZERLAND . . . . .			200							3,880			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . . .	104,639	15,876	190,823	104,781	295,462	120,657	4,847	3,005	290,615	117,652	105,710		

## Cocaine and Salts of Cocaine.

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
AUSTRALIA . . . . .	81		—	Nil.	81		—		81		5,426		330	Imported from United Kingdom 79; from U.S.A. 1.5; from Holland 0.5.  Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.  Figures for 1922 are preliminary figures only. Neither direct manufacture nor refining carried on in United Kingdom.
AUSTRIA . . . . .		411				411		251		160	6,131		200	
BELGIUM . . . . .	52		Not stated	Nil.	52		—		52		7,684			
BRITISH COLONIES <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	4		—		4		—		4				12	
CANADA . . . . .		84		Nil.		84		0.454		83.546	9,030			
CEYLON . . . . .	1,363		—		1,363		—		1,363		4,504			
CHINA . . . . .			—	Nil.							436,094			
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .		6,526		Nil.		6,526					13,595		83	
DENMARK . . . . .				Nil.							3,289		100	
FINLAND . . . . .				Nil.							3,335		30	
FRENCH COLONIES <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	1.15				1.15		—		1.15					
GERMANY . . . . .	51		6,302		6,353		5,291		1,062		59,857		516	
GREAT BRITAIN <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	705	212	—	Nil.	705	212	539		166		46,967		180	

<sup>1</sup> Including: Fiji, Gambia, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Seychelles, S. Vincent, Cyprus, Federated Malay States, Gold Coast, Swaziland and Mauritius.

<sup>2</sup> Including: French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, Reunion, French Somaliland, French Settlements in India and Oceania, New Caledonia, S. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana.

<sup>3</sup> In 1917 the Report of the Committee on the Use of Cocaine in Dentistry to both Houses of Parliament states: "Cocaine is brought to this country from South America, Java or India usually in leaf and subsequently is treated in the United Kingdom."

Cocaine and Salts of Cocaine (continued).

(WEIGHT IN KILOS THROUGHOUT.)

Country	Imports		Manufacture		Imports plus manufacture		Exports including re-exports		Available for internal consumption		Population (in thousands)	Actually consumed	Estimated requirements	Remarks
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922				
INDIA . . . . .				Nil							319,075	28. 21 (no year)		
INDO-CHINA . . . . .	31		—		31		—		31		20,000			
ITALY . . . . .	827										36,120			
JAPAN . . . . .	2,063	195	2,324	3,680	4,387	3,875	18	9	4,369	3,866	77,005			Exclusive of Japanese territories. 1,530 crude cocaine imported in 1921, used for manufacture.
KOREA . . . . .	37	19	—	Not yet completed	37	19	—	—	37	19	17,264		Unascr.	
KWANTUNG . . . . .	19	8	—	—	19	8	—	—	19	8	600		Unasc.	
LUXEMBURG . . . . .				Nil							263		4.204	
MALAY STATES (UNFED.) . . . . .	Negligible										984			
NEW ZEALAND . . . . .	8.731			Nil	8.731		Nil		8.731		1,218		15	
NORWAY . . . . .				Nil							2,391			
PERSIA . . . . .				Nil							9,000			
POLAND . . . . .	84		—	Nil	84		Nil		84		26,886		200	Figures only approximate.
SIAM . . . . .	Norecords	0.283		Nil	Norecords	0.283		Nil	Norecords	0.283	9,121		200	Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS . . . . .	Negligible										881			
SWITZERLAND . . . . .	881		732		1,613						3,880			
TSING-TAO . . . . .	5		—		5		—		5		200	255 (in 1921)		
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA . . . . .		3.485		Nil		3.485		—		3.485	6,922	3.289 (in 1921)		
UNITED STATES . . . . .	0.736	127	2,311	1,656	2,311.736	1,783	225	96	2,086.736	1,689	105,710		241 tons of coca leaves	
VENEZUELA . . . . .	2.212										2,411			

Annex 6.

LEGITIMATE OPIUM REQUIREMENTS OF HONG-KONG.

GENEVA, May 19th, 1923.

NOTE BY THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE.

This note is circulated to members of the Opium Advisory Committee in consequence of the discussion which took place in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly last September, and in view of the undertaking then given by the British Delegation with regard to the proposed increase in the import of raw opium into Hong-Kong. The object of the note is to explain the circumstances in which, and the grounds on which, the increase was proposed by the Government of Hong-Kong. The question will have to be considered in connection with the general question of the application of Part II of the Convention, which is the fifth item on the Agenda.

The quantities of raw opium imported and boiled, and of chandu sold, for the years 1916-1922 are given in the following table:

	Number of chests imported	Amount boiled by Government monopoly (Chests)	Amount of prepared opium sold. (Taels)
1916	360	365	459,682
1917	420	352	469,668
1918	450	539	639,684
1919	540	377	457,968
1920	180	228	294,376
1921	120	211 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	262,805
1922	150	311 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	370,332

It will be noticed that a great reduction took place in 1920. This was made in view of the greatly reduced sales<sup>1</sup>.

Arrangements were made for the same amount of opium to be supplied in 1922 as in 1921 (*i. e.* 10 chests per month), but in June the Government of Hong-Kong asked for an additional supply of 30 chests in that year and 20 chests a month in 1923, on the ground that, for some time past, the Government had been boiling considerably more than the 10 chests per month supplied by India, and had thus been reducing stocks accumulated in 1919. The sudden reduction from 45 chests to 10 chests a month at the beginning of 1920 had proved to be too great, and it had been found that the greatly reduced sales which then justified it were due (though partly to decreased consumption) in the main to the smuggling of illicit opium into Hong-Kong on a scale which was not sufficiently realised. This illicit traffic was now less prevalent owing partly to the unsettled conditions in the neighbouring provinces of China, and the temporary interruption of communications caused by strikes, but also to the greater success of the Government's preventive measures, including an increase of staff and a vigorous system of banishment for smugglers. As a consequence of the reduction of the facilities for obtaining smuggled opium, the sales of Government opium had of late increased.

Attention was called to the proposed increase at the meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations in September, and an undertaking was given by the British Delegation that, if the Advisory Committee should so recommend it, next spring the supply of opium placed on sale in Hong-Kong would be so limited that the average consumption from that date until the end of 1923 would not exceed the average consumption of the last few years on the closest estimate which could be made.

Towards the end of the year, the Hong-Kong Government, submitted their estimate of the requirements of the Colony in 1923, based on the consumption in 1922. The amount to be imported was put at 25 chests per month, but it was pointed out that in addition to the imported opium much of the smuggled opium seized had been used by the Government monopoly, and but for this, it would have been necessary to increase the estimate to 28-32 chests per month. The Government cannot — it was added — depend on seizure continuing on the same scale.

The following considerations have been put forward in justification of this estimate.

1. The importance of keeping the whole trade in and consumption of opium in the Colony as far as possible under Government supervision and control.

2. The effects on the Colony of the serious situation which has sprung up in China. The recrudescence of opium growing in China and the abundant supplies of Chinese opium obtainable in the neighbouring provinces which have intimate intercourse with the Colony, at the small

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the opium imported from India, the Hong-Kong Government uses a certain amount of confiscated opium.

cost of from \$ 2.00 to \$ 3.00 per tael (prepared), as compared with \$ 14.50 per tael for Hong-Kong opium, make it very difficult for even the most stringent preventive measures to eliminate a large illicit consumption.

3. The geographical position of the Colony also makes it virtually impossible to prevent smuggling into Hong-Kong from the mainland completely. The stuff can be smuggled in, in small quantities, without great risk on the innumerable junks which use the port.

4. It results from this situation that, if Government supplies are restricted, the consumers will fall back on the smuggled article. The price of this will go up to an extent that will make smuggling so profitable that the preventive service will be unable to cope with it ; more opium than ever will be smoked and the position will be worse than before ; the only people to profit being the smugglers.

5. The Chinese population is growing.

6. The percentage of adult Chinese males in the community, constituting about 50% of the total Chinese population, is high. These men are the principal consumers, and where they form a large percentage of the Chinese population, the consumption of opium per head of that population may also be expected to be high.

7. It may be noted incidentally that the quality of Government chandu is far superior to that of the smuggled article and any change which leads to the substitution of the Government article for the smuggled article is to the good.

The figures of seizures prove that there is practically no smuggling of Hong-Kong Government chandu *out* of the Colony. The bulk of the opium seized is Chinese from Amoy, which is regarded as clear evidence of the existence of an unsatisfied demand *in* the Colony.

The table brings out very clearly the increasing success of the present Government preventive measures. The detailed figures of seizures are noteworthy for the large number of seizures of small quantities of illicit opium, resulting from the intensive campaign against divans.

Also the figures of consumption which show a steady decline from 1918 to 1921, and a rise in 1922, support the view that more smokers are again turning to Government chandu as a result of the intensive preventive campaign.

---

The Government of Hong-Kong suggest that, reviewing the position generally, it appears to be reasonably well established that:

(A) — There is an increased (and possibly increasing) demand for Government chandu, due to (1) a progressive increase in the Chinese population of the Colony, and (2) restricted facilities for smuggling resulting from the increasing success of the intensive preventive measures undertaken by the Government.

(B) — If provision is not made for an increased supply of Government chandu to be available to meet this demand, smuggling will become so profitable that the best preventive system in the world will be unable to put a stop to it; more opium will be smoked, with consequent harm to the consumer, harm to the interests of order and good government, and harm to the cause of opium control.

They accordingly urge that in estimating the legitimate requirements of the Colony due allowance ought to be made for these factors; and that if this allowance is made, the Colony's requirements for 1923 are about 25 chests per month, and that for future years 30 chests per month is a reasonable maximum figure.

The key to the situation is the restriction of *production* at the source; granted which, the virtual suppression of consumption by a highly organised Government such as that of Hong-Kong would be a comparatively simple matter.

#### NOTE ON ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA, SUBMITTED BY THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE.

The Powers which have ratified the International Opium Convention 1912, have in Part II undertaken the obligation of taking measures for the gradual *and effective suppression* of the use of prepared opium. I circulate, for the consideration of the Committee, the following suggestions with a view to securing an effective application of Part II of the Convention. In considering

Year.	Raw Opium chests boiled.	Selling price of prepared opium.	Quantity sold.	Total seizures Raw.	Total seizures prepared.	Total number of seizures.	Total cases where convictions were obtained.	Estimated Chinese population.	Taels per head per annum.
			Taels.	Taels.	Taels.				
1912	1,113								
1913	667								
1914	449	\$ 10.00	370,740	34,233.7	9,690.1	172	137	510,000	.73
1915	340	\$ 11.00	409,032	205,678	19,499.1	230	163	520,000	.79
	+5 1/2								
1916	365	\$ 11.50 et \$ 12.00	459,682	87,176	21,886.7	335	229	535,000	.86
1917	352	„	469,668	17,165	24,258.1	326	223	555,000	.84
1918	539	\$ 14.50	639,684	42,231	27,982.3	419	220	580,000	1.10
1919	377	„	457,968	20,824.5	28,262	379	223	605,000	.76
1920	225	„	294,376.5	19,255.6	106,176.3	444	250	635,000	.46
	+3								
1921	200 1/2	„	262,805.4	76,294.1	17,835.1	748	646	675,000*	.39
1922	311 1/2	„	370,332	95,525.3	17,789.79	1,455	over 643	705,000	.52

\* The population of the Colony according to the census of April 1921 was approximately 600,000, but since then there has been further large influx of Chinese.



these proposals and generally the question of the application of Part II in the Far East, it is imperative to bear in mind that within the last two or three years the position has been profoundly changed for the worse by the revival on a large scale of the cultivation of opium in China, and the enormous traffic in the drug which has grown up there in consequence.

My suggestions are:

- (1) That the farm system, where it is still in operation, should be abolished and that the opium business should be made a Government monopoly and kept entirely in the hands of the Government.
- (2) As a corollary of (1), that the retail sale of prepared opium should be made only from Government shops, and that all private shops should be abolished. Persons in charge of the Government shops should be paid a fixed salary without any commission on the amount of business done, and therefore would have no temptation to push the sales.
- (3) That a uniform maximum limit should be fixed for the amount of prepared opium placed on sale for consumption, calculated according to the number of the adult Chinese male population, *i. e.* x taels per 10,000 adult Chinese males in the Possession, and that the annual imports of raw opium should be limited to the amount required for that rate of consumption.
- (4) That the possibilities of the system of registration and licensing which has already been introduced in some of the Far Eastern Possessions should be thoroughly explored.
- (5) That the interested Powers, that is the Powers having Possessions in the Far East where the consumption of prepared opium is still permitted, should conclude an agreement among themselves to apply the foregoing measures for the purpose of carrying out Part II of the Convention.
- (6) That the position should be generally reviewed periodically by the Powers interested and the question of further reducing the maximum limit fixed in the agreement should be considered.

---

**Annex 7.**

---

REPLY DATED MAY 15th, 1923, OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT CONCERNING  
THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE JAPANESE RETURNS AND THOSE OF  
OTHER COUNTRIES.

In reply to your letter of April 27th, concerning the explanation of the discrepancies between the Japanese statistics of the import and the export statistics given by certain other countries, I have the honour to transmit to you the reply sent by the Japanese Government, together with the opinion of our expert in regard to this matter.

Dr. Uchino, who will come to the Committee meeting, will be pleased to explain further on the point.

(Signed) S. OKUYAMA.

---

THE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE JAPANESE AND BRITISH RETURNS ON IMPORT  
AND EXPORT OF MORPHINE, ETC.

The discrepancies appearing in the report of Great Britain on her export of drugs to Japan and that of Japan on her import from Great Britain must be viewed from two different angles one that of international trade and the other the practice carried on by various nations.

The first discrepancies occur in the figures given in both reports for a given year.

*A Comparative Table showing the annual import and export in the Japanese and British returns during 1910-1920.*

Year.	Japanese Returns.	British Returns.	Japanese returns over British returns. lbs.
	Total imports of morphine and heroin. Country of origin: England to Japan and her territory.	Exports of morphine and heroin and their salts to Japan and her territory.	
	Quantities in lbs.	Quantities in lbs.	
1910	851	—	851
1911	1,503	3,647	— 2,144
1912	1,710	7,769	— 6,059
1913	4,680	15,757	— 11,077
1914	8,182	22,008	— 14,826
1915	24,713	12,796	11,917
1916	37,898	7,257	30,641
1917	41,509	1,825	39,784
1918	7,749	—	7,749
1919	4,715	—	4,715
1920	11,714	1	11,713

The figures in the Table show the wide discrepancies in the returns of both countries in each given year. Thus, between 1911 and 1914, there were more exports from England registered than those shown by the figures given in the Japanese returns, while from 1915 on there were more imports shown in the Japanese returns than in those of the British. When this was discussed, the attention of our Government was directed toward the figures of import of 1921 and to those for January to April of 1922, drawn up by the Department of Finance. The question was seriously taken up, in view of the fact that since January 1st, 1921, no permit for the import of morphine was issued by the Department for Home Affairs. It was ascertained, after an investigation, that all the morphine imported in 1921, amounting to 5,926,719 kilos (and from England 1,703,819 kilos), had already been contracted for purchase before 1921 and was already on the way to Japan. This provision for import was made in the Regulations for controlling morphine, etc. (Art. 15, Departmental Ordinance No. 41, issued in 1920).

Concerning the import of narcotic drugs from January to April 1922 reported by the Department of Finance, the following facts have been ascertained:

Drugs.	Quantities in lbs.	
Heroin	725	Purchased on October 18th, 1920, and passed the Customs in 1922.
Morphine	689	Purchased on October 20th, 1920. On December 25th, 1920, shipped from London to Rotterdam and on October 21st, 1921, shipped from Rotterdam to Japan, passed the Customs in 1922.
Heroin	125	On May 17th, 1920 landed to the bonded warehouse and cleared the Customs in 1922.

It is therefore evident that the figures for export in the British returns for a given year do not correspond with those for import in the Japanese returns of the corresponding year for the simple reason that the entries in the reports of the respective years do not correspond.

The second discrepancy is to be found in the entry of the Customs returns of the Japanese Government with regard to the "Country of Origin", with particular reference to the transit, the transshipment and storage in a bonded warehouse. It is observed that no consistent indications are given in the Customs returns as to the "Country of Origin." In case of discrepancies between Japanese and British figures, it is assumed that the transshipment might have been made from a bonded warehouse to which destination the British report appears to have shipped the drugs, while the Japanese returns are marked as from Great Britain in the declaration of the Customs. In the case of the discrepancies between the returns of Japan and the United States, the country of origin was given as that country, while in fact it was found to be only the country of transit. This will explain the excess of imports into Japan above the figures given by the British or United States returns.

**Annex 8.**

**DISCREPANCIES EXISTING BETWEEN STATISTICS SUBMITTED BY JAPAN AND OTHER STATES.**

LETTER AND MEMORANDUM FROM THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT (May 14th, 1923).

Sir,

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to refer to your letter of the May 30th, 1922, in which attention is called to the serious discrepancies existing between the British statistics of exports of dangerous drugs to Japan and the Japanese statistics of imports of these drugs from Great Britain. It was suggested that the attention of the proper authorities in Great Britain should be drawn to the matter and the request made that the Secretariat of the League of Nations might be furnished with any relevant information or explanation likely to assist the Council of the League in its efforts to ensure a proper control of the traffic in dangerous drugs.

2. In conformity with this request the competent authorities in Great Britain were asked to investigate the matter; and I am to transmit herewith a copy of a statement which has been prepared by the Board of Customs with a view to explaining, so far as is possible, the statistical discrepancies.

3. It would appear to be desirable that complete statistics of imports and exports should be compiled by all countries on a uniform basis and published at frequent intervals for the purpose of checking the returns and throwing light on the course of international traffic; and I am to suggest that the matter is one which might be discussed with advantage at the approaching meeting of the Opium Advisory Committee.

(Signed) CHARLES TUFTON.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE BRITISH BOARD OF CUSTOMS (May 1st, 1923).

The statistics compiled by this Department in regard to exports of morphine during the period in question do not include any figures of exports through the parcel post. No records are available here which would enable the Japanese statistics in regard to exports from the United Kingdom by this channel to be checked, and accordingly the Board cannot usefully offer any observations in regard to the quantity of 11,638 lbs. stated to have been so exported.

As regards the quantity of approximately 8,000 lbs. which is shown in the Japanese returns as having been taken by freight to Japan direct from Great Britain, as against 1 lb. in the British returns, the discrepancy, if the Japanese returns are approximately correct, and relate to morphine apart from preparations containing the drug, may be due to one or more of the following causes:

- (1) To false or inaccurate declarations by exporters, etc., on shipping bills as to the country of final destination. For instance it would appear that some of the vessels concerned arrived in Japan from ports in America, and in these cases the destination of the goods may have been shown as Canada or the United States of America. Some probability is lent to this suggestion by a comparison of the British returns for the period in question with those for previous years. The figures for 1912, 1914, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920 (excluding exports on Government account between August 1914 and June 1917) are as follows:

	1912	1914	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920
	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.
Japan (including Formosa and Japanese leased territories in China) . . . . .	7,769	22,008	7,257	1,825	—	—	1
United States of America . . . . .	3	125	6	395	1,338	7,592	1,028
Canada . . . . .	132	332	916	1,471	1,469	1,156	796

It will be seen that the practical cessation of exports to Japan by freight as shown in the returns, during the years 1918-1920, was accompanied by a sharp rise in the quantities shown as exported to the U. S. A., while the figures for Canada over the period are somewhat higher than those over other three periods. Similarly, inaccurate declarations may in some instances have been made as to destination in the case of consignments exported by the eastern route. It would be impracticable at this distance of time to collect and compare the documents necessary for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the declarations made by shippers in regard to these consignments.

- (2) To consignments in some instances having been actually placed on board in a foreign country. The most obvious opportunity for this to occur is in the case of boats such as those of the N. Y. K. line, which start from this country, call at Antwerp, and then return to this country before proceeding on their voyage to Marseilles and the east.

- (3) It is possible that the destination of exports may occasionally have been wrongly entered in this Department, but this could only account for a very small part of the discrepancies.

