

Geneva, June 22nd, 1928.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

16

**TRAFFIC IN OPIUM**

**REPORTS ON THE WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS  
DURING ITS ELEVENTH SESSION**

*Held at Geneva, from April 12th to 26th, 1928.*

**I. REPORT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA AND RESOLUTION  
ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL.**

The eleventh session of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs was held at Geneva from April 12th to 27th, 1928.

The report on this session has been distributed to the Members of the Council.

During its session, the Committee dealt with the question submitted to it by the Council's decision of June 13th, 1927, regarding the reservation made by the Swedish Government in connection with Article 6 (c) of the Geneva Convention of 1925.

As you are aware, the Committee had already considered this question at its extraordinary session, when it proposed to the Council that a copy of the part of its report dealing with the question, and the Minutes on the same subject, should be forwarded officially to the Swedish Government for information and examination — a proposal which the Council approved in December 1927. The Swedish Government replied by a note dated March 31st, 1928, stating that, after careful consideration of the documents submitted, its apprehensions were not entirely dispelled, and it could not therefore see its way to make any definite examination of the question of Sweden's accession to the Convention until it knew whether its reservation could be accepted. This letter gave rise to an exhaustive discussion in the Committee. It will be remembered that paragraph (c) of Article 6 of the Convention deals with the control of the sale of drugs by chemists and others. It is laid down that chemists must either enter in their books particulars of all drugs dispensed under medical prescription, or file and preserve the prescriptions. The discussion which took place in the Advisory Committee led to the adoption of the following resolution :

*Swedish Reservation.*

“ The Committee would point out that the Convention allows two alternatives : the registration by the pharmacist of the details of the supply of the drug or the retention by the pharmacist of the prescription ; that the difficulties in the way of registration are not, in its opinion, such as to justify a reservation on the point ; and that it deprecates, for the reasons which appear in the Minutes of the discussion of the Committee, the acceptance of the Swedish reservation. ”

I propose that the text of this resolution be communicated to the Swedish Government and, for their information, to the other Members of the League and the States invited to be represented at the Opium Conference of 1924-25.

At the Council session in December 1927, M. Scialoja, representative of Italy, referring to the Central Board contemplated by the Convention of February 1925, said he feared that many States interested in the suppression of the drug traffic could not be represented on it.

He thought that, if the Secretary-General could so constitute the secretariat of the Central Board that it would form part of the Social Section of the League Secretariat, there would be no further difficulties, because, through the League of Nations, all States would be able to supervise the work of this Central Board.

On the motion of M. Adatci, representative of Japan, the Council decided to refer this question to the Advisory Committee.

After a long discussion in which considerable divergence of view was expressed, the Advisory Committee adopted the following resolution :

“ At the request of the Council, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs considered the proposal made by the representative of the Italian Government on the Council to constitute the secretariat of the Permanent Central Board, which was provided for in the Opium Convention of February 19th, 1925, as an integral part of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

“ The Advisory Committee considers that this proposal is in complete agreement with the stipulations of Article 20, paragraph 1, of that Convention, whereby the Secretary-General of the League of Nations is requested to provide for the control of the staff in administrative matters.

“ This proposal, moreover, does not in any way affect the right, which is conferred on the Central Board by paragraph 2 of the said Article 20, to nominate the members of its staff, who will be appointed by the Secretary-General subject to the approval of the Council. ”

This resolution was adopted on a vote by roll-call. It was accepted by six votes (China, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) to four (Great Britain, India, Japan and the Netherlands) and three abstentions (Bolivia, Siam and Switzerland). The Minutes of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth in which the views of the majority and minority are clearly indicated have been circulated for the information of the Council.

For the moment, I think the Council need only take note of this resolution and of the discussion as shown in the Minutes for its future guidance. There is no call for an immediate decision on this important question ; because the Central Board has not yet been set up. As M. Adatci said at the December session, “ a number of questions regarding the appointment of the Central Board have still to be settled ”.

In addition to the questions of the Swedish reservation and the secretariat of the Central Board, both of which had been referred to the Committee by special decisions of the Council, the Advisory Committee dealt with a number of problems connected with the control of the drug traffic. The Committee has always felt that, if satisfactory control is to be established in all countries, it is of the first importance that the Convention of February 19th, 1925, should be put into force. On this occasion it was able to conclude that there is every prospect that the Convention may begin to operate before the end of this year. On the other hand, the Committee deplored the absence of certain information which it requires to carry on its work satisfactorily. For example, there is the question of statistics. When figures for the quantity of opium or other narcotics imported or exported are sent to the League, certain countries give the gross weight of the shipments and not the net weight. The Committee decided to call the attention of Governments to this point and to ask them to base their statistics on the net weight of the narcotics imported or exported. It also decided, by a special resolution, to ask States to classify their imports and exports of raw opium according to the country of production (Turkish, Persian, Indian, etc.).

This resolution reads as follows :

“ The Committee requests that the Governments should be asked to classify their exports and imports of raw opium according to the country of production (Turkish, Persian, Indian, etc.), and that a form of table for the purpose should be prepared by the Secretariat and sent to the Governments..”

I propose that the Council ask the Secretary-General to request the Governments to comply with the Advisory Committee's wishes on this point.

A still more important matter is the total absence of information regarding the drug traffic in certain countries. The Committee asks the Council to instruct the Secretary-General to send a reminder to all Governments which do not send in any reports :

“ In view of the failure of certain Governments to furnish annual reports on the trade in opium and drugs in their territories as recommended by the Assembly and Council of the League, the Committee asks the Council to instruct the Secretary-General to send a reminder to any Government which fails to send in its report (by July 1st in the case of European countries and November 1st in the case of countries outside Europe). If no reply is received to the reminder, a second reminder should be sent (by cable when necessary) not less than one month before the date of the annual meeting of the Committee.”

I am sure the Council will feel bound to agree to this.

With regard to the illicit traffic, the Committee considered that the attention of Governments should be drawn to the necessity for inflicting on traffickers heavy penalties in the form of imprisonment and fines, in view of the specially serious character of the offence and the large profits traffickers derive from the transactions. The Committee also observed that "the courts everywhere should energetically associate themselves with the action of the administrative authorities".

The Committee summarised its attitude in a highly important resolution, which I shall ask my colleagues to study with particular care :

"The careful examination that the Committee has made of the numerous reports in regard to the illicit traffic which have been received since the meeting in October last, and which show that this traffic continues on an enormous scale, emphasises in the strongest way the urgent necessity for (a) the immediate ratification and enforcement by all States Members of the League of the Geneva Convention of 1925; (b) the adoption and strict application of the other measures which have been recommended by the Committee from time to time, and in particular the following :

"(i) Withdrawal of the licence to manufacture or trade in the drugs from any firm if there is sufficient evidence to show that the firm is engaged in or is knowingly supplying drugs for the illicit traffic ;

"(ii) Strict control over exports to countries not exercising adequate supervision over the trade in drugs, and the rigid limitation of such exports to the quantities that may reasonably be required for medical purposes in the country itself ;

"(iii) Immediate communication of the fullest particulars relating to any important seizures of smuggled drugs to the Governments of any countries in which the persons connected with the transaction may be or may have been residing at the time, or in which any part of the transaction may have taken place ;

"(iv) Immediate and full investigation, on the receipt of particulars of such a transaction, whether directly or from the League, by the Government ;

"(v) Exercise of an adequate control by every Government to ensure as far as possible that its territories shall not be used for the transit or transshipment of consignments of drugs (whether declared as such or not) for the illicit traffic ;

"(vi) Provision in each country's national law of severe penalties for persons convicted of organising the smuggling of drugs, whether into that or into other countries. "

The text of this resolution should, I think, be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the Governments Members of the League and to the parties to the Hague Convention.