It would also appear possible that morphine transhipped in the United Kingdom may, in some instances, have been accidentally included in the Japanese statistics, notwithstanding the fact that these are stated to relate to direct shipments in all cases.

There is the further possibility that some of the morphine in question may have been smuggled out of this country without the knowledge of this Department. It is, however, not clear how, if such be the case, the morphine came to be openly declared and entered on its arrival in Japan.

It should be added that during the period in question exports of morphine could only be made under a Privy Council Licence. The Board understand that during at least a large part of the period 1918-1920 very few, if any, licences were issued for exportation to Japan; and, if this is correct, it might help to account for the remarkable absence during that period of shipping bills showing exports to Japan by freight.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the statistics in question relate to a period prior to the introduction of the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1920. It seems impossible at the present date to obtain any conclusive explanation of the discrepancies during this period. It may be possible at a later date to obtain a more satisfactory comparison with Japanese statistics in regard to a period during which the Dangerous Drugs Act has been in force by the use of the statistics which, it is understood, are now being compiled by the Home Department.

---

### Annex 9.

---

## OPIUM PRODUCTION IN CHINA IN 1922.

### INFORMATION COMMUNICATED BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

Opium cultivation and consumption in China has reached a point where it ceases to serve any practical purpose to review conditions in the several provinces in detail. It may be asserted forthwith that the law which operates in restriction of opium production in the great majority of poppy-growing provinces is the ordinary law of supply and demand, while in not a few of the provinces there is an artificial stimulus to production in the form of compulsory planting under orders from the military chiefs who derive a substantial revenue by taxing the ensuing crops.

The price of Chinese opium in China is dropping consequently to a level which places it again in the reach of the ordinary coolie, while Consular reports show that throughout China the official classes contain a large percentage of smokers who, in many parts, find it unnecessary to practice any serious concealment of the vice.

It is true that estimates formed by foreign observers (based inevitably on very vague data) place the total annual production of opium in China at only a fraction, varying from one-tenth to one-third of the average production in prohibition years and there is reason to suppose that the demand, and consequently the output, will remain permanently at a lower level, inasmuch as in some of the seaboard provinces morphia is now a competitor, while the stupendous increase in the sale of cheap cigarettes in the interior presumably tends to seduce the coolie from opium.

With certain qualifications to be mentioned hereafter, it may thus be said that the present opium situation in China is as bad as it can be.

A few examples of reports from various provinces should suffice to justify this statement.

In Kansu it is said to be unsafe for an opium inspector to show himself.

In Honan the condition is so hopeless since Feng Yu-Hsiang left the province that the local branches of the Anti-Opium Administration have closed down in despair.

In Kirin the cultivation of opium is "officially encouraged."

Shensi — always a bad province — is reported to be growing more than for many years past.

From Kashgar His Majesty's Consul-General telegraphs that any sort of inspection will be vehemently opposed and adds, in explanation, that one-third of the officials are smokers.

In Kwansi the traffic in opium is the only trade which has managed to survive the anarchy of the last two years.

On the Yangtse generally the traffic is as bad as ever, and, as far down as Nanking, is described by His Majesty's Consul-General as being "unchecked."

The latest reports from Fukien are, in particular, most discouraging. This, the one province where the Chinese authorities succeeded in checking the recrudescence of opium cultivation in 1920 and 1921 and nearly eliminated the poppy, has now again, thanks to the civil war, slipped back to its old state and is being replanted extensively under encouragement from military rulers.

Szechuan is perhaps the worse centre of production and, besides supplying vast quantities for shipment down river, consumes opium unrestrictedly. Members of the British Legation,

travelling in the province last autumn, found their boat reeking with the drug which was being smoked openly all day long by military officers on board.

The reports from Yunnan alone would dispel any possible illusions regarding official suppression. A scheme has been put in hand to organise, under the auspices of the Yunnan Government, the export of opium to neighbouring provinces by the agency of a company created for the purpose. The transport is to be conducted under military protection and the figure given by His Majesty's Consul-General as the estimated value of the opium waiting to be handled is nothing less than ten million taels.

In its present state of impotence, the Central Government is practically powerless to deal with the evil. It is true that the provinces under their effectual control are practically free from poppy, but this only applies fully to Chihli itself. The "Model governor" of Shansi discourages growing as well as he can, and in Shantung the cultivation is small. On the other hand smoking in Peking is notoriously common and the extreme cheapness of opium and ease with which it is purchased tell their own tale.

The hoped-for effect of the interest taken in China's opium conditions by the League of Nations has shown no signs of materialising. The Advisory Committee of the League of Nations having recommended an investigation of the provinces with the aid of foreign representatives to be carried out at the season when the poppy is in bloom, the Government appointed commissioners and begun an inspection in the late autumn when in nearly, if not all, the provinces the harvest is over, the plants uprooted, and the bare fields give no clue of the illicit crop. The Peking Anti-Opium Association after at first accepting an invitation to co-operate in this useless "investigation" subsequently protested against its unseasonableness and were given an assurance that an investigation — whether the present one deferred or a fresh one, is not clear — would be held in the flowering season of 1923.

Unless, however, the interval sees a radical change in the state of the provinces, involving the re-establishment of responsible civil Government, it is out of the question that an investigation, however thoroughly made and whoever be the investigators, should create an appreciable effect on the cultivation of opium in China. In those provinces where poppy growing is rare and does not enjoy the sanction of the local authorities, the latter may be stimulated to greater zeal in suppression, but in the real centres of cultivation, such as Western China, Heilung Chiang and several of the central and southern provinces, it is hopeless to expect that the mere visit of a commission appointed by Peking, even with the prestige of the League of Nations behind it, would have any material result. If honestly conducted it would, at least, serve to reveal to the world the facts of opium cultivation in China in their true proportions.

Reports on the morphia evil were called for from all British Consuls in China in the latter part of the year and the answers show that, here again, things are going from bad to worse. Whenever an improvement is stated to have occurred, the report adds that the cause is to be found in the cheapness and abundance of opium.

*Copy of despatch from H. M. Consul-General at Foochow to H. M. Chargé d'Affaires at Peking*  
(January 17th, 1923.)

I have the honour to enclose herewith:

(1) Copy of a letter received from Rev. E. M. Norton, Secretary of the Fukien International Anti-Opium Association, dated January 3rd, forwarding a number of extracts from letters of missionaries at interior stations reporting extensive planting of poppy, and the encouragement of opium cultivation, chiefly as a means of raising revenue, for the support of the military in the regions concerned.

(2) Copy and translation of a letter which my American colleague and myself have addressed in identical terms to the General commanding the "southern" troops at present in control of Foochow and of the districts covered by the above reports. To this I attach copy in Chinese of the excerpts forming enclosure in the letter sent to General Hsu. As will be seen they consist of the material portions of the enclosure in Mr. Norton's letter.

On receipt of a reply from General Hsu I will not fail to communicate it to you, with any additional particulars that may be called for.

It appears to be beyond question that this whole Province, which I was able to report in my despatch No. 13 of April 21st, last, to be almost, if not quite, free from opium cultivation, has not only been, ever since the coming into power of the present *de facto* authorities, the scene of an extensive effort to foment this cultivation by every possible means, whether of encouragement of the willing or of intimidation of the unwilling, but that in many sections the chief object of the contending factions in their struggle with one another has been to secure and maintain a hold over this most lucrative source of revenue.

The statement of Mr. Norton's informant that the military authorities of Chuanchou and Changchou plan to raise fifteen million dollars from the opium taxes of those two prefectures may, perhaps, be an exaggeration. But it is the sort of thing that is being said all over Fukien. For instance, the "Fukien Jih Pao" of January 9th mentions that a land tax, levied in Hsien-yu district, is in reality a tax on opium cultivation, and that the tax office calculates on getting in \$ 580,000 from this source, of which \$ 100,000 is to be paid by the villagers within ten days.

Whereas the former opium tax in this district was assigned to the upkeep of roads, the present levy is entirely for pay of troops. It is true that the paper expresses doubt as to the possibility of collecting so much; but, if half a million dollars is the assessment of one Hsien, that on the thirteen Hsiens comprised in the prefectures of Chuanchow and Changchow may well run into a good many millions. The same issue of the same paper has also a note on opium cultivation in Chinmen Island, near Amoy.

The most serious feature of the present recrudescence is that farmers who do not plant poppy are penalised.

(Signed) WALTER J. CLENNELL,  
Consul.

FOOCHOW, January 3rd, 1923.

Dear Mr. Clennell,

I am instructed by the Executive Committee of the Fukien International Anti-Opium Association to send you the enclosed statement, which reveals the appalling condition of the Province at the present time. The facts given have been furnished in response to enquiries sent out by the Committee some weeks ago, and we are assured by Chinese members of the Committee that they do not supply one hundredth of the truth.

We are also credibly informed that in the two districts of Chuanchow and Changchow in S. Fukien the military authorities plan to raise no less than \$ 15,000,000 (fifteen million dollars) from Opium Taxes alone. It is also a matter of common knowledge that the five hospitals for "curing the opium habit" which have been recently established in Foochow by the head of the "Opium Suppression Bureau" are really facilitating the sale and consumption of Opium.

We venture to hope that you may be able, perhaps in consultation with the other Consuls in Foochow, to take some action which may lead to a lessening of these evils. The opium curse has been a matter of concern to the League of Nations, and the wide cultivation of poppy even in a comparatively small province like Fukien may surely be considered as of real international importance. We of course recognise that at present the irregularity of the Fukien Government may make consular action difficult, but trust that you will do whatever can be done to bring pressure to bear before it is too late. Any suggestions or advice which you may feel able to give to the Association will be very welcome, and may be sent to Bishop Hind, the President of the Association or Miss C. J. Lambert, Nantai, who is just taking over the English Secretaryship from me, as I am shortly leaving on furlough.

(Signed) E. M. NORTON,  
Honorary Secretary of the Anti-Opium Association.

*Extracts from letters sent to the Fukien International Anti-Opium Association.*

A. "Opium planting is being organised on a universal scale. It is either that or big compulsory levies of money, and the people prefer opium... There will be jobs for lots of reading men as supervisors of districts, and money will be very sticky. You grow 100, report 80, 50, etc. Seed had just arrived from Fuan, and a man has gone (left yesterday) to Sienuyu to buy a large quantity. It is said the latter will come by post to try to avoid Customs. I don't suppose the A. O. Association can get enough pressure on the new Government to do anything, as the system up here is to be worked to produce military revenue largely... It is in the posters referred to as "increased land tax." It would be impossible to get any public sentiment aroused against it here, as the alternative way of raising money seems to the people concerned much more grievous. One man to whom I spoke said this was a good chance to do something, *i. e.* to get a big outside foreign subscription to pay the necessary levy instead of the people, then they would go "anti-opium" quick enough. It may be denied from the Yamen here, where we have just got a Foochow man, Sing, but it's a regrettable fact all the same".

HINGHUA, November 29th, 1922.

B. "Will you please to take up with officials the question of the collecting of fines for growing poppy? Some way must be found for protecting the people who do not plant. There are many who would not plant if they knew they could be exempted from the fines. Our propaganda against the poppy planting is not effective in the absence of such assurance. Can you get some proclamations from Fukien Government in regard to the punishment of the guilty and protection of the innocent? As this has also to do with the Treaties with Foreign countries, could the Foreign Consuls bring some pressure on the Provincial Government? If we knew there would be redress or could make appeal against local magistrates for making the innocent pay, we could forward in our Anti-Opium raising propaganda. To do so without such assurance simply causes our Church

leaders to "lose face" and influence in the community. What is to be done? This is the most important question for your Society. Action must be immediate and decisive. Fine resolutions and delay hinder the cause. So there must be official pronouncement. On behalf of our large constituency in three large sections:

PINGHAI, KIO SAUK and HANKONG."

*Hinghua.*

C. "Poppy has been observed, just coming up, November 18th and 19, near Hua Dong, Iu Dang, and Sauh Bo on the main road from Hinghwa to Sienyu. In these regions there is more poppy being planted than there was two years ago. It would be a great help if the people who had not planted poppy were not punished. Heretofore whenever there has been a tax levied on people that grow poppy, it has been taken from the village, and offenders and non-offenders have suffered the same. Under this condition, it makes it difficult to keep people from planting it. If some pressure could be brought to the Government that would bring assurance of freedom from punishment if the people were not raising the poppy, it would be of immense assistance."

FUAN, December, 8th, 1922.

D. "A great deal of opium is being sown in the Fuan County. I believe the reason for its being sown is the desire on the part of the people to refund themselves for the money demanded from them for military purposes."

LOYUAN.

E. "It is said that the new Southern magistrate just taking up his duties here is forcing farmers to sow the opium seeds all over the place. I know more people are taking the drug in Loyuan district than ever before."

KIENNING.

F. "The growth of the opium habit lately is startling. Since the Southern Army have occupied the Province, opium is unblushingly sown everywhere. In Kienyang illuminated lanterns bear the legend "Foreign Earth", and in Ma-Sa I noticed a number of people smoking, although the outside of the building had a proclamation recently posted forbidding it; showing it was simply a means of extorting money."

YENPING.

G. "Since 1920 no opium has been cultivated in this territory, but the soldiers have brought it in in large quantities, maintaining a virtual monopoly on its sale at high prices. The chair-coolies make no attempt to hide where they get their opium, but freely say the soldiers are their source of supply."

Similar reports have been received from Chinese correspondents in Futsing Loyuan and other districts.

(Added; not included in Mr. Norton's letter.)

FU CHING, January 2nd, 1923.

H. "I have been informed on good authority that the local Government is ordering the people to plant opium on which a tax is to be collected. No proclamations have been issued, but deputies are sent out to exhort the people to plant."



British Consulate,  
FOOCHOW, January 17th, 1923.

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit herewith, for your information, and for such action as you may find it possible to take, excerpts from letters from foreigners living in the Districts of Fu-an, Fu-ning, Loyuan, Chien-ou, Nan-p'ing, Fu-ch'ing, P'u-t'ien and Hsien-yu, reporting the extensive planting of poppy in those regions. The Districts in question are said to be under either the direct control of your forces or of forces allied to you.

Realising your great interest in the eradication of the opium evil from China and in the maintenance of China's moral obligation to prevent the cultivation of poppy, I am bringing these facts to your attention in the confident hope you will take prompt action not only to have the poppy already planted uprooted, but to see to it that its planting is prohibited, in the regions under your control, and especially to see that innocent persons are not penalised for not planting.

I shall be happy to be able to report to my Legation and to my Government whatever action you may take in this matter.

I have, etc.

(Signed) WALTER J. CLENNEL,  
H. B. M. Consul.

General Hsu CH'UNG-CHIH  
Foochow.

---

Annex 9a.

---

MEMORANDUM BY THE BRITISH DELEGATE ON PRODUCTION OF OPIUM AND  
ITS EXPORT FROM THE CHINESE PROVINCE OF YUNNAN.

GENEVA, May 14th, 1923.

The following information has reached His Majesty's Government with reference to the production of opium in, and its export from, the Chinese Province of Yunnan.

The cultivation of the poppy was carried on without attempts at concealment in Yunnan during 1922, the flower being as much in evidence through the province as in the days before the prohibition of its growth. The total amount produced is estimated at 700 tons in contrast to 10-1200 tons twenty years ago. The acreage under poppy in Yunnan this season is estimated to be at least double that of last year.

In November, 1922, it was reported that the provincial authorities had resolved to essay the export of opium to other parts of China, *via* Kuangsi and that a specious commercial company to effect this purpose was then in course of formation. The name of this company, which was then understood to have its office in the establishment of the local Chinese Chamber of Commerce, was the Kuang Ying Kung Ssu and the intention was to transport the opium by two routes along which the provincial Government was to undertake to give adequate military protection in collaboration with Lu Yung T'ing in Kuangsi and in conjunction with the operations said to be impending for the pacification of that province in connection with the suggested union of Kuangtung, Kuangsi, Yunnan, Kweichow and Ssuch'uan. These routes radiate from Yunnanfu and proceed: (a) *via* Kuang Nan, Fuchow, Chen Pien, and Ssu En to Liu Chow and (b) *via* Poyai, Pose and Nanking to Wuchow. Opium sent by the former route was intended for sale in Kuangsi and Hunan and that by the latter for distribution in Kuangtung if the price were sufficiently attractive and, if not, for transportation to Shanghai. The value of the opium of which this company would have the disposal was said to exceed 10,000,000 taels.

Of the many roads leading from Yunnan to Kuangsi, the one most favoured by the Cantonese opium merchants in December was that which passes through Kuang-nan to Pose. The opium travelling along this road was met at T'ien P'eng by large caravans organised by the Cantonese and armed with rifles and machine guns.

In February 1923, it is stated to have been reported that large quantities of opium were daily leaving by rail and road in a southerly direction and some of these had arrived at Haiphong. As much as 4 or 5 tons left daily by rail, and caravans going by road (some bound for Kwangsi) were of considerable size. Opium was unloaded at Nan Ki, a halt on the Yunnan railway about 10 miles from the Chinese frontier station of Hokow. At Nan Ki it was repacked in kerosene tins which were carried across the Nan-ti river and then transported along the French military road across the frontier to Laekay, the operations being supervised at different stages by Chinese soldiery and French frontier gendarmerie.

The levy imposed by the Tonkin Government was 30 % of the total consignment at a fixed price of \$ 8.00 per kilogramme.

A reference to the Yunnan opium traffic will also be found in an article on the Drug Traffic in China, in the "Times" of April 5th, 1923.

**Annex 10.**

APPROXIMATE CONSUMPTION OF PREPARED OPIUM AND MORPHINE EQUIVALENTS PER HEAD OF THE CHINESE POPULATION IN EUROPEAN AND JAPANESE COLONIES OF THE FAR EAST AND SIAM FOR THE YEAR 1921.

29th May 1923.

Country	Year	Number of Chinese	Quantity of prepared opium consumed kilos	LOCAL CONSUMPTION				Observations
				Opium grms.	Morphine grs. (a)	Equivalents grms.	(b) grs.	
<i>British Colonies and Possessions:</i>								
British North Borneo . . . . .	1918-20	37,600 <sup>2</sup>	8,400	224	3,360	17.92	268.80	(a) Calculated at 1 gramme 15 grains instead of 15.47 grains.
Straits Settlements . . . . .	1921	432,764	68,782	159	2,385	12.72	190.80	(b) Calculated at 8 % (Indian opium mostly).
Federated Malay States . . . . .	1921	494,548	33,111	66	990	5.28	79.20	<sup>2</sup> Adult Males.
Unfederated Malay States . . . . .	1921	180,000	20,991	1,166	17,480	93.28	1,399.20	
Hong-Kong . . . . .	1921	610,368	9,955	16.3	244.5	1.28	19.52	
Tsing-Tao . . . . .	1921	211,000	1,175	5.6	84	0.44	6.72	
<i>French Colonies:</i>								
Indo-China . . . . .	1921	546,928	73,211	133.8	2,007	10.60	160.56	
Dutch East Indies . . . . .	1920	880,000	100,665	114.3	1,714.5	9.14	137.12	
Macao . . . . .	1920	74,000	10,622	143.5	2,152.5	11.48	172.20	
Formosa . . . . .	1920	3,000,000	66,517	22.2	333	1.76		
Siam . . . . .	1919	1,000,000	70,000	70	1,050	5.60	84	
		200,000		350	5,250	28	420	

Annex 11.

MEMORANDUM ON THE WORLD CULTIVATION AND PRODUCTION OF OPIUM

BASED ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO, AND IN THE POSSESSION OF, THE SECRETARIAT.

*Prepared at the request of the British Representative.*

May 23rd, 1923.

In computing the world's total cultivation and production of opium, it should be stated at the outset that statistics for any of the producing countries, with the exception of India, either do not exist, or are of so approximate a nature that any accurate estimate of the world's total production is quite impossible to obtain. The estimate given in this memorandum had been deduced from an examination of such evidence as has been available for the use of the Secretariat, and no account has been taken of the uses to which the opium produced is put, that is to say, no distinction has been drawn between opium used for smoking and eating and opium used for the manufacture of morphia and other derivatives.

In general, it may be said that, from the examination of such reliable statistics of which use has been made and these are very few — it appears that India exports an amount approximating to the combined amounts produced in Turkey and Persia. The recrudescence of poppy cultivation in China, however despite, the repeated efforts made by the Central Government, has been so marked, that, according to the testimony of foreign consular representatives and officials of the Chinese Maritime Customs, the production in China at the present moment is greater than the combined production of India, Persia and Turkey.

The table below contains the results deduced from the examination of the data for the various countries. The chief sources of reliable information, such as replies to the Questionnaire of 1921 and annual reports, have in certain cases not been received by the Secretariat.

The state of cultivation and production will be found in the sections devoted to each country and an approximate estimate of the amount produced appears at the end of each section. Attention has been confined in most cases to the years 1920, 1921 and 1922, although the figures for 1919 have also sometimes been taken into account.

WORLD PRODUCTION OF OPIUM

Country	1920 lbs.	1921 lbs.	1922 lbs.
<i>Europe:</i>			
Bulgaria . . . . .	3,740 <sup>2</sup>	22,000 <sup>1</sup>	22,000 <sup>1</sup>
Greece . . . . .	7,216 <sup>2</sup>	67,500 <sup>1</sup>	50,000 <sup>1</sup>
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes . . . . .	145,970 <sup>3</sup>	235,752 <sup>1</sup>	235,752 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Near East and Egypt:</i>			
Egypt . . . . .	4,400 <sup>2</sup>	5,000 <sup>1</sup>	5,000 <sup>1</sup>
Turkey <sup>4</sup> . . . . .	610,000 <sup>1</sup>	650,000 <sup>1</sup>	650,000 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Middle East:</i>			
Persia . . . . .	254,510 <sup>1</sup>	454,000 <sup>1</sup>	450,000 <sup>1</sup>
<i>East and Far East:</i>			
Afghanistan . . . . .	25,900 <sup>1</sup>	25,900 <sup>1</sup>	25,900 <sup>1</sup>
Chinese and Russian Turkestan . . . . .	44,000 <sup>1</sup>	44,000 <sup>1</sup>	44,000 <sup>1</sup>
China . . . . .	4,400,000 <sup>1</sup>	4,400,000 <sup>1</sup>	4,400,000 <sup>1</sup>
India (including Burma) . . . . .	2,501,688 <sup>2</sup>	1,949,671 <sup>1</sup>	1,954,656 <sup>1</sup>
Indo China . . . . .	13,200 <sup>2</sup>	10,384 <sup>1</sup>	10,384 <sup>1</sup>
Japan (including Formosa and Korea) . . . . .	8,184 <sup>2</sup>	11,000 <sup>1</sup>	11,000 <sup>1</sup>
Siam . . . . .	15,400 <sup>2</sup>	15,400 <sup>2</sup>	15,400 <sup>2</sup>
<i>Total production</i> . . . . . lbs	<u>8,034,208</u>	<u>7,890,607</u>	<u>7,877,092</u>
tons	<u>3,587</u>	<u>3,523</u>	<u>3,515</u>

From this table it will be seen that the total production of opium in the world is in the neighbourhood of 3,500 tons. The calculations, however, are, by force of circumstances, so approximate, especially with regard to China, that this may be an over-estimate.

It should be noted that the estimated figures for Bulgaria and Greece for 1921 and 1922 differ considerably from the official figure given in their answers to the Questionnaire for production in 1920. The reasons for the apparently large increase in production in these countries in 1921 and 1922 are given later. From the evidence obtainable, the world production of opium would appear to be between 2,500 and 3,500 tons a year.

<sup>1</sup> Approximate only.

<sup>2</sup> Official figures.

<sup>3</sup> Official export figures.

<sup>4</sup> The estimated figures for production in 1919 are 1,044,392 lbs.

EUROPE.

*Bulgaria.*

Source: "Encyclopaedia Britannica"; Answer to the Questionnaire of 1921.

Opium has been produced for some time in Bulgaria in the districts of Kustendil, Lowtscha and Halitz. It is of the best quality and most of it was used for home consumption before the war, any surpluses for export being sent to Constantinople, where it was sold as Turkish opium.

From the Bulgarian reply to the Questionnaire of 1921, it would appear that the production in 1920 was 1700 kgs. (3,740 lbs). The Bulgarian *Bulletin de Statistique mensuel*, however, gives a total export from Bulgaria in that year of 2,513 kgs, which indicates either that a considerable quantity of opium was imported for re-export, or that the total production was much greater, or that there was a large surplus from the preceding year.

In 1921, the total export for the first seven months amounted to 7,556 kgs.<sup>1</sup>

The exports are chiefly to Turkey, where it is doubtless sold as Turkish opium, France and the United States, which in 1919 imported 29,201 kgs.<sup>1</sup>

*Estimated total production.*

In view of the apparent discrepancy between the production for 1920, as given in the reply to the Questionnaire, and the export figures for that year, it is impossible to arrive at any accurate figure for production. Such trade returns as exist show no import of opium into Bulgaria after 1915 and the exports for the first six months of 1921 exceeded 5000 kgs.<sup>1</sup>

The present production might perhaps be put at between 10,000 and 12,000 kgs. per annum (22,000-26,400 lbs).

No annual report has been received from Bulgaria.

*Greece.*

Sources: United States Report and Answer to the Questionnaire of 1921.

The poppy has been grown in Macedonia for some considerable time, the average production of opium amounting to between 130,000 and 150,000 lbs. In 1921, the yield was 67,500-70,500 lbs.<sup>2</sup>

The opium is exported to the United States, Germany and France.<sup>3</sup>

The sowings for 1922 were smaller than for 1921, since the farmers obtain a greater profit from tobacco, and the prospects for the growing of opium appear to be less favourable than formerly.

The answer to the Questionnaire of 1921 states that in 1920 the quantity produced was 3,280 kgs and the area under cultivation was 250 hectares.

The import figures for the United States show an import of 8,000 kgs from Greece in 1920. This amount, which is 4,720 kgs more than the total production, as given in the Greek answer to the Questionnaire, may perhaps be accounted for by the fact that in that year Smyrna belonged to Greece and large quantities of opium were exported from that town.

*Estimated Total Production.*

No annual report has been received from Greece.

1920 3,280 kgs. (7,216 lbs).

1921 67,500 - 70,500 lbs (between 48,000 and 52,000 lbs remained in Salonika, as they are shown as stock in hand in January 1922).

1922 less than 1921 perhaps in the neighbourhood of 50,000 lbs.

*Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.*

Sources: "Encyclopædia Britannica"; Reply to the Questionnaire of 1921; Report by Secretary to H. B. M. Legation Belgrade, May 1922.

Before the Balkan war of 1912, Serbia produced no opium. As a result of that war, certain provinces belonging to Turkey were ceded to Serbia and became known as Serbian Macedonia. These provinces had produced opium, under Turkish rule, since 1865. The Turkish Government encouraged its production by remitting tithes on opium and poppy seed for the period of one year on land sown for the first time, and by distributing instructions on the production and preparation of opium, pointing out that an opium crop was ten times as profitable as that of wheat. The cultivation has continued ever since and production was very large during the war.

The opium is produced in the south of Serbia, especially in the districts of Kumanovo, Skopoje, Veles and Stip. The crop varies, in accordance with climatic conditions, between 100,000 and 150,000 kgs. per annum. The opium grown is of the finest quality and the trade in it has always

<sup>1</sup> Bulgarian *Bulletin de Statistique mensuel*.

<sup>2</sup> United States Commerce Reports, Report by Consul Leland B. Morris, Salonika.

<sup>3</sup> Export to France in 1920 was 35 quintals (3,500 kgs) (Commerce et Navigation 1920) to the United States, 22,000 kgs in 1919, 8,000 in 1920 (Supplement to Annex II of Document O. C. 49.)

been in the hands of the Salonika merchants. It would appear that, owing to the large quantity of opium produced during the war which remained unsold, and to the international restrictions on the traffic in this drug, less opium is grown than formerly.<sup>1</sup>

The reply of the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government to the Questionnaire of 1921 states that a total area of 2,930.35 hectares was under cultivation in 1921 in Serbia proper, to which must be added from 7-8,000 hectares, formerly belonging to the European provinces of Turkey. The Serb-Croat-Slovene Delegate to the second Assembly estimated the area under cultivation in 1921 at between 5-8,000 hectares.

In 1921 the harvest was smaller than in the preceding year, less opium being cultivated and one-third of the crop being lost through drought. The total estimated production was 72,000 okes (203,040 lbs).

The opium was mostly exported to France and the United States. The American purchasers have established direct relations with the growers with the object of effecting deliveries through some other port than Salonika.<sup>2</sup>

In pre-war years the exports of opium amounted to a value of 7,179,000 dinars, the opium being sent to Asia Minor, Germany, England and the United States. In 1920, 66,350 kgs. of opium were exported, representing a total value of 8,087,866 dinars.

#### *Estimated Total Production.*

From the foregoing, a very approximate estimate of the production for the last three years<sup>3</sup> is recorded.

1920	—	66,350 kgs. (145,970 lbs).
1921 <sup>3</sup>	—	107,160 kgs. (235,752 lbs.)
1922 <sup>3</sup>	—	107,160 kgs. (235,752 lbs.)

### EGYPT AND THE NEAR EAST.

#### *Egypt.*

*Sources:* United States Commerce Reports; Answer to the Questionnaire.

Prior to 1914 opium was imported into Egypt mostly from Smyrna, although it was also grown to a certain extent.

The harvest takes place in the middle of March.

Opium is not smoked but eaten, the practice being prevalent for the most part in Upper Egypt.

On the outbreak of war, the import ceased and in 1918 the Egyptian Government issued a decree prohibiting the cultivation of the poppy and ordering an increase of the area under cereals.

In the summer of 1920, the price of opium advanced to \$ 90 per lb.

In 1922, three-quarters of the province of Kena was under cultivation and the estimated crop was a very small one.<sup>4</sup>

In the reply to the Questionnaire of 1921, the production of Egypt is stated as being 2,001 kgs. for 1920, on a basis of 3 kgs to the hectare.

No annual report has been received from Egypt.

#### *Estimated Total Production.*

The total production would seem to be in the neighbourhood of 2,000 kgs, possibly less, as the 1922 harvest seems to have been small.

#### *Turkey.*

*Sources:* "Encyclopædia Britannica"; United States Commerce Reports 1922; General Report of Trade and Economic Conditions of Turkey 1919; Department of Overseas Trade; and Trade Report in the "Chemist and Druggist".

Turkey has produced opium for many years, the opium at present produced being almost entirely grown in Asia Minor, since most of the European provinces in which the poppy was grown were ceded to Serbia after the Balkan war in 1912.

The crops in Asia Minor are very uncertain owing to drought, spring frosts and locusts. In order to avoid total failure, there are three sowings between March and October. Notwithstanding this precaution, quantities of the drug are wasted when the crop is a full one, owing to the difficulty of gathering the whole of it during the short time in which collection is possible.

<sup>1</sup> Report by Secretary to H. B. M. Legation, Belgrade, May 1922.

<sup>2</sup> Die Wirtschaftsverhältnisse Mazedoniens, contained in Germany, Foreign Office — Deutschland und die weltwirtschaftliche Lage: Abschnitt 1 (gesamtübersichter uber das in und auslandische Wirtschaftsleben) Blatt No. 184/IV. Oktober 1922, Jahrgang 4.

<sup>3</sup> The Questionnaire states that it was impossible to supply any figures for production in 1921. The figures for 1921 and 1922 have therefore been obtained by multiplying the total area under cultivation (2,930.35 hectares) by 12, which represents the lowest approximate amount of opium produced per hectare in kilogrammes, and adding to it an amount of 72,000 kgs, representing the approximate production, arrived at by the same means, in the former European provinces of Turkey.

<sup>4</sup> United States Commerce Reports, April, May and June 1922. Report by Consul S. Pinkey Tuck, Junr., Alexandria.

The yield of opium varies between one-third and seven and a half chequis<sup>1</sup> (.54 to 12.15 lbs) per toloom (16.00 square yards), the average being in the neighbourhood of one and a half chequis (2.43 lbs).

In pre-war years the average amount of opium exported from Asia Minor was 7,000 chests<sup>2</sup>, and in exceptionally good seasons the export rose to 12,000 chests.

The Turkish answer to the Questionnaire of 1921 gives the average pre-war export at 432,000 kgs. Between the years 1910-1914, the total output in Turkey would appear to have varied between 7,000-10,000 cases of 143 lbs a case.<sup>3</sup>

The poppy is grown round Afion Kara-Hissar, Akshehir, Ushak, Balıkesir, Sparta, Konia, Sivas and in the Iadin vilayet.<sup>4</sup> All the opium grown in these provinces is exported through Smyrna or through Constantinople. The amount produced in them varies.

It is extremely difficult to arrive at any figure for the total of production in Turkey. As, however, all the opium produced, with a negligible exception, is exported, the import figures of the various importing countries may enable an approximate calculation to be made.

**1919.** — In 1919, 338,123 lbs. of opium were exported to the United Kingdom<sup>5</sup> and 641,187 lbs to the United States; Egypt imported about 82 kgs.

The largest buyer from Smyrna in 1919 appears to have been Japan<sup>6</sup> and the stock in that city amounted to about 4,060 cases (65,000 lbs). Assuming that this last quantity was all exported, a total export, and consequently an approximate total production of 1,044,392 lbs would be obtained, a figure which approximates to the Turkish Government's own estimate of pre-war production.

**1920.** — In 1920, 22,110 lbs were exported to France<sup>6</sup>  
 209,000 lbs to the United States<sup>7</sup>  
 341 lbs to New Zealand and<sup>7</sup>  
 333,090 lbs to the United Kingdom<sup>8</sup>, making a  
 Total export 564,541 lbs.

The quantity imported by Japan is difficult to determine, as the total import of opium into that country for the first eight months of 1920 was 51,593 Japanese lbs (68,444 English lbs)<sup>9</sup>. This opium was imported entirely from Persia and Turkey, but in what proportions is not known. Assuming, however, that half came from Turkey and half from Persia, Japan imported 34,222 lbs from Turkey in the first eight months of that year.

The Chinese leased territories imported no opium from Turkey in 1920.

It would appear that the total export from Turkey in that year amounted to 610,169 lbs.

The total production may therefore have been in the neighbourhood of 600,000-650,000 lbs.

The American Consul General at Constantinople, writing in 1920, did not think that the post-war total output averaged over 2,500 cases a year (357,500 lbs), but this seems to be an underestimate.

**1921.** — In 1921 opium was plentiful throughout Asia Minor, as is shown by the prices which it fetched in the open market. The prices for the 1921 crop averaged American \$1.60 to \$1.70 per lb.<sup>10</sup>

As, however, the import figures for 1921 for the United States, France and the United Kingdom, three of the principal importing countries throw little light on the amount exported from Turkey, it is not possible to obtain a reliable export figure for 1921. Judging from the sales in the Constantinople market, there is no reason to suppose it to have been any lower than in 1920.

**1922.** — Figures for 1922 are almost entirely lacking. The total amount of raw opium remaining in stock in Constantinople and Smyrna in December 1922 was between 1,700 and 1,800 cases<sup>11</sup> (243,100-257,400 lbs). From early reports of the prospect for the 1923 harvest the crop in the Smyrna district for 1922 seems to have been an extremely good one and yielded 3,000 to 3,500 cases (429,000-509,500 lbs).<sup>11</sup>

In February 1923 the total stocks of opium held in Constantinople, Smyrna and the interior amounted to 1200 cases (171,600 lbs); 228 cases were sold in January, 140 of which were destined for Japan. In February 326 cases were sold, over 200 of which were sent to Japan.<sup>11</sup>

In view of the few statistics available, it is impossible to estimate more than very approximately the amounts produced by Turkey in the last three years. The Bulletin of the Imperial

<sup>1</sup> 1 chequi — 1.62 lbs.

<sup>2</sup> 1 chest contains 150 lbs.

<sup>3</sup> Supplement to Commerce Reports, United States Department of Commerce, Trade of Turkey for 1920 by the American Consul General at Constantinople.

<sup>4</sup> General Report on the Trade et Economic Conditions of Turkey for 1919, Department of Overseas Trade.

<sup>5</sup> Annual Statement of Trade, 1919.

<sup>6</sup> Commerce et Navigation, France, 1920.

<sup>7</sup> Supplement to Annex II of Document O. C. 49.

<sup>8</sup> Minutes of the 4th Session of the Advisory Committee, Annex 1.

<sup>9</sup> United States Commerce Reports, Turkey. Report by Consul General George Horton.

<sup>10</sup> Minutes of the Advisory Committee.

<sup>11</sup> "Chemist and Druggist", Trade Report.

Institute calculates that the average annual production is between 7,000 and 12,000 chests (of 150 lbs each),<sup>1</sup> or from 1,050,000-1,800,000 lbs. This would appear to be an over-estimate. but the figures given below can only be regarded as a very rough approximation.

*Estimated Total Production.*

1919 : 1,044,392 lbs.

1920: between 600,000 and 650,000 lbs } production was probably much greater in these years,  
 1921: between 600,000 and 650,000 lbs }  
 1922 : the production in the districts around Smyrna alone amounted to 429,000-509,500 lbs.

The total production may therefore have been about 600,000 lbs.

MIDDLE EAST.

*Persia.*

*Historical Summary. Source: "Encyclopædia Britannica".*

Although the cultivation of the poppy was carried on in Persia at an earlier date than in India, Persian opium was almost unknown in England until 1870, when the annual yield is said not to have exceeded 2,600 cases. The profits, however, were so great that all available ground was soon used for the cultivation of the poppy, to the exclusion of cereals, with the result that a severe famine ensued in 1871-72, entailing a large number of deaths. Despite this calamity, however the cultivation of opium continued and was even extended, reaching an average total production of 10,000 piculs<sup>2</sup> a year. In 1907 the amount produced was 10,000 piculs (1,333,333 lbs).

Opium is largely produced in the districts of Ispahan, Shiraz, Yezd and Khonsar, the strongest quality being grown east of the river Tigris.

*Production in recent years.*

The various consular and trade reports concerning Persia give very little information on production.

In 1909, the export from Persia was 890,719 mans (2,645,435 kgs)<sup>3</sup> (one man = 6½ lbs or 2.97 kgs).

Before 1911 about half the total amount produced found its way to the Chinese market chiefly through Hon-Kong and the Strait Settlements. A small quantity was exported by way of Trebizond to Constantinople, and about 2,000 piculs to Great Britain.

The average annual export to the United Kingdom in the ten years 1912-22 amounted to 175,641 lbs.

In 1920, the export of Persian opium to the United Kingdom was 3,910 lbs<sup>4</sup>, the amount transhipped at Bombay, principally for Singapore, Hong-Kong and Formosa, being 160,600 lbs. There appears to have been no export to the United States in that year as none is shown in their import figures. The total export for 1920 may therefore have been about 164,510 lbs.

The home consumption is apparently about 90,000 lbs a year."<sup>4</sup>

In 1921, the total export was 56,000 mans (166,320 kgs).<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Millspaugh, however, (Administrator General of the finances of Persia), states that the exports of opium in 1921 amounted to a total of 362,885 lbs (164,648 kgs).

The difference between these two figures for 1921 is not great.

According to Dr. Millspaugh's figures, the exports in 1921 were divided among the following countries:

Country	Quantity in lbs.
China <sup>6</sup>	12,642
Egypt	1,570
England	272,644
India	11,027
United States	1
Japan	23,573
Russia	32,826
Switzerland	1
Mesopotamia	8,651

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of the 4th session of the Advisory Committee.

<sup>2</sup> 1 picul equals 133 1/3 lbs.

<sup>3</sup> Article appearing in the Persian newspaper "Iran" on June 1st, 1922.

<sup>4</sup> Document C. 155 M. 75. 1923 XI.

<sup>5</sup> Letter from Dr. M. C. Millspaugh, Administrator General of the Finances of Persia to the International Anti-Opium Association Peking, the letter states that the present export tax on opium is causing a decrease of production.