Another resolution deals with certain details in connection with the prosecution of traffickers :

"The Committee has had its attention called to the difficulties experienced by the authorities, in their investigations as to the persons responsible for the smuggling of a large quantity of drugs which were recently seized in New York, through their inability to obtain from the Government of the exporting country photographic or other facsimiles of certain cables sent from that country to the United States and the names of the persons sending them. In view of the extreme importance of obtaining all possible information as to the persons who organise the illicit traffic, and who for this purpose abuse the facilities afforded by the telegraphic and other means of communication, the Committee would urge that every Government should in such cases, on the application of a responsible Government and on being satisfied that the information is necessary for the investigations by the responsible authorities in the country of seizure, furnish facsimiles of the telegrams sent in connection with a smuggling transaction and the names of and other particulars relating to the persons sending them, and, if the power to do so does not exist at present, should, if possible, obtain such power. "

I propose that the Council instruct the Secretary-General to communicate the text of this resolution to the Governments of the States Members of the League and parties to the Hague Convention, at the same time asking them whether they are in a position to carry out the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

In connection with the question of the illicit traffic, there arises a technical point with which the Committee dealt. This relates to morphine esters — combinations of morphine with an organic acid. Certain manufacturers have endeavoured to find substitutes for morphine which would escape the supervision applicable only to morphine and its salts.

These efforts have resulted in the manufacture of the esters I have just mentioned, the most important of which is apparently benzoyl-morphine. It is already manufactured in comparatively large quantities, and has been shown by scientific research to possess all the properties of a drug of addiction. Moreover, the morphine contained in benzoyl-morphine can readily be recovered, and hence quantities of morphine that will escape supervision can be put on the market.

It is therefore necessary to consider the possibility of applying Article 10 of the Convention of February 19th, 1925, to all these products (esters). In accordance with a definite procedure the provisions of the Convention can be applied to narcotics which have been proved to possess the harmful properties of those expressly mentioned in the Convention. As the procedure laid down by the Convention entails a certain lapse of time before any results can be obtained, the Committee adopted a resolution requesting the Council to draw the attention of Governments to the necessity of placing benzoyl-morphine under control forthwith.

The text of the resolution is as follows :

“ The Committee desires to draw the attention of the Council to the attempt which has been successfully made to evade the existing system of control over the traffic in drugs by the manufacture of benzoyl-morphine and other esters of morphine, which fall outside the provisions of most national laws, but from which morphine can easily be recovered, and which, so far as is known, are liable to give rise to the same abuse ; and the Committee would urgently recommend that, pending the completion of the procedure under Article 10 of the Geneva Convention for bringing such substances within the scope of the Convention, the Governments should immediately apply to benzoyl-morphine, and possibly other similar substances if manufactured, the same control over manufacture, distribution, export and import as in the case of morphine. ”

I think all my colleagues will agree that it is the Council's duty to do its utmost to suppress this serious abuse, and I therefore ask you to recommend the Governments to place benzoyl-morphine, and perhaps other similar substances, under the same control as is exercised over morphine in regard to manufacture, export and import, at the same time drawing attention to Article XIV (d) of the Hague Convention of 1912. In virtue of the provisions of this Article the Contracting Parties are bound to apply the Laws and Regulations for the manufacture, import, sale and export of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts to any new derivative of morphine, of cocaine and of their respective salts, or to any new alkaloid of opium which may be shown by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill effects.

I have now to speak of the results of the work of the Sub-Committee set up at the extraordinary session of the Advisory Committee in October last to study the methods of supervising the traffic in narcotics, taking into account M. Cavazzoni's memorandum. A comparison had been made by M. Cavazzoni, showing the relation between his scheme and the Hague and Geneva Conventions, and the Secretariat had collected for the Sub-Committee's use a considerable amount of material relating to the methods already in use in a number of countries. From this material and from M. Cavazzoni's memorandum, the Sub-Committee selected such provisions as it considered sound or as had proved their value in practice. The Sub-Committee was thus able to establish a standard method or code for the administrative control of narcotics, which is appended to the Committee's report. The Sub-Committee's report will be attached *in extenso* to the Minutes of the session. This report was approved by the majority of the members of the Committee, the representative of Italy dissenting. His views are set out in a statement appended to the Sub-Committee's report.

The Advisory Committee has asked the Council to request the Secretary-General to forward the “ code ” to Governments for examination, and I propose that the Council should do so.