<sup>6</sup> As China does not permit the import of foreign opium, except for medical purposes, amounting only to a few pounds per annum, the designation of China would appear to connote Formosa, Tsing-Tao, Dairen, Macao and Hong-Kong. Hong-Kong recorded importations of Persian opium during the year 1921, amounting to 233 chests or 29,733 lbs



*Estimated Total Production.*

It is impossible to arrive at an accurate figure for the total production of opium in view of the lack of statistics. In 1920, it may, however, have amounted to 164,510 lbs (the total amount exported) plus an estimated 90,000 lbs for home consumption, making a total of 254,510 lbs and in 1921 it may have amounted to between 454,904 lbs and 452,885 lbs. Neither figure, however, can be regarded as anything more than an approximation.

Persia has not replied to the Questionnaire of 1921, nor has she sent in an annual report.

*Afghanistan.*

*Sources:* Notes and Report dated April 25th, 1921, by the British Consul General at Kashgar.

In the British Annual report concerning the trade of Chinese Turkestan with India, it is stated that the chief import into Chinese Turkestan is opium coming from Afghanistan. "The Chinese invariably endeavour to show that the drug emanates entirely from Afghan territory, but a great deal, and it should be noted the best quality, is now grown across the frontier in Semirechia, and some is also produced in the Chinese province of Kansu."

The British Consul General at Kashgar estimates the production in Afghanistan in 1921 at the following quantities:

<i>District</i>	<i>Quality</i>	<i>Estimated yearly production</i>
Jizib	Superior to other districts	5,800 lbs.
Chayab	Superior	5,300 lbs.
Shakr-i-Buzurg	2nd quality	2,600 lbs.
Herat	2nd quality	5,200 lbs.
Jellalabad	2nd quality	7,000 lbs.
Total:		25,900 lbs.

*Estimated Total Production.*

From the figures given by the British Consul General at Kashgar, the production of opium in Afghanistan in the year 1921 may be estimated at 25,900 lbs. Whether it has decreased or increased is not known.

*Chinese and Russian Turkestan.*

*Sources:* British annual report concerning the trade with Chinese Turkestan Indies, March 31st, 1922.

Notes and reports dated April 25th, 1922, by the British Consul-General at Kashgar.

In Russian Turkestan (Semirechia) the quantity of opium produced round Tokmak, and the great Karakul Lake is estimated at 44,000 lbs.

In 1921, about 2,400 Tungans and Turkis left the Kalja and Urunchi districts for Semirechia for the purpose of planting the poppy and preparing opium. In addition, a number left Chuguchak for the same purpose. During 1920, the cultivation of the poppy by the Chinese on the Russian Turkestan frontier and in the area of Tokmak and Karakul in Semirechia assumed large proportions extending from Ili Chuguchak and on to the Altai mountains.

*Estimated total production.*

From the estimated total production given in the British consular reports, it would appear that the production in Chinese and Russian Turkestan amounts to about 44,000 lbs per annum.

*India.*

*Sources:* "Encyclopædia Britannica" and Statistics of British India, Vol. II, 1922, Dept of Statistics, India.

The first mention of the production of opium occurs in 1516, when Pyers (quoted in the *Aromaticum Historia*, 1574) speaks of the production in the kingdom of Cous (Puch Behar), south-west of Bhutan) in Bengal and of Malwa. Its introduction into India appears to have been connected with the spread of Islam. The opium monopoly was the property of the Great Moghul and was regularly sold.

Indian opium is partly a Bengal Government monopoly and partly produced by a number of States in Central India, the Rajputana Agency and the Baroda State; it is also grown in the Khirpur State (Sind), the production being limited to the requirements of that State.

The seed is sown between the 1st and 15th November, the poppy blossoms about the middle of February and the opium is collected between February 25th and March 25th, except in the Malwa States, where it is collected in April.

The former yield per acre was 16 lbs; the present yield would appear to be about 12 lbs.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "The Truth about Indian Opium" issued by the Industries et Overseas Dept. India Office, Whitehall, London, 1922.

*Bengal opium.*

The region in which the poppy was cultivated in 1920 for the manufacture of Bengal opium comprises thirty-two districts in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. The whole department has from the 29th September 1910 been under the control of one opium agent, whose headquarters are at Ghazipur, where there is a Government factory in which the crude opium is manufactured into the form in which it is consumed, and in which a certain quantity of morphia is annually manufactured for export. The cultivation of the poppy and the manufacture of opium are regulated by Act. XIII of 1857 as amended by Act. I of 1911, and are under the control of the Government, the Board of Revenue of the United Provinces and the immediate supervision of the opium agent at Ghazipur. Cultivation is permitted only under licence granted on the authority of the opium agent. The area to be cultivated is fixed by the licences and the cultivator is bound to sell the whole of his production to the opium department at the rate fixed by the Government.<sup>1</sup>

In March, April and May, the opium is made over to the offices of the department, weighed and tested. After weighing the opium is forwarded to the Government factory at Ghazipur, where it is manufactured into three forms: (a) opium intended for export (provision opium): (b) opium intended for consumption in India and Burma (excise opium): and (c) medical opium for export to London, and alkaloids.

Provision opium is sold by public auction in Calcutta. A notification is published annually, generally before the month of October, stating the minimum number of chests which will be put up for sale in each month of the calendar year and the quantities so notified are not altered without three months notice. The sales are conducted month by month by the Bengal Government.

The number of chests actually sold in 1920 was 2,320 (each chest contains 140 1/7 lbs). In addition to this, there were sold, under special agreements, 3000 chests to the Government of the Straits Settlements, 180 to the Government of Hong-Kong, 1,700, to Siam, 2,900 to the Government of the Netherlands Indies and 192 to the Government of North Borneo, making a total, of 10,292 chests

By a convention of 1815, the French Government has the right to purchase not more than 300 chests of opium a year. By a further agreement, remaining in force until December 31st 1924, it is bound to take effective steps to prevent the illicit traffic in opium between adjacent French and British territories.

The cultivation of the poppy is prohibited in the British provinces other than the United Provinces to a certain extent in the Punjab and in some of the provinces of Burma.

The only licit supply of opium for internal consumption is what is known as Bengal "excise opium."

*Malwa opium.*

*Rajputana and Central India.*

In the Indian States of the Rajputana agency and Central India, the British Government "does not control the cultivation of the poppy, the manufacture of opium or its local consumption."

Malwa opium was formerly imported into the Bombay Presidency for local consumption in British India, as well as for exportation by sea to China, but that import has been discontinued from April 1st, 1912, the Bombay Presidency being supplied from Ghazipur.

By arrangements made between the British and Chinese Governments, only a fixed number of chests of Malwa opium could be exported to China. This export has been prohibited since January 1st, 1914.

*Baroda.*

*Punjab and Burma.*

The cultivation of the poppy and the manufacture of opium are permitted in Baroda under a State monopoly for consumption in the State.

The cultivation of opium is permitted in certain districts of the Punjab and Burma on a very limited scale for local consumption.

The amount of opium produced by the native States of India is not known accurately by the Indian Government, since that Government possesses no close control over them.<sup>2</sup>

The area under cultivation in the United Provinces and the quantity produced in the years 1917-20 were:

	Area	Quantity <sup>3</sup>	Lbs
1917-18 <sup>4</sup>	207,019 acres	32,248 maunds	2,579,840
1918-19	177,123 acres	27,343 maunds	2,187,440
1919-20	154,621 acres	22,731 maunds	1,818,480

The acreage under cultivation in the United Provinces in the years 1920-23 was:

1920-21 <sup>5</sup>	—	116,055 acres
1921-22	—	117,930 »
1922-23	—	143,020 » (estimate)

<sup>1</sup> This rate was 6 rupees per seer (1 seer = 2 2/35 lbs) in 1894-5, 7-8 rupees in 1913-14, 9 rupees in 1916-17, 11 rupees in 1920-21 and 15 rupees, in 1921-22.

<sup>2</sup> Information supplied by Mr. Campbell, representative of India on the Advisory Committee.

<sup>3</sup> 1 maund is taken as equal to 80 lbs for the purposes of these calculations.

<sup>4</sup> *Financial Statistics for British India*, Vol. II, 1922.

<sup>5</sup> Figures supplied by Mr. Campbell, Representative of India on the Advisory Committee.

The numbers of provision chests made were:

1920-21 <sup>1</sup>	—	5,800 chests
1921-22	—	7,500 "
1922-23	—	9,000 " (estimate)

The amount of excise opium produced during the years 1913-1920 was:

1913-14 <sup>2</sup>	—	8,307 chests
1914-15	—	8,943 "
1915-16	—	8,391 "
1916-17	—	8,732 "
1917-18	—	8,567 "
1918-19	—	8,512 "
1919-20 <sup>1</sup>	—	7,289 "
1920-21 <sup>1</sup>	—	7,074 "
1921-22 <sup>1</sup>	—	5,628 "

An examination of the statistical tables shows that the production in the United Provinces has decreased considerably since 1870, the highest amount of opium produced being 128,817 maunds in 1875-76 and the lowest being 22,731 maunds in 1920.

In 1919 to 1920, 1,115,240<sup>3</sup> lbs of opium were exported to countries which buy by a system of direct sales from the port of Calcutta and 357,840<sup>3</sup> lbs on private account from the same port. The total amount in pounds exported from the ports of Calcutta and Bombay (the only two ports from which opium is allowed to leave India) was 1,473,080 lbs.

The exports in 1920-21 amounted to 7,660 chests (1,072,400 lbs), in 1921-22 to 6,081 chests (851,340 lbs) and in 1922-23, April to November 1922, to 4,520 chests (632,800 lbs).<sup>3</sup>

With regard to the production of opium in the native States of India, which, since the cessation of export to China, has been used entirely to meet local requirements in India, the following figures are given for cultivation:

1918-19	—	24,871 acres
1919-20	—	56,934 "
1920-21		84,000 " (about). <sup>1</sup>

There was a reduction of opium cultivation in these States after the trade with China ceased, with the exception of a great increase during the war to meet the requirements of the British Government for the manufacture of morphia.

The figures for cultivation in these States vary considerably, as will be seen from the following table:

*Natives States.*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Area</i>
<sup>4</sup> 1912	71,983 acres
1913	47,143 "
1914	12,277 "
1915	15,320 "
1916	10,568 "
1917	46,441 "
1918	58,341 "
1919	24,871 "

*Estimated total production.*

In 1920 the total production of the United Provinces amounted to 1,818,480 lbs (22,731 maunds) and the total number of excise chests amounted to 7,289 (899,671 lbs). In 1921 the total number of provision chests made was 7,500 (1,050,000 lbs)<sup>2</sup>. In 1922 the number of provision chests made was about 9,000 (1,260,000 lbs)<sup>1</sup> and the number of excise chests was 5,628 (694,656 lbs)<sup>1</sup>.

The figures for the total production, disregarding the amount consumed in the native States, which is unknown, would therefore appear to be in 1920 the total amount produced in the United Provinces 1,818,480 lbs together with 683,208 lbs the approximate amount produced by the native States (calculated on a basis of 12 lbs to the acre), giving a total of 2,501,688 lbs.

The production for 1921 and 1922 is calculated from the total number of excise and provision chests made in those years.

<sup>1</sup> Figures supplied by Mr. Campbell, Representative of India on the Advisory Committee.

<sup>2</sup> "The Truth about Indian Opium" by G. Dixon, issued by the Industries and Overseas Department, India Office, Whitehall, London.

<sup>3</sup> Answer to the Questionnaire of 1921.

<sup>4</sup> "The Truth about Indian Opium" issued by the Industries and Overseas Department, India Office, Whitehall, London, 1922.

TOTAL PRODUCTION

Year	Provision chests (Contents shown in lbs)	Excise chests	Total
1921	1,050,000	899,671	1,949,671
1922	1,260,000 (estimated)	694,656	1,954,656

These figures can only be taken as approximate since accurate returns of production are available only for the United Provinces.

*Burma.*

*Sources* : Letter from the International Anti-Opium Association, Peking, September 17th, 1920, addressed to the British Government; Reply of the Secretary of State for India to a Question in the House of Commons, April 29th, 1920; and Minutes of the first Session of the Advisory Committee, May, 1921.

It would appear, from the statement<sup>1</sup> made by the Representative of India on the Advisory Committee, that the cultivation of the poppy in Burma has always been prohibited except in a narrow strip of territory bordering on Yunnan. This territory comprises three distinct regions; the first under the control of the British Government, in which cultivation has been prohibited, the second under the native chiefs controlled by the British Government, in which a policy of progressive control aiming at ultimate suppression has been instituted, and the third which is very inaccessible and inhabited by wild, independent tribes who are entirely outside the control of the Government, although within its territorial frontier. In this tract the Government of Burma has no officers and exercises no control, and it is therefore impossible at the moment to suppress cultivation. The amount of opium produced, however, is believed to be small.

The Secretary of State for India, in reply to a Question in the House of Commons on April 29th, 1920, regarding the extension of the traffic in opium between India and China through British Burma, said that any opium smuggled from Burma into China was grown almost exclusively in the narrow strip of territory bordering on Chinese frontier. Since that territory was almost inaccessible and very little under the control of the Government of Burma, an effective control would probably entail the assumption of direct administrative control and would involve heavy expenditure and possibly armed interference. The Governments of India and Burma, however, were considering the possibility of adopting measures leading to the ultimate suppression of cultivation.

*Estimated total production.*

In view of the complete absence of any figures, it is not possible to give an estimate of production. It would appear, however, to be inconsiderable, although the quantities of opium reaching the Chinese province of Yunnan from Burma are apparently large, and the farmers in Yunnan complain that it is not fair that they should be prevented from growing the poppy and thus be able to share a profit which otherwise goes entirely to Burma.<sup>2</sup>

*Indo-China.*

*Sources* : International Opium Commission, Shanghai; Reports of Delegations; Answer to the Questionnaire; and Annual Report.

A very small cultivation of the poppy seems to have existed in Indo-China for some time on the plateau of Tran-Ninh in Upper Laos and on the plateau of Dong-Van.

On the Tran-Ninh, plateau the production did not exceed 400-600 kgs., in 1909.

In 1907, the Customs Administration of Indo-China bought 2,062 kgs and, in 1908, 3,088 kgs from these areas.

The mountainous nature of the country, and the small numbers of the population, militate against the production of opium in these territories to any large extent.

In 1920, the production in French Indo-China amounted to 6,000 kgs.<sup>3</sup> The annual report states that the cultivation of the poppy has been sensibly reduced and that the average annual production for the years 1911-1921 did not exceed 4,720 kgs.

*Estimated total production.*

1920	6,000 kgs.
1921	4,720 kgs.

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of 1st session of the Advisory Committee, 2 - 5 May, 1921. Page 21.

<sup>2</sup> International Anti-Opium Association, Peking, Report 1920.

<sup>3</sup> Answer to Questionnaire of 1921.

*Japan, including Korea and Formosa.*

*Sources:* Answer to the Questionnaire of 1921; Annual Report 1921.

A certain amount of opium is grown in Japan proper and, in 1920, the area under cultivation was 929 acres, the quantity produced being 3,470 kgs. In 1921, the acreage amounted to 1,726, the quantity produced being 4,897.57 kgs. The principal district where the poppy is cultivated is Osaka.

The yield in 1921 was not so great as was expected, owing to the damage caused to the crops by hail.

The opium produced is all consumed in Japan and its colonies.

In 1920, in Korea the quantity produced was 160 kgs, the area cultivated being 60 hectares.<sup>1</sup>

In 1920, Formosa produced 90 kgs, the area under cultivation was not stated.<sup>1</sup>

*Estimated total production.*

The total production for 1920 for Japan, Korea and Formosa amounted to 3,720 kgs. In 1921, the production for Japan alone amounted to 4,897.57 kgs. Production seems to be on the increase. This may be accounted for by the fact that most of the opium used in Japan, Korea and Formosa is imported and the imports in 1920<sup>1</sup>, 1921<sup>1</sup> and 1922<sup>1</sup> have decreased from 51,593 Japanese lbs (1920) to 13,043 Japanese lbs (1922).

The total production may therefore be put at about 5000 kgs.

*Siam.*

*Sources:* Statistical Year Book of the Kingdom of Siam 1920; Answer to the Questionnaire of 1921.

A very small quantity of raw opium is produced in Siam. By the new opium law, the poppy can only be planted under licence.

The Siamese delegate to the International Anti-Opium Conference at the Hague in December 1911 stated that the distant hill tribes in the northern hills cultivated a small amount for their own consumption.

In the answer to the Questionnaire, the annual production in Siam was estimated in 1920 at 7,000 kgs, the area under cultivation being 640 acres.

The annual report for 1921 from Siam is on its way, but has not yet been received.

*Estimated total production.*

The total production of opium, all of which is consumed in the Kingdom of Siam, may be put at about 7,000 kgs.

*China.*

*Historical summary. Sources:* Chinese Year Book 1921, compiled by H. T. Montague Bell and H. G. W. Woodhead; "Encyclopaedia Britannica".

The poppy has been known in China for twelve centuries and it has been used medicinally for nine. The introduction of opium is said to have been brought about by the Arabs, probably in the 13th century. There is no record of it being used for smoking, however, until the middle of the 17th century, when the practice of smoking opium mixed with tobacco was introduced and gradually became general. This habit had been formed by the Dutch colonists in Java and taken by them to Formosa, from whence it spread to Amoy and the mainland.

Foreign opium in any quantity was first introduced into China by the Portuguese settlers in Goa in the beginning of the 18th century. In 1729, the import of foreign opium was 200 chests and in that year the Emperor issued the first anti-opium edict.

In the general history of the southern provinces of Yunnan, revised and re-published in 1736, opium is noticed as a common product. The growing of opium in China may, therefore, be said to have begun about the end of the 17th century.

In 1790, the import of foreign opium was 4,000 chests a year. By two edicts of 1796 and 1800, the smoking of opium was prohibited and the importation of foreign opium forbidden. Although by these measures opium became an article of contraband, the quantity imported rose from 5000 chests in 1820 to 16,788 in 1830, 20,619 in 1828 and 70,000 in 1858.

By the terms of the rules of trade drawn up as a supplement to the Treaty of Tientsin, traffic in opium was legalised by China and a tariff rate of Hk. taels 30 per picul<sup>2</sup> was authorised. A total tax of 110 Hk. taels per picul on foreign opium was levied between 1898 and 1911, when it was raised to 350 Hk. taels.

In 1906, an anti-opium edict was issued ordering the entire abolition of opium cultivation and smoking within ten years from January 1st, 1907.

Negotiations in 1907 between India and China produced an Agreement whereby India undertook to reduce the export of the drug from India by 5,100 chests, beginning on January 1st 1908 for a period of three years. An agreement was signed on May 8th, 1911, between Great Britain

<sup>1</sup> Answer to the Questionnaire.

<sup>2</sup> 1 picul = 133 1/3 lbs., or 60.61 kgs.

and China, providing for the complete extinction by the end of 1917 of the export of opium from India to China and of the reduction of opium in China. The agreement further laid down that Indian opium should be "barred from any province in China which can establish by clear evidence that it has effectively suppressed the cultivation and import of native opium."

The revolution of 1911 caused a setback in the campaign against opium, owing to the inability of the Central Authorities to control the military provincial Governors, for whom the cultivation of the poppy meant a large revenue. A considerable opium crop was harvested in 1912.

The Chinese authorities at that time made an attempt to justify the complete prohibition of the import of Indian opium, on the ground that the new criminal code contained drastic stipulations against the cultivation or use of opium, thus entitling the Chinese Government to close all the provinces of China, in accordance with the terms of the 1911 Agreement.

The Indian Government announced in 1913 that after the March and April opium auctions at Calcutta and Bombay no further sale of certificated opium for the Chinese market would be permitted. No new restrictions, however, appear to have been put on the sale for other markets from which opium could have been smuggled into China. By the end of 1915, Indian opium was officially excluded from the following fifteen provinces: Anhui, Chekiang, Chihli, Fengtien, Fukien, Heilungkiang, Honan, Hunan, Hupeh, Kirin, Kwangsi, Shensi, Shantung, Sinkiang and Szechuan.

In accordance with the Anglo-Chinese Agreement of May 8th, 1911, the legitimate foreign opium trade in China and the legitimate Chinese cultivation of opium ended on December 31st, 1917.

The concensus of opinion, in which Sir John Jordan, late British minister in Peking concurred, was that China had made astonishing efforts between the years 1907 and 1917 to rid herself of opium and was practically free from opium cultivation in 1917.<sup>1</sup>

*Position in recent years. Sources:* Reports of the International Anti-Opium Association, Reports of Commissioners and Consular Representatives of Foreign Powers.

Since that date, however, there have been various unauthorised revivals of the cultivation of the poppy in different parts of China, not infrequently, it would appear, with the tacit sanction or even the active encouragement of certain military officials, who have taken this means to increase their provincial revenues contrary to the laws issued by the Central Government. The Central administration has repeatedly attempted to put a stop to poppy cultivation, but the actual conditions of the various provinces of China seem to have been determined by the attitude of the local military and civil authorities.

From the confused, and in some cases conflicting reports received concerning the extent of cultivation of the poppy in the various provinces of China, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions as to the exact amount now being grown. The information contained in the reports of the Commissioners of Maritime Customs and of the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking may generally be taken as fairly accurate, and there seems little doubt that the Central Government is unable adequately to enforce its laws regarding poppy cultivation in certain provinces, notably in the south.

*Production in Provinces in 1920, 1921 and 1922.*

Reliable reports indicate that in 1920 the opium poppy was being cultivated in a fairly extensive scale in the following provinces: Shensi, Yunnan, Hupeh, Honan, Fukien, Kweichow, Szechuan and Kansu. The following table contains information of interest, but necessarily very incomplete, regarding production and cultivation in these and other provinces for the years 1920, 1921 and 1922. Additional information is to be found in documents O. C. 113, O. C. 117.<sup>2</sup> circulated to the Committee at the request of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

Province	1920	1921	1922
<i>Northern and Coastal Provinces.</i>	(1) No information available on cultivation.	—	—
CHIH LI			
KIANGSU	(1) No information available on cultivation.	—	—
SHANTUNG	(1) No information available on cultivation.	—	—
PECHILI			
<i>Northern Interior Provinces.</i>	(1) Poppy extensively grown in the west of the province Nesiang and Lo river basin being the chief producing districts. It is also grown as far east as Juchow and Kian Hsien.		
HONAN			

(2) Opium produced in Jehol.

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of 1st session (May 1921) of the Advisory Committee.

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 9 to the Minutes of the fifth session of the Advisory Committee.

(Continued.)

	1920	1921	1922
KANSU	(1) Kansu was practically free of poppy except in remote mountainous regions. The governor had taken a strong attitude and cashiered a number of officials.	(1) and (2) Opium grown openly with the connivance, if not under the direct order, of the military authorities. This was a result of the rise of the militarists. The civil governor is also reported to have announced to a meeting of officials, gentry and merchants that, in order to replenish the finances of the province, he had determined to encourage the planting of the opium poppy generally. (3) (Reports of Special Commissioners). The Commissioners found no trace of poppy cultivation.	
SHANSI	(1) No cases of cultivation reported except in remote districts.	(3) (Despatch of Governor). Opium cultivation had been strictly forbidden.	(3) Shansi reported to be entirely free of poppy cultivation, according to the despatch of the civil Governor.
SHENSI	(1) Reports from Hanchung, in the south of the province, indicate extensive and open cultivation carried on under the encouragement of the local military authorities. Nearly the whole of Hanchung was under poppy cultivation. This region was nominally under the control of the northern Government.	2) Opium widely grown especially in the valley of the Wei river, to the south of Hanchung-fu and in the south-east of the province. In the west the inhabitants were being subjected to "a heavy opium tax", levied equally on those who did and on those who did not cultivate the poppy. This province was considered to be under the effective control of the central Government. (3) (Reports of Special Commissioners).  Investigators reported that in many districts there was no poppy cultivation, while in others it had been suppressed. In Den Wu where several plantations were discovered, the Commission requested the local military and civil authorities to order destruction.	(3) No poppy cultivation was found in February 1922 and the region south of the Han river was being watched with a view to exterminating cultivation.
SUIYIEN		(3) Despatch of Special Commissioner). Poppy cultivation was discovered in some places, but the plants were destroyed. Great efforts had been made by the local authorities to enforce the prohibition law.	
Central Provinces ANHUI	(1) No reports of cultivation.	(3) (Despatch of Governor). Cultivation was only carried on in remote districts and in these the plants were destroyed.	
HUNAN	(1) In Western Hunan the poppy was growing in every district; one-third of the fields were under poppy cultivation in Chienchow and Chensi.		



(Continued.)

1922

1920

1921

HUPEH

(1) The poppy was being grown on an extensive scale in the whole of the Shihnan prefecture in south-west Hupeh.

(2) The cultivation of opium was more extensive than ever before.

(3) (Despatch of Civil Governor).

Poppy plants had been destroyed in many places and prohibition of opium cultivation would be enforced as soon as the south-west of the province had recovered from the invasion of the southern troops and order had been restored.

KIANGSI

(1) No reports of cultivation.

*Southern Coastal Provinces.*

CHEKIANG

(1) No cultivation.

FUKIEN

(1) This district was partly in the hands of the north and partly in the hands of the south and extensive cultivation was carried on in the districts of both sides. The officials had issued positive orders for the cultivation of the poppy. The International Anti-Opium Association was not allowed to send a delegate to witness the destruction of the crops, on the ground that the Anglo-Chinese agreement with its provisions for joint inspection had expired, and no action was taken to destroy them until the poppy had been successfully harvested and the taxes thereon collected by the local military authorities.

(3) (Reports by Special Commissioners and Despatches of Governor). According to these reports there was practically no cultivation of the poppy carried on in this province. In some districts it would appear that there had never been any opium grown, and in others cultivation had been suppressed.

(2) The cultivation of Opium was more extensive than ever before in the Foochow District.

(2) The southern part of Fukien contained extensive areas planted with opium and the British Consul reported that the northern troops were well known to encourage the farmers to plant poppy seed in many places. In the country round Kienning-Fu, there was a specially plentiful supply of opium. The areas of cultivation included particularly Teng-K'ou, Kuei-T'ing, Hsiang-T'ing, Feng-T'ing and Tzu-Hsiao.

(4) The poppy had been destroyed and no recrudescence had been detected. Fukien was the one district from which anything hopeful was reported and the activities of the new Commissioner, M. Wang Tai Chen, seemed to have been fairly successful. The districts in which the poppy had been destroyed were Chain-An, Min-Hai and Hian-Chien.

(5) Opium was sold every where in Kienning.

*Province*

KWANGTUNG

(1) No cultivation.

*South-West Provinces.*

KWEICHOW

(1) Every encouragement short of witten authority was given by the provincial officials to cultivate the poppy. A special bureau known as a Military Accounts Department, was instituted to collect the revenue from opium cultivation. During May, 1920 the reaping of the poppy crop paralysed all other work. Opium was seen growing in the districts of Chenyuan, Shenping, Hsinchow, Huanping, Chingping, Pingyueh, Huanghsien, Kueting, Lungh, Kweiyang, Chingchen, Anping, Anshun, Chiensi, Chinshin.

(6) Opium was planted everywhere and the famine conditions were in consequence serious. The distress was due to the extensive cultivation of the poppy, which left insufficient land for the cultivation of cereals.

(Continued)

	1920	1921	1922
SZECHUAN	(1) Some improvement, but cultivation had begun again during 1918 and 1919 above and below the district of Chungking. In the east considerable progress was made towards suppression.	(2) Free from cultivation except for certain districts. (3) (Despatch of Special Commissioner). Poppy cultivation was discovered in some places, but the plants were destroyed. Great efforts had been made by the local authorities to enforce the prohibition law.	
<i>Province</i> YUNNAN	(1) Cultivation was general throughout the province. An indication of the extent of production is given by the fact that opium was sold at \$ 1 per oz. in February, 50 cents in March and 30 cents in May, 1920.  The mountainous character of western Yunnan renders the actual acreage available for cultivation very small.	(2) The British Consul at Yunnan-Fu reported that opium was being grown throughout the province and that a regular system of taxation, under the guise of fines for the cultivation of opium, was in force. Cultivation had greatly increased under the direct encouragement of the military authorities.	
MANCHURIA AND MONGOLIA	(1) and (2) A small amount of cultivation was carried on, notably on the Korean frontier.		
KIRIN AND HEILUNKIANG	(2) Cultivation prevalent since 1919.	(3) (Despatch of Governor). In Kirin some districts were reported to cultivate the poppy, but most of the plants were destroyed upon discovery. A law prohibiting cultivation had been proclaimed and enforced. In Heilungkiang prohibition had been strictly enforced, with the exception of certain districts which were out of civil control on account of their remote situation.	(3) In this province cultivation had been suppressed and no trace of the poppy was to be found.
HSINCHIANG		(3) (Despatch of Governor). Prohibition of poppy cultivation had been strictly enforced.	
THIBET		(2) In the eastern and more settled portions of the Marches of Thibet large quantities were grown.	

NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Chinese Year Book, 1921.
- <sup>2</sup> Correspondence respecting the Cultivation of Opium in China. (Blue Book, China, No. 1, 1921). (Letter from Sir Beilby Alston to Dr. Yen, June 27th, 1921.)
- <sup>3</sup> Report of Mr. Chao-Hsin Chu to the Advisory Committee June 21st, 1922, based on reports from the Chinese Commissioners of the Commission of Enquiry in 1921. The Commissioners were as follows:  
*Fukien province:* Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung, accompanied by Mr. Chan Pei-Kiun, Taoyin of Amoy and Mr. Yu Shao-Ying.  
*Kansu province:* Special Commissioner Pan Ling-Kou, assisted by Rev. Yensou-chien.  
*Anhui province:* Governor of Anhui.  
*Kilin province:* Governor of Kilin.  
*Heilung-Kiang province:* Governor of Heilung-Kiang. Special Commissioner Chao Sen Chang.  
*Suiyien province:* Special Commissioner Wu Pun-Chih.  
*Hsinchiang province:* Governor of Hsin-Chiang.  
*Szechuan province:* Defence Commissioner of the frontier of Szechuan.  
*Jehol (Pechili province):* Special Commissioner Yao Chi-Yuen.
- <sup>4</sup> Extract from report received from H. B. M. Representative in China forwarded by the British Government to the Secretariat, September 1st, 1922.
- <sup>5</sup> Letter to the International Anti-Opium Association from Archdeacon Philips.
- <sup>6</sup> Telegram from the Kweichow representative of the United International Famine Relief Office, December 1921, to Headquarters, Peking.

*Estimated Total Production.*

It is impossible to obtain any figure for the production of opium in China after 1906<sup>1</sup> in which year the estimated production was 330,000 piculs<sup>2</sup>.

The Chinese delegates at the Shanghai Conference of 1909 said that no figures for production and cultivation had ever been available. There is, however, no doubt that the amount of poppy grown at this present moment is considerably less than that grown twelve years ago, when Sir Alexander Hosie made his report to the British Government in 1911.

In 1917 cultivation and production had ceased, and despite the fact that there has been a recrudescence of poppy cultivation during the last three years (as the foregoing comparative summary clearly shows), a reasonable estimate would put the 1919-20 crop at less than 10 % of the 1909-10 crop; the crops for 1921 and 1922 would not appear to exceed in any great measure that of 1920.

In general it may be assumed that the responsibility for the recrudescence of the cultivation of the poppy in China is due to the illegal action of the military authorities (Tuchuns), who are in many cases beyond the control of the Central Government.

In view of the complete absence of any official statistics, it is very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to arrive at an accurate figure of the present production. Foreign observers in China place it at an amount varying from one-tenth to one-third of the average production in the years before the prohibition of cultivation was enforced. It seems improbable that the present output will increase since morphia has in the last few years replaced opium to a considerable extent.

As a very approximate estimate, 10 % of the amount produced in 1906 has been taken. This would mean that China at present produces about 33,000 piculs (or 4,400,000 lbs). This figure should in no sense be taken as an accurate estimate but it may afford some idea of the amount of opium at present produced.

---

**Annex 12.**

---

[*Translation.*]

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL FROM THE SWISS GOVERNMENT

(May 21st, 1923).

During the debates of the Fifth Committee of the third Assembly of the League of Nations on the subject of the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, the Swiss representative made the statement that the Federal Council intended very shortly to submit the International Opium Convention for approval to the Federal Chambers. The Federal Government much regrets that, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, the Administrations entrusted with the necessary preparatory work have not been able to complete their work by the date which the Swiss representative had in view when making this declaration.

After having once more carefully considered the various problems of a hygienic, legal, economic and political nature arising out of the question of Switzerland's adherence to the International Opium Convention, the Federal Council, being convinced that not merely a national, but also an international regulation of the drug traffic is in the general interest, and fully recognising the high ideal at which the League of Nations aims, will make every endeavour to enable the Federal Chambers to give a decision in the near future on the question of the adherence of the Confederation to the 1912 Convention.

(Signed) MOTTA,  
for Federal Political Department.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Encyclopaedia Britannica".

<sup>2</sup> 1 picul = 133 1/3 lbs.

**Annex 13.**

PERSIAN AND TURKISH SITUATIONS.

June 6th, 1923.

(MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY MRS. HAMILTON WRIGHT.)

It is impossible to obtain a proper perspective of the question we are discussing without an understanding of the Turkish and Persian situations. It has been contended that it was unjust to ask further sacrifices on the part of India while Turkey and Persia continued their cultivation unchecked. At our last meeting in January there was a tentative proposal that the countries which had not accepted the Importation certificate system and refused to become parties to the Hague Convention be outlawed from the legitimate trade. This would apply primarily, of course, to the great opium-producing countries of Turkey and Persia. It is obvious that the co-operation of these countries is essential if an effective control of production is to be procured. While Turkey, for many years, refused to accept the Convention or attend any of the International Opium Conferences — and Persia while signing the Convention — nullified that action by her reservations, there has been of late a marked tendency on the part of both of these countries to co-operate in this movement. Taking this new attitude into consideration it seemed unwise to check their advances by threatened boycott.

The question of boycotting — even if accepted — presents many difficulties. As Persia and Turkey produce the only high grade medicinal opium, the question of conferring the monopoly on India, where the opium is of a most inferior grade, does not seem a practical one and would inevitably result in increasing rather than decreasing production. There is little reason to believe that Turkey and Persia would cease to cultivate, as they can always find a market through illicit channels for their greatly superior product, thereby increasing the difficulties at every angle.

In view of the recent determination of the Turkish delegation in Lausanne to accept the Convention, our position is obviously the correct one. This decision on the part of Turkey and her further declaration that she will later join the League of Nations marks a great step in advance.

The co-operation of Persia is equally essential — particularly in view of the immense amount of Persian opium which seems to be circulating throughout the East to-day without restraint. The Committee has already been provided with certain Persian figures. I have been promised still further information which should have been here before, but I shall at once circulate it when received. In a letter received recently from the Administrator General of Finances in Teheran, he wrote in regard to the policy of Persia in relation to the opium trade:

“A Commission is now sitting on this subject and it is expected that the various interested branches of the Government will arrive at a decision in this matter at a very early date. As soon as the decision is reached I shall also give you information regarding the production and exportation of Persian opium.”

A cable from the Government in Teheran to its representative in Washington states:

“A special committee formed to study the opium question will shortly present its report to the Madjless. The merchants are bitterly opposed to the restrictions of the growth of the poppy. Nevertheless, the Government is *making every effort* towards finding a solution of the problem which will commend itself to the Madjless and have the merit of both respecting Persia's international obligations and conciliating the merchants. As regards ratification of the Hague Opium Convention, a decision will be taken after the committee's report has been submitted to the Madjless.”

(Signed) GHAVAN-ED-SALTANEH,  
Persia.

From the Persian Legation in Washington the Minister writes as follows:

“I have sent numerous despatches to my Government both by mail and cable since last September and my endeavour has been faithfully to present to my Government both your views and the rising tide of American opinion against the traffic in opium and its derivatives.

“I have also learned in reply that, as a result of my representations a special committee has been formed and has been sitting in Teheran for some time with the purpose of carefully examining the whole problem in all its aspects. The Government is animated by a genuine desire to co-operate with other nations and is of the opinion that united action will alone achieve the object aimed at: all countries whether strong or weak must be willing to make sacrifices. I gather that the Committee is expected to submit its recommendations shortly and that the present Madjless or its successor will then put the matter to a vote.”

“One of the greatest obstacles with which the executive and legislative bodies have to contend is the strong opposition of the merchants, many of whom have been practically ruined by the stoppage of trade with Russia. There is a very serious adverse balance of trade existing at the present time in Persia owing to the fact that most of the products of our fertile northern and central provinces — which found a natural and easy outlet to the Russian market have now to take the long and devious route to the southern ports. The lack of railway and other transportation facilities makes it unprofitable to carry goods over long distances to the Persian Gulf. There is, therefore, a general outcry among the traders who see in the adoption of the recommendations of the Government a grave menace to one of their important remaining means of livelihood. Nevertheless, progress is being made in the right direction and the Government is alive to the necessity of demonstrating its good will in some tangible form.”

This letter shows the desire of the Persian Government to meet the now urgent demand for the restriction of opium cultivation. Persia's dependence upon her opium revenue is frankly admitted, but on the other hand she is not unwilling to meet the demand of public opinion that its cultivation be restricted if some practical programme of substitution can be suggested.

The situation in India is not so easily met. Turkey and Persia can always retain opium as legitimate items on their budgets. Nor would a restriction of cultivation seriously embarrass them — for as production is reduced the price must automatically ascend and opium still remain an important and in this case legitimate item of revenue.

But with India we have a different condition to meet. Indian opium has no permanent legitimate market. I do not speak of the opium consumed in that country under the term of “semi-medicinal.” Therefore when her exportation of raw opium is finally suppressed as imposed by the Hague Convention — she must turn to other sources for revenue. And it is gratifying to realise that there still remain in India great sources of wealth-as yet undeveloped — which would more than compensate for any loss entailed by the reduction of her poppy cultivation.

I have annexed to the present report (Appendix A) parts of a pertinent and suggestive article written by Lord Ronaldsday, late Governor of Bengal in the January number of the “Nineteenth Century.” This speaks at great length of the potentialities of that immense and as yet but partially developed country — of the 225,000,000 acres in British India which bring forth yearly crops of foodstuff — and which have not yet reached anything approaching their full development. He speaks of jute and the mills in Calcutta which exported before the war over 3,000,000 bags of one kind or another and during the war increased this number to 800,000,000. He refers to a new variety of rice which in 1919 resulted in an increase to the food supply in a certain area of 60,000,000 pounds, and he reminds the reader that round the head of the Bay of Bengal alone lie 20,000,000 acres of productive rice land. Another large potential source of wealth are the forests which cover some 250,000 square miles of territory. I only touch briefly on these points. He writes of the mineral wealth of the continent which is still more a matter for future development and closes his article emphasizing the fact that in the matter of raw materials India is one of the most valuable storehouses within the empire.

I shall speak very briefly of the Balkan situation (Appendix B) where the opium problem is relatively a minor one. Jugoslavia has inherited her opium problem with Macedonia where the peasants are growing small plots of poppy and selling to merchants in Salonika. It is difficult to trace this opium to its destination. The people of Macedonia also resent any interference on the part of Jugoslavia and therefore it is hard to exercise much control. But it is not the problem in the Balkans which is the serious one. It is upon Turkey and Persia that attention must focus.

As regards the attitude of the Turk — I found him extremely reasonable and not opposed to the principle that the cultivation of the poppy should be restricted to its medicinal need. The use of opium in Turkey is negligible. Those with whom I spoke said quite frankly that their religion enforced abstemious living and prohibited the taking either of drugs or wine, that if a practical substitute could take the place of opium in the Turkish budget — that is over and above the medicinal need of opium — the Turk would not be adverse to subscribing to such a principle (Appendix C.). I discussed the question with many prominent Turks in Constantinople and they said that opium as opium was not of interest to them — but as a matter of revenue it had a very definite place. If a constructive programme, however, could be presented whereby other revenue accruing items could be substituted, they saw no reason why such substitution should not take place, gradually of course and without needless dislocation of their financial machinery. In Lausanne I discussed this whole situation at length with the Turkish delegation and I was given authority by them to state to this Committee that they were in accord with the opinions expressed to me in Constantinople.

I have quoted from these various reports and articles in order to show that there is after all a practical way — if the nations choose — of getting rid of this curse of opium, without suffering financial disaster.