I have the honour to propose that the Council adopt the following resolution :

“ The Council takes note of the report and resolutions adopted by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs at its eleventh session, and adopts the present report. ”

---

## II. REPORT TO THE COUNCIL BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium has the honour to submit to the Council of the League of Nations its report on its eleventh session, held at Geneva from April 12th to 27th, 1928.

By a resolution adopted at its seventh session, the Committee decided that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, it would meet in the second half of January. This rule was departed from, however, in the case of the eleventh session because, having held an extraordinary session in September-October 1927, it seemed somewhat difficult to call a new meeting as early as January, and also because one of the members of the Committee had announced that he could not come to Geneva at that date. The Committee decided, however, to revert to the regulation date in future, and the next session will be held in the second half of January 1929.

The Committee held twenty-three public and two private meetings. The latter were devoted to the discussion of certain details of the illicit traffic which it seemed inexpedient to divulge. All questions of general interest, however, were discussed in public, in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Committee.

The Committee was very glad to obtain once more the assistance of the Chinese Government, which appointed as its delegate for the session, M. Chuan Chao, Secretary-General of the Chinese Delegation to the League of Nations.

Colonel Woods, who is one of the Committee's assessors, being unable to attend the session, it was agreed, at his request, that Mr. Dunham, who had accompanied him at previous sessions, should be present in order to be able to give him an exact account of the proceedings. Mr. Kenneth Caldwell and Mr. Pinkney Tuck attended as unofficial representatives of the United States Government.

The following members and assessors took part in the session :

Dr. CARRIÈRE ( <i>Chairman</i> ) . . . . .	<i>Switzerland.</i>
M. Constantin FOTITCH ( <i>Vice-Chairman</i> ) . . . . .	<i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes,</i>
Dr. CUELLAR . . . . .	<i>Bolivia.</i>
M. CHUAN CHAO . . . . .	<i>China.</i>
M. BOURGOIS . . . . .	<i>France.</i>
Dr. ANSELMINO . . . . .	<i>Germany.</i>
Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE . . . . .	<i>Great Britain.</i>
Sir John CAMPBELL . . . . .	<i>India.</i>
His Excellency M. CAVAZZONI . . . . .	<i>Italy.</i>
His Excellency M. SATO . . . . .	<i>Japan.</i>
M. W. G. VAN WETTUM . . . . .	<i>Netherlands.</i>
His Excellency M. FERREIRA . . . . .	<i>Portugal.</i>
His Highness Prince CHAROON . . . . .	} <i>Siam.</i>
His Highness Prince VIPULYA . . . . .	
Mr. Kenneth CALDWELL . . . . .	} <i>United States of America.</i>
Mr. Pinkney TUCK . . . . .	

### Assessors :

M. BRENIER.  
Mr. LYALL.

### Secretary :

Dame Rachel CROWDY, Chief of the Opium Traffic and Social Questions Section.

## I. RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION.

At its ninth session, the Committee adopted a resolution pointing out that very little progress could be made in the direction of suppressing the illicit traffic until the Convention came into force. It also observed that for this purpose ratifications from four States Members of the Council were still required, and it therefore asked the Council to consider the question very carefully. The Committee repeated this request most insistently at the end of its tenth session, and it now has pleasure in stating that the situation has changed considerably for the better. Further ratifications have been registered, and there is every hope of the

Convention coming into force very shortly. The new ratifications are those of Latvia and Luxemburg; Finland has adhered. In the case of Germany, the question of ratifying the Convention is inseparable from the reservation which was made when she signed the Convention, namely, that one of the members of the Permanent Central Board should be of German nationality; but an assurance has been given that all necessary steps for ratification will be taken as soon as the German Government is certain that its reservation will be taken into account. Sweden's ratification is also dependent on a reservation in connection with paragraph C of Article 6 of the Convention; this reservation, at the Council's request, was first considered by the Committee at its tenth session, and again, as will be seen below, at the present session.

In Switzerland, the Convention has already been ratified by the National Council of the Federal Chambers, and will doubtless be ratified by the Council of States at its next session.

Hungary states that she intends to ratify the Convention shortly, and that in the meantime its provisions have already received serious consideration.