As a matter of fact the world seems to have lost its perspective entirely in regard to this trade. Opium in the final analysis destroys — it does not create markets. It paralyses labour. And every pound that enters a country lessens the demand for the honest commodities that go to the upbuilding of a nation.

It is not necessary to dwell on the moral aspect of the trade. But no matter how dexterously we avoid the issue or distort the facts — in dealing with opium we are not dealing with the ordinary merchandise of everyday commerce — we are trading actually in human lives. For this reason the question strikes home so directly to America. Slavery was entrenched in the United States as is the opium trade in the East; and the disappearance of slavery meant great financial

readjustment and sacrifices and loss — and an abominable civil war. But so wrong a thing could not endure — and it went at last as opium must inevitably go.

It seems to me that the goal is less distant to-day than ever before. An extraordinary opportunity has been given to us sitting here in this room. It would be an infinite pity if we were not wise enough and brave enough to grasp it — but should leave it to some later group endowed with greater vision and a greater desire to serve their fellows than we.

---

Appendix A.

ARTICLE BY LORD RONALDSHAY, LATE GOVERNOR OF BENGAL  
PUBLISHED IN THE "NINETEENTH CENTURY," JANUARY, 1923.

Every year some 225,000,000 acres in British India bring forth crops of sugar, tea and coffee; rice, wheat, barley and other food grains; linseed, sesamum, rape and other oil seeds; cotton, jute and other fibres; indigo, opium and tobacco. In a single year<sup>1</sup> these spreading acres have yielded 34,750,000 tons of cleaned rice, 10,250,000 tons of wheat, 370,000,000 lbs. of tea, 4,500,000 400-lb. bales of cotton, 8,300,000 bales of jute, 500,000 tons of linseed, nearly 1,200,000 tons of rape and mustard, the same amount of groundnut, and 2,750,000 tons of raw sugar.

Nor has this immense territory reached anything approaching its full development. The tiller of the soil in India is, to say the least, conservative in his methods. With the aid of modern science the crops upon the land already cultivated can be enormously increased. Take an example: Bengal and Assam hold a practical monopoly in the production of jute, the raw material of the gunny bags in which year by year are moved the harvest of the world. During the war the fibre was put to another use of supreme importance to the armies in the field: sand-bags for the protection of the troops took the place to a large extent of the ordinary gunny bags of commerce. The mills of Calcutta, which exported 367,000,000 bags of one kind or another during the year before the war, increased this number to 802,000,000 during the year 1916-17, when the war was at its height. These are but examples of the importance of the product in peace and war. Much painstaking research on the part of the experts and the Agricultural Department has resulted in the discovery of varieties of the plant which give a yield much in excess of those hitherto grown by the Indian peasant. A variety known as "Kakya Bombai", giving, on the average, 160 lbs. of fibre more per acre than the local varieties, has been distributed amongst the villages of Eastern Bengal during the past few years, and by the year 1921 was being grown on an area of 200,000 acres. So successful was the crop that it was estimated that the eventual increase in the yield of the plant on the jute lands of Bengal might easily amount to 400,000,000 lbs. of fibre, worth probably £2,750,000. Scarcely had this estimate been made when a still more highly productive variety was discovered, giving on the average a yield of 80 lbs. an acre more fibre than "Kakya Bombai" itself. A similar story can be told of rice. Research produced not long ago, two varieties giving yields greater by some 250 lbs. per acre than those of the local variety. In 1919 these two varieties were grown on 250,000 acres, with the result that the food supply on this area was increased by 60,000,000 lbs. of grain worth £200,000. Be it remembered that round the head of the Bay of Bengal alone lie 20,000,000 acres of productive rice land and some idea of the ultimate value of this discovery can be formed.

These are not the only ways in which the agricultural output is being increased. By means of irrigation vast tracts of land formerly desert are being brought under the plough. The Punjab provides a notable example. Here an arid waste has been transformed into a bounteous granary. Canal colonies have been plotted out and nearly 9,000,000 acres in the province have been brought under cultivation by irrigation works classed as productive, *i. e.* works capable within ten years of their construction of producing sufficient revenue to cover their working expenses and the interest charges on their capital cost. All these things are sign-posts pointing the roads along which India is travelling towards a vastly increased production of raw material.

Another large potential source of wealth are the forests, which cover over 250,000 square miles of territory. These immense tracts are gradually being taken in hand, but the output of timber and firewood at present amounts to only 2 cubic feet per acre; while the manufacture of paper pulp from such things as bamboo — of which there are vast quantities — has only recently been undertaken. A useful product of the forests is the fruit of certain trees widely distributed over the continent, to which the commercial name of myrobalan, has been given. Its value is due to the tannin it contains, which renders it an important tanning agent. (It is exported at the rate of from 40,000 to 60,000 tons a year.) By a happy coincidence the country which produces a tanning agent on so large a scale likewise possesses, in almost unexampled quantity, material which when tanned becomes a commodity of universal consumption, namely, *leather*.

No statistics are required to apprise anyone who is familiar with the Indian landscape, whether in north or south or east or west, of the part played by the cow in the internal economy of the country. Let him call to memory any rural scene, and he will find it dominated by the bullock or the cow. It was estimated by the Indian Industrial Commission that there were in India 180,000,000 head of cattle and 87,000,000 sheep and goats; and in any case the export

---

<sup>1</sup> 1916-17, taken at random.

of hides and skins is not a matter of computation, but of fact. The year before the war the quantity of hides and skins exported was 1,906,931 cwts., valued at £10,606,000.

The mineral wealth of the continent is still more a matter for future development.

It will be seen, then, that in the matter of raw materials India is one of the most valuable storehouses within the Empire.

Appendix B.

OPIUM AND POPPY-SEED OIL IN JUGOSLAVIA.

*Report from the American Consul at Belgrade.*

Poppy seed was first brought into Macedonia about 1850, by the Government of Turkey, in an effort to economically and commercially improve that part of their empire, and to increase their income. Since that time, the cultivation of poppy flowers in Macedonia, — first for the seed, and later for the opium and the seed, — has steadily increased.

The ordinary poppy or "garden poppy" (*Papaver somniferum vulgare*) is cultivated to some extent in the northern part of Yugoslavia, for the seed, which is used for flavouring food. The flower of this poppy is red, and the capsule is porous when ripe. The seed is grey in color.

The opium poppy (*papaver somniferum canaliculatum* or *allum*) is another variety, the capsule of which, when ripe, does not become porous, and the flowers of which are white or violet. The seed of the white poppy is light grey, that of the violet poppy is darker with a violet hue.

The white flowered poppy gives the best opium and the seeds from the white poppy gives the most oil. It is cultivated principally in the region of Tikves, and to a smaller extent in the regions of Havardarski, Veles, Stip, Kumanovo, Strumica, Prilep, Radoviste, and Kocane, all in Macedonia.

Ordinary commercial opium contains from 8 to 16 % morphine, depending on the climate, soil, and condition of the plants. Macedonian opium is considered to be richer in morphine than opium from Asia, but opium from different regions in Macedonia varies in the amount of morphine contained. According to statistics for the year 1917, the percentage of morphine in the opium from the regions in Macedonia was:

1. Kavardarski (Tikves)	11 1/2 to 14 1/2 %	morphine
2. Veles	11 to 13 1/2 %	"
3. Stip	10 1/2 to 13 %	"
4. Kumanovo	9 1/2 to 12 %	"
5. Strumica	9 to 12 %	"
6. Prilep	8 1/2 to 11 1/2 %	"
7. Radoviste	8 to 11 %	"
8. Kocane	8 to 11 %	"

According to these figures, the opium from the regions of Tikves, Veles, Stip, and Kumanovo, is considered the best. Opium from the regions of Smyrna and Constantinople gives an average percentage of 8 %, and that from Alexandria contains only 6 % morphine. Serbian opium therefore brings a better market price. It is blended with opioms of lower grades. According to information received from a German factory for extraction of morphine (E. Werk, of Darmstadt), the best opium is obtained by mixing the Macedonian opium with opium from Asia Minor and Persia. If only Persian or Asiatic opium is used, the quality of morphine is inferior.

During the occupation by the enemy, this German factory bought, in 1917, in Macedonia, 88,000 lbs. of opium, at prices ranging from \$ 12.75 to \$ 25.50 per lb.

The annual crop varies from 110,000 lbs., to 137,500 lbs., which is exported to England, France, Germany and some to other countries. Before the war, the price was about 80 dinars gold per oka. (\$ 5.50 a lb.). The 1920 harvest was sold for about \$ 8.50 a lb.

Before the war, this opium was exported through Salonika to London, packed in cases of 165 lbs. each. Merchants of Salonika used to buy the opium (green) in the fields, through agents.

Export in 1921 of

	Opium.		Poppy seed.	
	Lbs.	Dinars.	Lbs.	Dinars.
Austria	132.3	10,800	53.2	220
France	2.2	200		
Greece	153,433	11,505,810	26,073.3	45,000
Occupied Territories			3,897.3	21,965
Fiume			1,282.7	6,845
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Lbs. 153,657.5</b>	<b>Din. 11,505,810</b>	<b>Lbs. 31,304</b>	<b>Din. 74,030</b>



Export for 1922 (eleven months only).

	Opium.		Poppy seed.	
	Lbs.	Dinars.	Lbs.	Dinars.
Greece	73,411	6,821,622	4,195	16,045
Italy			51	325
Austria			66,568	378,222
Bulgaria			72,758	184,120
Czechoslovakia			3,139	19,000
Hungary			97,913	315,890
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Lbs. 73,411</b>	<b>Din. 6,821,622</b>	<b>Lbs. 244,624</b>	<b>Din. 913,602</b>

Crop and Acreage of fields sown for poppy seed.

	1920.		1921.	
	Acres.	Lbs.	Acres.	Lbs.
Serbia			8.2	15.5
South Serbia	5,212	15,013	6,166.2	16,172.2
Croatia and Sloven.	1,112	7,838	1,020.6	4,309.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina			22.2	57.3
Voivodina	615	3,053	840.8	3,394.3
Slovenia	166	607.7	200	755.8
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>Acres 7,105</b>	<b>Lbs. 26,501.7</b>	<b>Acres 8,258</b>	<b>Lbs. 24,706</b>

Appendix C.

OPIUM INDUSTRY IN FORMER OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

March, 1923.

*Report from the American Consul General at Constantinople.*

It should be noted that conditions favourable to poppy growing also lend themselves to the raising of grain, cotton, tobacco and silk. This is proven by the fact that in Macedonia and in Anatolia where the use of fertiliser is either unknown or deprecated, and where, for that reason, it is necessary to pursue the system of crop rotation, since the poppy exhausts the soil, the above mentioned products are grown on poppy land.

It may also be germane to invite attention to the fact that the methods in vogue out here in tilling the soil, in employing fertiliser and irrigation, in organizing the industry, are decidedly primitive, and that by the introduction of modern notions and practises a larger output at more profitable rates undoubtedly could be procured, provided skilled labour could be found at "reasonable" wages. The only instance of a 20th-century plant in the poppy industry known to the writer was launched in Macedonia in 1910, in and around the village of Gratzko, by a German who was acting, it is believed, for the big opium manufacturing firm in Darmstadt known as "Werk". This German farm was said to produce 1500 kilos of opium in a year. It is now broken up in consequence of the war. Generally, the holdings used for poppy growing are small and scattered, and the peasants are too phlegmatic or too poor to give adequate scientific attention to soil, weeds, plants and harvest.

Furthermore, it seems clear that the poppy planters as a class are not exclusively nor even primarily interested in the production of opium. The extraction of oil from the seeds is perhaps the uppermost consideration.

Turkish official statistics, although far from accurate, afford at least an approximate idea of the acreage devoted to poppy growing in Anatolia. The annexed table (which does not refer to Turkey in Europe nor to the hinterland of Salonika) shows a rather considerable oil production. It has been furnished by the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture. What becomes of the surplus of seeds not used for oil extraction for domestic use does not appear. Some of this raw material is exported to foreign lands, to be absorbed by them for purposes of artistic oil painting, salad oil, adulterating olive oil, cattle feed (oil cakes), etc. But the fact remains that the production of edible oil is an important element in poppy growing — as are olive oil, cotton oil, sesame oil and other vegetable oils entering into the daily diet of the Anatolian peasant. Similar conditions prevail in Macedonia. In 1910, if my information is correct, 4,000 tons of poppy seed were exported via Salonika, mostly for the oil factories of Germany (Mannheim) and northern France. How much oil was produced, in the same period, for home consumption is not known. It is generally estimated that 13 okes of seed, produce 7 okes of oil, the ratio being about 39%. Poppy oil is somewhat cheaper than olive oil and widely used by the poorer classes of the population (not only as food and cooking butter, but also in soap and varnish making and for burning in lamps). Its production calls for no such minute attention to the care of soil, plant and fruit as that required

when opium is the main object. In regions where wars and emigration have thinned out the population and raised the cost of labour, this economy is an item of consequence.

However, opium growing undoubtedly is a remunerative occupation, although the Government collects its tithe in accordance with immemorial usage (in Turkey at present 12 1/2 % of the product in natura). It is claimed by some that the net financial proceeds of a poppy field in Macedonia are three times higher on an average than those of a grain field of equal dimensions in that section, and that the difference in Anatolia is from 600 % to 900 % in favour of opium. This proportion is probably much exaggerated as otherwise, in spite of all obstacles, real or imagined, opium growing would be conspicuously on the increase instead of the reverse. Logic imposes the conclusion that, if opium growing were so exceedingly profitable, the industry would attract outside capital, induce modern methods of exploitation and blossom forth as an industrial factor of first class importance in spite of all humanitarian restrictions. As a matter of fact, the production of opium in these parts, as shown in the table hereunto annexed and marked as Appendix II, has suffered violent fluctuations and rather declined during the last quarter of a century. I dare not venture a prediction regarding the future. Unquestionably, as in the case of Turkish cigarette tobacco which, of late years, has experienced a wonderful development, the growing of opium possesses strange potentialities.

In order to reduce the present output and prevent any possible increase on a large scale, it would seem desirable to find a satisfactory substitute for the poppy business. In Macedonia, tobacco seems to promise the best results in this relation. In post bellum Turkey, perhaps the most efficacious antidote would be sericulture. With the people of the Near East, it is largely an economic question because neither the Turks nor the Greeks, nor the Bulgarians are opium smokers. Hashish is used to a limited extent, especially in Egypt, but this narcotic is derived from hemp, not from the poppy.

Silk has played a certain role in the economics of Turkey ever since the days of Justinian. The worm came here from China, and from here it spread into Greece, Sicily and Spain. Its culture, like so many other potential industries in the Near East, is in a state of suspended animation. During the war many mulberry trees were cut down for fuel. However, Asia Minor as a whole as well as Syria and the Caucasus, offers splendid opportunities for sericulture. The white raw silk of Brusa unquestionably equals the best brands of the Far East. But the methods in vogue in these parts are antiquated, the machinery used obsolete, the skilled labour partly dispersed.

In reference to the present international effort to limit the production of opium in Turkey, Persia, India and elsewhere to the quantities actually needed for medical purposes, it is desirable that it should not be jeopardized by tactless blunders hurting the *amour-propre* of backward countries.

In Turkey, there is no opium smoking of any consequence and no particular national attachment for the opium industry. It is believed that the people of Turkey would cheerfully fall into line with any programme for the restriction of opium production if some other source of revenue of similar promise could be devised. Under these circumstances, it would seem neither just nor politic, to threaten them with economic boycott unless they abruptly terminate their husbandry.

While numerous Turkish planters are engaged in poppy growing, the opium trade is altogether in the hands of Jews and Armenians. Just now the whole poppy business is in a bad way in Anatolia because of the recent Greek-Turkish war. It so happens, that the principal poppy fields are found in that section of Asia Minor over which that war was fought (as shown by enclosed maps borrowed from Dr. Millant's "La culture du pavot et le commerce de l'opium en Turquie", Paris, 1913). No moment, therefore, could be more propitious than the present, for inaugurating in that devastated region agricultural improvements. It will take several years before the war-stricken people of Western Asia Minor can recover. Before the war they had a mohair industry which commanded the world's commerce in that commodity; the war has reduced it by 50-75%. So with wool and other lines of domestic activity. The people are in a desperately receptive mood, and Westerners engaged in combating the "dope" traffic might well consider the practical value of actively helping the farmers of the ravaged hinterland of Smyrna and Brusa to undertake silk raising on a large scale.

As far as the Levant is concerned, Constantinople, Smyrna and Salonika are the principal opium markets. For the time being, two Governments are chiefly affected: 1) That of Turkey and 2) that of Greece. Yugoslavia is a minor, although by no means negligible factor in the opium business.

---

*Sub-Appendix No. 1.*

POPPY CULTURE IN ANATOLIA.

Vilayet.	Surface tilled Dunums.	Seeds used Okes.	Crops harvested Okes.	Oil produced in Turkey.
Angora. . . . .	10,526	14,330	434,880	9,728
Aidin . . . . .	38,807	40,823	5,455,600	22,000
Brussa . . . . .	15,150	12,500	98,000	59,000
Sivas . . . . .	39,315	98,305	1,293,360	89,550
Castamoni . . . . .	150	200	10,000	—
Konia . . . . .	42,764	110,400	2,479,051	236,000
Mamouret-ul-Aziz . . . . .	38,900	29,400	332,050	128,750
Eski-Shehir . . . . .	9,400	8,800	35,510	1,552
Adalia . . . . .	830	1,655	—	—
Ismidt . . . . .	1,479	1,189	57,340	4,000
Bolou . . . . .	4,500	5,200	117,000	13,500
Kara-Hissar . . . . .	33,300	76,900	14,370,000	981,116
Karassi . . . . .	13,100	7,200	351,300	87,250
Caesarea . . . . .	550	270	7,860	3,800
Kutahia . . . . .	30,300	28,000	1,311,400	488,350
Marash . . . . .	800	800	48,000	6,000
Nigde . . . . .	150	150	12,000	—
	<u>280,021</u>	<u>436,122</u>	<u>26,413,351</u>	<u>2,130,596</u>

Remarks: 4 Dunums = one acre.  
1 Oke = 2 5/8 lbs.

*Sub-Appendix No. 2.*

OPIMUM PRODUCTION IN ANATOLIA AND MACEDONIA.

Year.	Output in Asia Minor.	Output in Macedonia.
1888. . . . .	8,700 cases	700 cases
1889. . . . .	5,500 "	1,200 "
1890. . . . .	5,300 "	1,400 "
1891. . . . .	7,400 "	1,300 "
1892. . . . .	7,500 "	1,000 "
1893. . . . .	2,845 "	250 "
1894. . . . .	4,500 "	1,050 "
1895. . . . .	7,500 "	1,100 "
1896. . . . .	4,500 "	860 "
1897. . . . .	7,000 "	1,150 "
1898. . . . .	3,500 "	800 "
1899. . . . .	6,500 "	1,600 "
1900. . . . .	8,000 "	1,650 "
1901. . . . .	6,500 "	1,350 "
1902. . . . .	11,000 "	2,800 "
1903. . . . .	4,000 "	955 "
1904. . . . .	9,850 "	2,800 "
1905. . . . .	3,500 "	550 "
1906. . . . .	6,500 "	980 "
1907. . . . .	2,500 "	300 "
1908. . . . .	4,000 "	800 "
1909. . . . .	4,300 "	650 "
1910. . . . .	9,000 "	1,500 "
1911. . . . .	2,000 "	200 "
1913. . . . .	10,500 "	
1914. . . . .	7,000 "	
1915. . . . .	2,750 "	
1916. . . . .	3,000 "	
1917. . . . .	2,400 "	
1918. . . . .	3,340 "	
1919. . . . .	3,000 "	
1920. . . . .	2,000 "	
1921. . . . .	2,200 "	
1922. . . . .	2,400 "	

Sub-Appendix No. 3.

OPIUM IN TURKEY.

Turkish opium has three nomenclatures each designating a different quality. They are: 1) Druggist, 2) Soft and 3) Malatia.