The delegate of the Netherlands stated at the last session of the Council that ratification would take place within a few weeks. The delay is due to the fact that the domestic legislation of the Netherlands requires amendment before the Convention can be ratified; but the necessary bill has already been passed by the Second Chamber, and will shortly be passed by the First.

The Canadian ratification will not be much longer delayed, as a bill for the purpose has been introduced in Parliament, and should be passed very shortly.

The position in Japan is similar to that in the Netherlands. The Convention has been considered by the Privy Council, but cannot be put into force until Japanese legislation has been brought into line with the provisions of the Convention. It is to be hoped that this final step will soon be taken.

So far, the Convention has been ratified by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, India, Latvia, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Sudan and the Union of South Africa — fifteen States in all — and, as stated above, ratifications are expected from Canada, Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland, and the deposit of instruments of ratification from Roumania<sup>1</sup>. Ten accessions have also been received — those of Bolivia (*ad referendum* and with reservations), the Free City of Danzig, the Dominican Republic (*ad referendum*), Egypt, Finland, Monaco, the New Hebrides, Salvador, San Marino and Venezuela (*ad referendum*).

The total number of ratifications required before the Convention can come into force, which is fixed at ten under Article 36, has thus already been reached and exceeded. The number of ratifications by States Members of the Council is now four, including two permanent Members (France and Great Britain), as required by the Convention. When three of the ratifications expected have been given, the conditions laid down in Article 36 for the coming into force of the Convention will be entirely satisfied, and there is every prospect that before the end of 1928 the Convention may begin to operate.<sup>1</sup>

## II. PROGRESS REPORT.

This report, drawn up by the Secretariat, shows as usual how and to what extent the Committee's resolutions have been put into effect, particularly as regards measures to suppress the illicit traffic.

The Committee had asked the Council to point out to the Chinese Government that it would be most useful for the Committee to have before it a report of all important seizures of narcotics effected by the Chinese Maritime Customs at the ports and stations under their supervision, and had at the same time specified the manner in which these reports ought to be made if they were to be really useful and help the other Governments to prevent the illicit export of narcotics to China. The chief reason which led the Committee to adopt this resolution was that no sufficiently detailed reports of seizures had been received from China since the second quarter of 1927. No direct reply has yet been given to this complaint, but the Chinese representative on the Council has stated that the Chinese Administration has been careful to send the Opium Section regular information regarding seizures by the Chinese Customs, and that any delay which may have occurred was due in most cases to technical difficulties; every effort, he said, would be made to comply with the Committee's wishes. The Chinese representative on the Committee has confirmed this statement. There is therefore reason to hope that the Committee's resolution, which was inspired solely by a desire for the continuance of friendly co-operation between China and other countries with a view to the

---

<sup>1</sup> The ratification of the following States Members of the Council have been received by the Secretariat: Roumania, (May 18th) and the Netherlands (June 4th). With the deposit of these ratifications six of the seven ratifications by States Members of the Council required under Article 36 of the Convention have been received.

We do not know whether the Assembly will entrust other work to us, but in any case we have completed the task which we were asked to perform. In pursuance of the Council's decision, the result of our work is now to be submitted to the Assembly. This will be done in a series of documents to be attached to this survey.

These documents will be sent at the same time to the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, since the Committee on Arbitration and Security is an offshoot of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

*The survey was then read and adopted.*

### 30. Close of the Session.

The CHAIRMAN. — It is usual on these occasions for the Chairman to deliver a final speech summarising the work done. I would ask my colleagues to allow me to refrain from inflicting upon them to-day the torture of a Chairman's speech. The heat which we have had to bear during the whole of our week's work at Geneva is still sufficiently overpowering to form an excellent reason for ending this meeting. Besides, the best thing I could say would be, to mention the results achieved, and I think I can assert that, notwithstanding all the difficulties which we have encountered, this session has fully confirmed the results obtained at the previous session, and others have been added to them. I referred to the importance of our work at the close of our Committee's second session and it is therefore unnecessary for me to return to it. I should, however, like to emphasise the fact that we have had fresh questions to deal with — I refer to the German delegation's suggestions. In submitting their proposals, the German delegation's object was to assist in increasing security, for which I thank them on behalf of us all. Although it was not possible to adopt M. von Simson's proposals in their entirety, the results obtained are most satisfactory.