*Druggist:*

The druggist opium is used mostly in the preparation of morphine and other pharmaceutical prescriptions. It is somewhat harder than the other two qualities and yields 12 % of morphine according to the British Harrison analysis, which is the equivalent of 11 % in American analytical measures. This quality is produced in the following cities of Anatolia, arranged in order of their productive importance: Kara-Hissar, Eski-Shehir, Tchal, Islam-Keuy, Balikesser, Bolvadin, Ack-Shehir, Narli-Han, Tchaoushli, Biledjik, Kara-Agatch, Gheve, Sparta, Kutahia and Konia. The city of Urgub can be added to these, as it produces a peculiar kind of opium used in mixing soft and druggist.

*Soft:*

The soft quality, as the name implies, is softer than other opioms and has a finer appearance, *i. e.*, a clearer, golden-like colour. It gives a better taste to smokers and yields from 13 to 15 % morphine. Soft opium is produced in Asia Minor at Hadji-Keuy, Amassia, Nixa, Tokat, Erba-Herek, Zile, Yozgad and Yumush-Hadji-Keuy.

*Malatia:*

Malatia opium is produced in the city of the same name, and yields from 11 to 12 % of morphine. It is sometimes mixed with soft and druggist with a view to getting a better price, but when unmixed it is sold at practically the same price as druggist.

During the World War, Germany and Austria absorbed nearly all the Turkish opium output. Soon after the Armistice, Japan monopolised the market by buying over 3,000 cases of 143 pounds each. United States, English, German, Italian and French buyers appeared on the market late in 1919. Americans bought \$ 1,308,051 worth in the same year, \$ 275,424 in 1920, \$ 144,802 in 1921, and \$ 179,574 in 1922. The lack of labour and war conditions prevailing in Asia Minor, since Turkey entered the European war, have considerably decreased the output. Anatolian peasants are now sowing wheat, corn and barley instead of opium in order to keep themselves alive. Local opium dealers, however, are of the opinions that, with the advent of normal conditions, Anatolian peasants will find it profitable to pay more attention to opium sowing. Subjoined is a table showing how the Turkish opium output has been affected by war conditions:

1913	10,500	cases of 143 lbs. each
1914	7,000	" "
1915	2,750	" "
1916	3,000	" "
1917	2,400	" "
1918	3,340	" "
1919	3,000	" "
1920	2,000	" "
1921	2,200	" "
1922	2,400	" "

Constantinople and Smyrna are the principal markets for Turkish opium. Prices vary with foreign exchange fluctuations, stocks available for export, and arrivals from the interior. Speculators also play an important role in fixing prices. Stocks available for export at Constantinople at the end of 1922 amounted to 814 cases and at Smyrna to 160 cases. Present market prices are the following:

Druggist	at 1200-1250	piasters per oke	(\$ 2.65 — \$ 2.77 per lb)
Soft	" 1350-1400	" " "	(\$ 3.00 — \$ 3.10 " " )
Malatia	" 1250-1300	" " "	(\$ 2.77 — \$ 2.88 " " )

**Annex 14.**

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM  
AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.**

**REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON THE WORK OF THE FIFTH SESSION**  
*(May 24th to June 7th, 1923.)*

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs has the honour to submit to the Council of the League the following report on the proceedings at its fifth session, which was held from May 24th to June 7th, 1923.

This session has been particularly important in view of the proposals which were submitted to the Committee by the Delegation of the United States of America and in view of the conclusions which, as a result of its enquiries and of its previous work, the Committee has unanimously reached for the establishment of a programme of practical action. In the resolutions which it has adopted, the Committee proposes that the Council should invite the interested Governments to open negotiations in order to arrive at agreements with a view to carrying out this programme.

The wealth of information collected by the Committee has enabled it, moreover, to examine the general situation as regards the production and use of opium and other drugs.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.**

All the members and assessors were present, but in some instances the Governments concerned had nominated new representatives, Dr. UCHINO now representing Japan, Dr. POENSGEN representing Germany, and the United States of America being represented in an advisory capacity by the Hon. Stephen G. PORTER, in association with Bishop BRENT and Surgeon-General BLUE. No answer having been received by the Secretariat from the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the invitations issued by the Council, this Power was not represented.

The following is a list of the members present:

M. G. BOURGOIS (Chairman)	<i>France</i>
H. H. Prince CHAROON (Vice-Chairman)	<i>Siam</i>
M. CHAO-HSIN CHU	<i>China</i>
Dr. POENSGEN	<i>Germany</i>
Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE	<i>Great Britain</i>
Mr. John CAMPBELL	<i>India</i>
Dr. Senichi UCHINO	<i>Japan</i>
M. van WETTUM	<i>Netherlands</i>
H. E. M. FERREIRA	<i>Portugal</i>
The Hon. Stephen G. PORTER in association with Bishop BRENT and Surgeon-General BLUE	} <i>United States of America</i>

*Assessors:*

M. Henri BRENIER  
Sir John JORDAN  
Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT

*Secretary:*

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

## REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE.

The Committee decided, with reference to Rule 2 of its Rules of Procedure, that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should hold office from one spring session to another.

### PUBLICITY OF MEETINGS.

The Committee noted that the Council had agreed that it should be left to the discretion of the Committee to decide what publicity should be given to its meetings.

The Committee decided that for this session all the meetings should be held in public unless the members of the Committee wished to sit in private for the discussion of any particular question.

### THE PROPOSALS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Delegation of the United States of America presented the two following proposals:

“ 1. If the purpose of the Hague Opium Convention is to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent, it must be recognised that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate. ”

“ 2. In order to prevent the abuse of these drugs, it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medicinal and non-scientific purposes. ”

These proposals were amplified by the United States representatives, who, in commenting on them, showed that they were in full accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the International Opium Convention of 1912.

The Committee very fully examined the proposals of the United States. It would be difficult in a short space to summarise the discussions which took place, but a full report of them is included in the minutes of the meetings, and reference should be made to them. After a long discussion, and on the proposal of a Drafting Committee which was appointed to prepare the final text, the Committee adopted unanimously the following resolution:

“ I. The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium accepts and recommends to the League of Nations the proposals of the United States representatives as embodying the general principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs, and on which, in fact, the International Convention of 1912 is based, subject to the fact that the following reservation has been made by the representatives of the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal and Siam:

“ ‘The use of prepared opium and the production, export and import of raw opium for that purpose are legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention.’ ”

“ II. The Advisory Committee, appreciating the great value of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has for the past two years been making to deal with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs, expresses the belief that all the Governments concerned will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention.

“ III. In bringing the American proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Advisory Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by: (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adhesion of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medicinal and scientific uses with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) recommending the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures for securing international co-operation in suppressing that traffic; (4) inviting the Powers with territories in the Far East to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for an investigation by the Chinese Government of the conditions in China with a view to the more effective application of Chapter II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention.

“ IV. As a means of giving effect to the principles submitted by the representatives of the United States and the policy which the League, on the recommendation of the Committee, has adopted, and having regard to the information now available, the Advisory Committee recommends to the Council the advisability of inviting:

- “(a) The Governments of the States in which morphine, heroin or cocaine and their respective salts are manufactured and the Governments of the States in which raw opium or the coca leaf is produced for export for the purpose of such manufacture;
- “(b) The Governments having territories in which the use of prepared opium is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention, and the Government of the Republic of China,”

to enter into immediate negotiations (by nominating representatives to form a committee or committees, or otherwise) to consider whether, with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912, agreements could not now be reached between them:

- “(a) As to a limitation of the amounts of morphine, heroin or cocaine and their respective salts to be manufactured; as to a limitation of the amounts of raw opium and the coca leaf to be imported for that purpose and for other medicinal and scientific purposes; and as to a limitation of the production of raw opium and the coca leaf for export to the amount required for such medicinal and scientific purposes. The latter limitation is not to be deemed to apply to the production and export of raw opium for the purpose of smoking in those territories where that practice is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention;
- “(b) As to a reduction of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those territories where it is temporarily continued, and as to the measures which should be taken by the Government of the Republic of China to bring about a suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China.”

*Reservation by the Representative of the Government of India.*

The representative of the Government of India associates himself with the foregoing resolution, subject to the following reservation regarding paragraph I:

“The use of raw opium, according to the established practice in India, and its production for such use, are not illegitimate under the Convention.”

The representatives of the United States of America communicated to the Advisory Committee the following reply regarding the above resolution:

“I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 5th, 1923, enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted by the Advisory Committee in regard to the propositions presented by the United States representatives.

“The reservation made by the representatives of the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal and Siam in adopting the American proposals appears to be but a reaffirmation of Chapter II of the Hague Opium Convention, and, as such, gives rise to no question. Paragraphs II and III are matters to which no exception could, it is hoped, be taken, especially as it is the earnest desire of the United States to co-operate in every possible way in the work of suppressing the abuse of narcotic drugs.

“While I am without specific instructions in regard to the subject-matter of Paragraph IV, it contains a suggestion which I shall take pleasure in submitting to my Government for favourable consideration.

(Signed) Stephen G. PORTER.”

APPLICATION OF CHAPTER II OF THE CONVENTION WITH REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN POSSESSIONS AND OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE FAR EAST.

The Advisory Committee very fully discussed the question of the use of prepared opium and examined the figures for consumption in the European Possessions and other countries in the Far East. It reached the conclusion that the general situation does not show at present the gradual reduction of the use of prepared opium which is stipulated by the terms of Chapter II of the Convention, and adopted by six votes to one, with one abstention, the following resolution proposed by the representative of Great Britain:

“The Advisory Committee, having regard to the large amount of detailed information now available, recommends the Council to invite the Powers with Far Eastern territories where the use of opium for smoking is temporarily continued, in pursuance of Chapter II of the Opium Convention, to enter into immediate negotiations, by means of calling a special conference of representatives of these Governments, or otherwise, to consider what measures could be taken to give a more effective application to Chapter II of the Convention and to bring about a reduction of the amount of opium used, and whether, on the lines of the suggestions set out below or on other lines, an agreement or understanding could not now be reached for the adoption of a uniform policy on the matter:



- “I. That the farm system, where it is still in operation, should be abolished, and that the opium business should be made a Government monopoly and kept entirely in the hands of the Government.
- “II. As a corollary of paragraph I, that the retail sale of prepared opium should be made only from Government shops, and that all private shops should be abolished. Persons in charge of the Government shops should be paid a fixed salary, without any commission on the amount of business done, and therefore would have no temptation to push the sales.
- “III. That a uniform maximum limit should be fixed for the amount of prepared opium placed on sale for consumption, calculated according to the number of the adult Chinese male population, *e.g.*,  $x$  taels per 10,000 adult Chinese males in the territory, and that the annual imports of raw opium should be limited to the amount required for that rate of consumption.
- “IV. That the possibilities of the system of registration and licensing, which has already been introduced in some of the Far Eastern territories, should be thoroughly explored.
- “V. That the possibility should be considered of making uniform, so far as circumstances permit:
  - “(a) the price at which prepared opium is retailed in the different territories, and
  - “(b) the penalties for infraction of the law in regard to the import, export, sale and use of prepared opium.
- “VI. That the interested Powers, that is the Powers having territories in the Far East where the consumption of prepared opium is still permitted, should conclude an agreement among themselves to apply the foregoing measures for the purpose of carrying out Chapter II of the Convention.
- “VII. That the position should be generally reviewed periodically by the Powers interested and the question of further reducing the maximum limit fixed in the agreement should be considered.”

The Committee further unanimously decided to recommend that the minutes of its discussions on the subject should be communicated to the Governments with the resolution.

#### LIMITATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF MORPHINE, OTHER OPIUM DERIVATIVES AND COCAINE.

The Advisory Committee examined such figures as had been obtainable regarding the manufacture of morphine, other opium derivatives and cocaine in the producing countries. It became apparent, during the consideration of this item of the agenda, that there was a large amount of morphine and other drugs imported to and manufactured in Japan. The Committee received explanations from the Japanese representative to the effect that, as no figures for the quantity of morphine actually remaining in stock in Japan were available, the statistics for import and manufacture combined could not be taken as representing consumption. The Committee noted that, from information supplied by the Japanese Government to the Japanese Diet on February 2nd, 1923, it appeared that the quantity of narcotic drugs required by Japan for internal consumption was far below the amount imported and manufactured.

The Japanese representative said that it might be supposed that some quantity of drugs was smuggled out of Japan without the knowledge of the Japanese Government, but he informed the Committee of new ordinances which had lately been promulgated by his Government with the object of restricting the import and export of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts and of supervising their manufacture, sale and consumption. The new laws required the permission of the Department of Home Affairs for the export and import of these drugs, and, in the case of export, the application had to be accompanied by a certificate issued by the authorities of the locality to which the shipment was destined. A manufacturer was required to notify the local authorities of the raw materials which he used, his yearly output and the whereabouts of his factory. He had further to furnish an annual report of the names of the products, the quantities which he manufactured and the sources of supply of his raw materials. The Committee was glad to receive the assurances of the Japanese representative that his Government was taking more effective measures to cope with the general situation in Japan regarding narcotics.

The Committee had before it statistics of the import of drugs into America showing that the great majority of the derivatives of opium and cocaine imported by the United States was furnished by Switzerland. The importance of obtaining the adhesion of Switzerland to the Convention and the import and export certificate system was emphasised.

The information obtained by the Committee concerning the manufacture of drugs was steadily increasing and seemed to make it possible now to form a rough estimate of the world's requirements.

Twenty-one Governments had transmitted to the Secretariat an approximate estimate of their total annual requirements for internal consumption, and the Mixed Sub-Committee appointed jointly by the Health and Opium Committees was still pursuing its investigations.

Suggestions were considered regarding the limitation of the manufacture of morphine, heroin and cocaine, and the Committee reached the conclusion that it now seemed possible for the Governments of the producing countries to approach each other with a view to reaching a general understanding.

With regard to heroin, the Advisory Committee, on the suggestion of the Portuguese representative, decided to recommend to the Council a resolution to the effect that Governments should be asked to transmit their views as to the possibility of the total suppression of the manufacture of heroin or, alternatively, the limitation of its manufacture to the minimum quantities recognised as necessary either for special cases or for prescriptions by specialists. The Portuguese representative supported his proposal by referring to certain authoritative opinions expressed in the medical world, which tended to show that the total suppression of the manufacture of heroin would not deprive the medical world of a necessary drug.

The Committee's final decision regarding the action to be recommended on the question of the limitation of the manufacture of these drugs will be found in that part of this report dealing with the proposals of the United States of America.

#### PROGRESS REPORT.

The Advisory Committee also had before it a progress report by the Secretariat on the work accomplished since its January session.

##### (a) *Signature and Ratification of the Convention.*

The Committee noted that fifty-one countries Members of the League had signed, and forty-two had ratified, the International Opium Convention of 1912<sup>1</sup> (Annex 1). Mrs. Hamilton Wright furnished the Committee with information regarding the position in Turkey. She had been officially requested by the Turkish Delegation to the Lausanne Conference to inform the Committee that the text of the Convention had been included in the Treaty at present under consideration between Turkey and Greece, that Turkey was willing to accept the Convention, to join the League of Nations and to accept the same restrictions as any other nation.

##### (b) *Import Certificate System.*

The Committee reviewed the general situation and noted that twenty States had accepted the import and export certificate system and had put it into force, and that thirteen others had accepted it in principle (Annex 2). Since the last session of the Committee, therefore, eight more countries had now put this system into effect and three had accepted it in principle.

The representatives of the United States of America explained the system of certificates in force in that country. An importer had to obtain authority from the Federal Narcotics Control Board in respect of each consignment proposed to be imported, and, if approval were given, could obtain from the Board a certificate to that effect. The Board had full power to adopt any form of certificate which it might think fit.

The Committee instructed the Secretariat to communicate the particulars of the system in force in America to all signatory States of the International Opium Convention of 1912 in order that those States might, before sanctioning exports to the United States of America, obtain the production of a certificate from the Federal Narcotics Control Board.

The Portuguese representative stated that a Bill was at the moment before the Portuguese Chamber providing for the issue of a certificate of import to all exporting countries which demanded it. The certificate would state that the quantities imported were for medicinal and scientific purposes and, further, that the drugs would not be re-exported; the certificate would apply only to European and Insular Portugal. With regard to the Portuguese Colonies, the Portuguese Government thought it preferable to make special provisions in view of the special conditions obtaining in Macao with regard to the question of opium.

Through lack of time, the further consideration of the position in regard to the import certificate system was postponed till the next session of the Committee.

The Committee was also compelled to postpone the further consideration of the resolution of the third Assembly, as the position in regard to Switzerland, Turkey and Persia was not yet cleared up.

##### (c) *Annual Reports.*

Fifteen annual reports for 1921 and eleven for 1922 have been received by the Secretariat. Several of these reports, however, are not complete. The Committee decided once more to ask the Council to urge on the Governments the importance of sending in the annual reports on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs in accordance with the unanimous recommendation of the Assembly, since the information which they contained was of the utmost value.

<sup>1</sup> The following States Members of the League have signed but not ratified the Convention: Argentine, Colombia, Costa Rica, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Paraguay, Persia and Switzerland.  
Albania has neither signed nor ratified the Convention.

(d) *Traffic in Cocaine.*

The Advisory Committee noted that eighteen Governments had replied to the request to furnish information with regard to manufacture of cocaine and that twelve countries had sent in an estimate of their requirements. In addition, estimated requirements had been received from a large number of British Colonies.

The Secretariat is in correspondence with Peru and Bolivia regarding the production and export of coca leaves as well as of crude cocaine and its salts.

The Netherlands representative informed the Committee that the Minister for Foreign Affairs was willing to ask the Minister for Labour to introduce a Bill authorising the Netherlands Government to publish figures for the manufacture of cocaine the moment that the Committee had received similar figures from all other manufacturing countries. The Committee noted that, with the exception of Peru and Bolivia, the only statistics of manufacture which had not yet been obtained were those from France and the Netherlands, and the French representative informed the Committee that the French figures would be in the hands of the Secretariat in a very short time. The representative of the Netherlands requested the Secretariat to send him the French figures on their arrival in order that he might request his Government to take the action to which he had referred.

The progress report further dealt with the total annual requirements of opium and its derivatives for consumption, the discrepancies between statistics in the returns of the various countries, the co-operation between China and Japan with regard to illicit traffic. The decisions on these points will be found under different headings.

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO THE SEIZURES OF DRUGS.

The Advisory Committee attached the utmost importance, in connection with the suppression of the traffic, to the exchange of information between Governments of the seizures of drugs. It therefore adopted the following resolution:

“The Advisory Committee recommends the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to the extreme desirability not only of direct communication to other immediately interested Governments of the details of any seizures made, but also of a general communication to the Secretariat of the League of Nations of all important seizures in order that the fullest international publicity may be secured by the transmission, with the consent of the Governments concerned, of this information by the Secretariat both to other Governments not immediately concerned in the specific case and to the Press.”

WORLD PRODUCTION OF OPIUM.

In reviewing the general situation with regard to the world production of opium, the Advisory Committee noted the lack of accurate or detailed information for most of the producing countries. The Committee understood that the investigations which the Chinese Government undertook to make this year are being made, but that the reports of these enquiries have not yet been received. The Committee noted that, according to the latest information in its possession, the position was worse than last year.

In the course of the discussions, the French representative explained that his Government had taken steps to prevent any passage through Tonkin of opium from Yunnan destined for another province in the South of China.

The Chinese representative assured the Committee that the Government of the Republic of China would never under any circumstances legalise the production of opium in China and that the present recrudescence was due to the lack of control by the central Government in certain provinces. The rumour which had been circulated regarding the establishment of an opium monopoly by the Chinese Government was untrue; that Government would never recede from the position which it had taken up in 1917 when the final prohibition of cultivation had been carried out.

DISCREPANCIES IN STATISTICAL RETURNS AND THE POSITION OF BONDED WAREHOUSES.

The Advisory Committee had before it the replies of the Japanese, British and United States Governments on the discrepancies between British and American statistics of exports of drugs to Japan and the Japanese statistics of imports of drugs from those countries. The British representative proposed that some arrangement should be come to between the Governments for the preparation, on a uniform basis, of their statistics of the import and export of drugs, whereby uniform particulars could be given, more especially as to the countries from which the drugs were consigned, the country of destination, if possible, the countries through which the drugs passed by way of transit or transshipment, shipments out of bond and, if possible, the country of origin, that is, the country in which the goods were manufactured or produced.

During the discussion on this question, the Japanese representative informed the Committee that the former practice in his country of waiting until narcotics landed in bond were withdrawn

from bond before regarding them as imports, had been discontinued. The new regulations laid down that all narcotics landed in bond would be considered as imports from the date of their landing.

The Committee eventually appointed a Sub-Committee to enquire into the possibility of establishing a system whereby uniformity in statistics could be obtained. The report of the Sub-Committee is annexed (Annex 3). The Committee approved the suggestion in the report that the statement prepared for the Sub-Committee by the Secretariat should be transmitted to all Governments with a request for their observations. The Committee also recommended that the note prepared by the British representative on the position of bonded warehouses in relation to the traffic (Annex 4) should be sent at the same time for the observations of the Governments.

#### ARTICLE XIV OF THE CONVENTION: MEMORANDUM ON EXEMPTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE SIAMESE REPRESENTATIVE.

The Siamese representative raised the question as to what exemption should be granted by a State to preparations which did not come within the terms of the Convention because the percentage of morphia or cocaine which they contained was less than that prescribed therein. A quantity of morphia, for instance, might be so diluted by a solvent as to bring it below 0.2 per cent and thus cause the preparation to fall outside the scope and control of the Convention.

The Advisory Committee decided to recommend that the Governments should be asked whether they had experienced any difficulties and, if so, how they had dealt with them, and to communicate to the Secretariat any information in their possession on this subject in order that the matter might be discussed at the next session of the Committee.

#### VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS.

The Committee took note of resolutions and reports submitted by the following voluntary organisations:

- The Harvard International Assembly;
- The International Anti-Opium Association;
- The Edinburgh Anti-Opium Association;
- The International Women's Suffrage Alliance;
- The League of Red Cross Societies.

#### CO-OPERATION BETWEEN JAPAN AND CHINA WITH REGARD TO ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

The Committee noted that negotiations were in progress between Japan and China regarding co-operation between these countries in order to suppress smuggling. A joint committee was about to be set up to examine this question.

#### INCREASE IN PENALTIES: PROPOSAL BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

The French representative informed the Committee that the French Government attached great importance to the question of increasing the penalties for illicit traffic in drugs. By reason of the ease with which these drugs can be smuggled, it considered that, however stringent the measures taken on the frontiers of a country, it was impossible to detect more than a very small quantity of the contraband drugs passed through. During the discussion, the French representative drew attention to the advisability of instituting the penalty of imprisonment, and, if possible, of prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*). He called attention to the fact that certain courts were not always ready to apply with complete strictness the penalties laid down.

Attention was also called by the British representative to a new provision which had just been adopted by Parliament in the Dangerous Drugs Act of the present year, which was to the effect that:

Any person "who, in Great Britain, aids, abets, counsels or procures a commission in any place outside Great Britain of any offence punishable under the provisions of any corresponding law in force in that place, or does any act preparatory to or in furtherance of any act which, if committed in Great Britain, would constitute an offence against this Act", shall be guilty of an offence against the Act.

The Committee adopted the following resolution:

"The Advisory Committee, considering that the infliction of severe penalties on persons engaged in the illicit traffic in narcotics is one of the best means of preventing the spread of that traffic, recommends the increase of penalties in certain countries, the adoption of the penalty of imprisonment, and, if possible, of prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*), a very strict application of the penalties laid down, and the introduction of clauses providing for the punishment of infractions committed in foreign countries."

#### CONCLUSION.

In submitting this report to the Council, the Committee draws attention to the importance which it attaches to the collaboration of the United States of America and expresses the hope that this collaboration will be continued.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. I. The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium accepts and recommends to the League of Nations the proposals of the United States representatives as embodying the general principles by which the Governments should be guided in dealing with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs and on which, in fact, the International Convention of 1912 is based, subject to the fact that the following reservation has been made by the representatives of the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal and Siam:

“The use of prepared opium and the production, export and import of raw opium for that purpose are legitimate so long as that use is subject to and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention.”

- II. The Advisory Committee, appreciating the great value of the co-operation of the Government of the United States of America in the efforts which the League has for the past two years been making to deal with the question of the abuse of dangerous drugs, expresses the belief that all the Governments concerned will be desirous of co-operating with that Government in giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention.
- III. In bringing the American proposals to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, the Advisory Committee would recall that, during the two years that have elapsed since the Convention came into operation, it has worked towards the same ends by: (1) taking all possible steps to secure the adhesion of all countries to the Convention; (2) investigating the question of the world's needs of the manufactured drugs for medicinal and scientific uses with a view to the eventual limitation of the production of these drugs; (3) recommending the system of import certificates, arranging the exchange between States of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs, and proposing other measures for securing international co-operation in suppressing that traffic; (4) inviting the Powers with territories in the Far East to review their requirements of opium, and submitting proposals for an investigation by the Chinese Government of the conditions in China, with a view to the more effective application of Chapter II of the Convention and the solution of the problem of the use of prepared opium in the Far East; (5) collecting and publishing information as to the measures taken to give effect to the Convention and the position generally in all countries in regard to the traffic, with a view to securing the enforcement of the Convention.
- IV. As a means of giving effect to the principles submitted by the representatives of the United States and the policy which the League, on the recommendation of the Committee has adopted, and having regard to the information now available, the Advisory Committee recommends to the Council the advisability of inviting:
- (a) The Governments of the States in which morphine, heroin, or cocaine, and their respective salts are manufactured and the Governments of the States in which raw opium or the coca leaf are produced for export for the purpose of such manufacture;
- (b) The Governments having territories in which the use of prepared opium is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention and the Government of the Republic of China,
- to enter into immediate negotiations (by nominating representatives to form a committee or committees, or otherwise) to consider whether, with a view to giving the fullest possible effect to the Convention of 1912, agreements could not now be reached between them:
- (a) as to a limitation of the amounts of morphine, heroin or cocaine and their respective salts to be manufactured; as to a limitation of the amounts of raw opium and the coca leaf to be imported for that purpose and for other medicinal and scientific purposes; and as to a limitation of the production of raw opium and the coca leaf for export to the amount required for such medicinal and scientific purposes. The latter limitation is not to be deemed to apply to the production and export of raw opium for the purpose of smoking in those territories where that practice is temporarily continued under the provisions of Chapter II of the Convention;
- (b) as to a reduction of the amount of raw opium to be imported for the purpose of smoking in those territories where it is temporarily continued, and as to the measures which should be taken by the Government of the Republic of China to bring about a suppression of the illegal production and use of opium in China.

*Reservation by the Representative of the Government of India.*

The representative of the Government of India associates himself with the foregoing resolution, subject to the following reservation regarding paragraph 1:

“The use of raw opium, according to the established practice in India, and its production for such use are not illegitimate under the Convention.”

2. The Advisory Committee, having regard to the large amount of detailed information now available, recommends the Council to invite the Powers with Far Eastern territories where the use of opium for smoking is temporarily continued in pursuance of Chapter II of the Opium Convention, to enter into immediate negotiations, by means of calling a special conference of representatives of these Governments, or otherwise, to consider what measures could be taken to give a more effective application to Chapter II of the Convention and to bring about a reduction of the amount of opium used, and whether, on the lines of the suggestions set out below or on other lines, an agreement or understanding could not now be reached for the adoption of a uniform policy on the matter:
  - I. That the farm system, where it is still in operation, should be abolished and that the opium business should be made a Government monopoly and kept entirely in the hands of the Government.
  - II. As a corollary of paragraph I, that the retail sale of prepared opium should be made only from Government shops, and that all private shops should be abolished. Persons in charge of Government shops should be paid a fixed salary without any commission on the amount of business done, and therefore would have no temptation to push the sales.
  - III. That a uniform maximum limit should be fixed for the amount of prepared opium placed on sale for consumption, calculated according to the number of the adult Chinese male population, *e.g.*,  $x$  taels per 10,000 adult Chinese males in the territory, and that the annual imports of raw opium should be limited to the amount required for that rate of consumption.
  - IV. That the possibilities of the system of registration and licensing, which has already been introduced in some of the Far Eastern territories, should be thoroughly explored.
  - V. That the possibility should be considered of making uniform, so far as circumstances permit:
    - (a) the price at which prepared opium is retailed in the different territories, and
    - (b) the penalties for infraction of the law in regard to the import, export, sale and use of prepared opium.
  - VI. That the interested Powers, that is, the Powers having territories in the Far East where the consumption of prepared opium is still permitted, should conclude an agreement among themselves to apply the foregoing measures for the purpose of carrying out Chapter II of the Convention.
  - VII. That the position should be generally reviewed periodically by the Powers interested and the question of further reducing the maximum limit fixed in the agreement should be considered.
3. The Advisory Committee asks the Council to request the Governments to communicate their views as to the possibility of a total suppression of the manufacture of heroin or of its limitation to the minimum amount required.
4. The Advisory Committee, being convinced of the great value of the information contained in the annual reports which each Government has been requested to transmit to the Secretariat, once more recommends the Council to urge on the Governments the importance of sending regularly to the Secretariat such reports, which should contain the fullest possible information, both with regard to the production of and the traffic in opium and other narcotics.
5. The Advisory Committee recommends the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to the extreme desirability not only of direct communication to other immediately interested Governments of the details of any seizures made, but also of a general communication to the Secretariat of the League of Nations of all important seizures in order that the fullest international publicity may be secured by the transmission, with the consent of the Governments concerned, of this information by the Secretariat both to other Governments not immediately concerned in the specific case and to the Press.
6. The Advisory Committee recommends that the statement prepared by the Secretariat for the Sub-Committee on Customs Statistics, together with the memorandum prepared by

Sir Malcolm Delevingne on the position of bonded warehouses in regard to the traffic in narcotics, should be communicated to the Governments with a request for their observations.

7. The Advisory Committee, considering that the infliction of severe penalties on persons engaged in the illicit traffic in narcotics is one of the best means of preventing the spread of that traffic, recommends the increase of penalties in certain countries, the adoption of the penalty of imprisonment, and, if possible, of prohibition of residence (*interdiction de séjour*), a very strict application of the penalties laid down, and the introduction of clauses providing for the punishment of infractions committed in foreign countries.

(Signed) G. BOURGOIS,  
*Chairman.*

Rachel E. CROWDY,  
*Secretary.*

CHAROON,  
*Vice-Chairman.*



Appendix A.

STATEMENT AS TO SIGNATURES AND RATIFICATIONS OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1912.

PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION (signed and ratified)		MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				NON-MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE				
		States Parties to the Convention	States which have signed and ratified, but not signed the Protocol putting Convention into force.	States which have signed but not ratified.	Non-parties to the Convention.	States Parties to the Convention.	States which have signed and ratified but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force.	States which have not ratified the Convention	States non-parties to the Convention	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Africa, S.</li> <li>2. America, U. S. of</li> <li>3. Australia</li> <li>4. Austria</li> <li>5. Belgium</li> <li>6. Bolivia</li> <li>7. Brazil</li> <li>8. Bulgaria</li> <li>9. Canada</li> <li>10. Chile</li> <li>11. China</li> <li>12. Cuba</li> <li>13. Crecho-Slovakia</li> <li>14. Danzig</li> <li>15. Denmark</li> <li>16. Ecuador</li> <li>17. Finland</li> <li>18. France</li> <li>19. Germany</li> <li>20. Great Britain</li> <li>21. Greece</li> <li>22. Guatemala</li> <li>23. Haiti</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24. Honduras</li> <li>25. Hungary</li> <li>26. India</li> <li>27. Italy</li> <li>28. Japan</li> <li>29. Liberia</li> <li>30. Luxemburg</li> <li>31. Netherlands</li> <li>32. N. Zealand</li> <li>33. Nicaragua</li> <li>34. Norway</li> <li>35. Panama</li> <li>36. Peru</li> <li>37. Poland</li> <li>38. Portugal</li> <li>39. Roumania</li> <li>40. Salvador</li> <li>41. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Kingdom of</li> <li>42. Siam</li> <li>43. Spain</li> <li>44. Sweden</li> <li>45. Uruguay</li> <li>46. Venezuela</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Africa, S.</li> <li>2. Australia</li> <li>3. Austria</li> <li>4. Belgium</li> <li>5. Bolivia</li> <li>6. Brazil</li> <li>7. Bulgaria</li> <li>8. Canada</li> <li>9. China</li> <li>10. Cuba</li> <li>11. Czecho-slovakia</li> <li>12. Denmark</li> <li>13. Finland</li> <li>14. France</li> <li>15. Gt. Britain</li> <li>16. Greece</li> <li>17. Guatemala</li> <li>18. Haiti</li> <li>19. Honduras</li> <li>20. Hungary</li> <li>21. India</li> <li>22. Italy</li> <li>23. Japan</li> <li>24. Liberia</li> <li>25. Luxemburg</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>26. Netherlands</li> <li>27. New Zealand</li> <li>28. Nicaragua</li> <li>29. Norway</li> <li>30. Panama</li> <li>31. Peru</li> <li>32. Poland</li> <li>33. Portugal</li> <li>34. Roumania</li> <li>35. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Kingdom of</li> <li>36. Siam</li> <li>37. Spain</li> <li>38. Sweden</li> <li>39. Uruguay</li> <li>40. Venezuela</li> <li><del>41. Danzig*</del></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Salvador</li> <li>2. Chile</li> <li>3. <i>Danzig.*</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Argentine</li> <li>2. Colombia</li> <li>3. Costa Rica</li> <li>4. Esthonia</li> <li>5. Latvia</li> <li>6. Lithuania</li> <li>7. Paraguay</li> <li>8. Persia</li> <li>9. Switzerland</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Albania</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. America, U. S. of</li> <li>2. Germany</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ecuador</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dominican Republic</li> <li>2. Mexico</li> <li>3. Monaco</li> <li>4. Russia</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abyssinia</li> <li>2. Afghanistan</li> <li>3. Lichtenstein</li> <li>4. Turkey</li> </ol>

\* Danzig is not a Member of the League but is under its special protection.

## Appendix B.

### IMPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

SITUATION TO DATE (*March 16th, 1923*).

The following Governments have stated that they will bring the system into force from the date mentioned in each case:

Albania	September 1st, 1922.
Austria	September 1st, 1922.
Czechoslovakia	September 1st, 1922.
Denmark	October 1st, 1922.
Esthonia	January 1st, 1922.
Great Britain	September 1st, 1922.
Greece	September 1st, 1922.
India	January 1st, 1923.
Italy	January 1st, 1923.
Japan	January 1st, 1923.
Latvia	April 1st, 1923.
Luxemburg	April 28th, 1922.
Mexico	No date given, but already in force.
New Zealand	April 1922.
Norway	No date given, but already in force.
Panama	March 1922.
Poland	September 1st, 1922.
Siam	January 1st, 1923.
South Africa	September 28th, 1921.
Spain	November 1st, 1922.

The following Governments have accepted the system but have not, as yet, given any date on which it will be brought into force:

Australia, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Germany, <sup>Hungary</sup> Haiti, <sup>Newfoundland</sup> Lithuania, Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, Switzerland.

## Appendix C.

### CUSTOMS CONTROL OF THE IMPORT AND EXPORT OF OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

#### REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE.

The Sub-Committee was appointed at the instance of Sir Malcolm Delevingne (5th meeting) and included the following members:

M. BRENIER, Chairman.  
Sir MALCOLM DELEVINGNE (Great Britain).  
Dr. UCHINO (Japan).  
Mr. NEVILLE (United States).

M. BLANCO assisted the Sub-Committee, and Mr. CHAPMAN, Customs expert of the League of Nations, drew up a most complete report, which pressure of time entirely prevented the Sub-Committee from examining before the end of the session.

The primary object was to devise some plan for the drawing up of uniform statistics (as far as possible), so as to prevent the recurrence, to give only one instance, of the enormous discrepancies which the official British and Japanese statistics, when compared, showed as to morphine.

It immediately appeared that the problem was not only one of nomenclature and figures (and tables translating them), but, fundamentally, a problem of international means of control raising again the question of the licensing system for exports.

Mr. Chapman's very thorough report contains suggestions most of which appear reasonable and effective. But some imply, not only the solution of the fundamental difficulty of a uniform

system of licences or permits, but also changes in the actual practice of many countries; for instance, that the export licences should be granted by a central authority in a single bureau. The minute particulars to be given, so as to ensure a strict control — and which will naturally react very usefully on the statistics — may also raise some difficulty.

As the report recalls, the Customs treatment and the systems of trade statistics (were it only as to nomenclature) are exceedingly diverse throughout the world; it does not seem impossible to agree on some uniform method as to recording the movements of opium and dangerous drugs. But it is certainly necessary that the several Governments — especially those interested in the trade — should be consulted on this matter.

It was therefore agreed that the Secretariat should be asked to communicate Mr. Chapman's report — as embodying most useful remarks and suggestions — to the principal Governments concerned, and, in particular, to those having delegates on the Opium Advisory Committee, so as to have their advice on the subject.

The Sub-Committee — in its first and only sitting — agreed on the following essential points:

1. That the imports and exports of the drugs falling under the 1912 Convention should be recorded in a uniform manner;
2. That the statistics should, among other points, necessarily record at least the following particulars:
  - (a) the port or country of consignment, care being taken to define the word exactly, "original" consignment, as distinguished from the country of immediate, or last, receipt.
  - (b) the country of final destination.
3. That particular regard should be had to the question of transshipments, so as to avoid leakage.
4. That the system of treating and recording all narcotics covered by the Convention as actual imports immediately on landing or on arrival, even if these narcotics are landed into a bonded warehouse, is a measure which tends to remove one of the main causes of discrepancies in international statistics, and permits a better watch being kept on movements of drugs its adoption by all countries is worthy of serious consideration.

The system in question was introduced in Japan as from January 1st, 1921.

5. As to imports, that the statistics should show clearly whether the drugs were imported.
  - (a) for internal consumption;
  - (b) in bond (when released from bond for export, the drugs should be exactly recorded);
  - (c) for transshipment, transit or re-export.

The Sub-Committee would like to draw particular attention to the difficulties attending an exact record of postal parcels containing the drugs, which is none the less very necessary, as their nature (of the drugs — not of raw or prepared opium) admits of an enormous traffic by this means. There is also the new difficulty arising from air-transport of these parcels.

---

#### Appendix D.

---

### CONSIDERATION OF THE POSITION OF BONDED WAREHOUSES IN RELATION TO THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

NOTE BY SIR MALCOLM DELEIVINGNE, BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE

It was mentioned at the last Session of the Committee that the Netherlands Government has asked whether the question of free ports included the question of bonded warehouses, and it was decided to examine the position as regards bonded warehouses at our next meeting. The point which is of interest to the Committee is whether imports of dangerous drugs which are stored on arrival in bonded warehouses under the control of the Customs Authorities and are re-exported from bond, are subject to the same control as ordinary imports into, or exports from, a country under the provisions of the Opium Convention and the system of import certificates recommended by the League of Nations. It would seem desirable that the practice of the different countries in regard to this matter should be ascertained. It is understood that in some countries re-export from bond is regarded merely as transshipment, and no control over the re-export such as is provided for by the Convention and the import certificate system in the case of ordinary exports is exercised. In other cases it is understood that the authorities require an export licence to be obtained before re-export out of bond can take place, but such exports do not figure in the Customs returns. It will be evident that if country A gives a licence for the export of drugs to country B on the production of an import certificate from the Government

of country B, and on arrival at country B the drugs are stored in bond and can be re-exported from bond to country C without any licence from the Government of country B or the production of an import certificate from the Government of country C, the persons engaged in the illicit international traffic in the drugs will be able easily to evade the control which the League is attempting to establish in accordance with the Convention. I suggest as a matter for the consideration of the Committee whether a questionnaire should be issued to the Governments asking what their practice is in regard to re-export from bond of dangerous drugs which have been consigned to the country, and whether they would see any difficulty in requiring an export licence to be obtained and an import certificate to be produced before the re-export from bond was permitted.

It will be understood that the foregoing does not apply to consignments on through bills of lading from country A to country C which are landed in country B and stored temporarily in bond pending transshipment. In such cases an import certificate from the Government of country C should be produced to the Government of country A before the latter Government issues its licence for the export of the consignment.

---