Before closing this session, I consider it my duty to thank my colleagues for the goodwill with which they have all co-operated in this common task. I also desire to thank the services of the Secretariat, and in particular M. Sugimura and all his colleagues, whose valuable assistance has, as usual, greatly facilitated our task.

I likewise desire to pay a special tribute to M. Rolin Jaequemyns, the Rapporteur for the German suggestions, whose work in this connection has been of the highest value. (*Applause.*)

Lord CUSHENDUN (British Empire). — Before we separate, I would like to be allowed to move a most hearty vote of thanks to you, Sir, for your presidency of our proceedings. I do not suppose there is anyone in this Committee who has had a longer experience than I have of committees of all sorts and of public business of all sorts, and I can truthfully say that I have never known, in any committee upon which I have ever served, a more efficient Chairman than Dr. Beneš. He has never spared himself the utmost labour, and both in this plenary Committee and in the Drafting Committee we know that the labours which he has imposed upon himself have been extremely onerous. Not only that. In presiding over our proceedings here, his continual good humour, his constant and unfailing courtesy and his quick and ready efficiency have won the admiration of us all. I am quite certain that there is no one here who would not feel that, if we left this room without giving him our hearty thanks, we should be failing in a duty which is also one of our greatest pleasures. (*Applause.*)

M. VON SIMSON (Germany). — I fully endorse Lord Cushendun's words in regard to our Chairman. Lord Cushendun has expressed the feelings of all the members so well and so fully that I have nothing to add to his remarks. (*Applause.*)

The CHAIRMAN. — I heartily thank Lord Cushendun for the kind words he has addressed to me on behalf of the Committee and also M. von Simson for endorsing those words, which are highly encouraging for our future work. I hope that time will show that we have contributed successfully to the work of peace.

I declare the third session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security closed.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

---

effectual suppression of the illicit traffic from which China suffers, will not have been taken in vain.

The resolution which points out how necessary it is for Governments to state in their annual reports what action is taken with regard to the narcotics seized, and to furnish any other particulars that may be of use in connection with such seizures, has led to replies from a number of countries, some of which state that they already furnish the desired particulars, and others that they are considering the possibility of so doing. It would certainly be desirable for all Governments to realise the genuine importance of the information asked for, since without these particulars it will always be very difficult for the Committee to gain an accurate idea of the position, and to ascertain the actual home consumption of the countries in which the seizures take place.

A resolution was adopted by the Committee at its tenth session, on the motion of Colonel Woods, concerning measures to render the control of narcotics and the suppression of the illicit trade as effectual as possible. The Governments to which the resolution has been communicated have, of course, not yet had sufficient time to define their attitude towards it. Moreover, all the Committee's discussions may be said to turn more or less on the principles formulated in Colonel Woods's resolution, and may consequently be regarded for the moment as constituting a provisional answer.

The Committee noted the small success so far obtained by the resolution requesting Governments of countries which manufacture narcotics or import them in considerable quantities to undertake thorough and systematic investigations to ascertain the sources from which the traffickers obtain their supplies and the method they employ. The Committee accordingly concluded that it was all the more necessary for it to examine the reports of seizures with care, and that it might be well to consider the possibility of repeating the resolution in a more explicit form, since the replies received show that certain Governments have not entirely grasped the meaning and purpose of the resolution.

The question of postal traffic and possible abuses thereof was again considered by the Committee, which requested its Chairman to communicate with the Bureau of the Universal Postal Union and discuss with the latter how the suggestions which will have to be made for the suppression of illicit traffic by post could be laid before the Union Conference to be held in London in 1929.

Regarding the question of free ports and free zones, the Committee took note of further information received from several Governments, and also of the list drawn up by the Secretariat showing the particulars so far obtained. A new and fuller list, showing more details, is to be drawn up by the Secretariat with the help of the Transit and Economic Sections.

The Committee also considered the replies received from certain Governments to the resolution requesting them to show in their statistics only the quantities of narcotics actually imported or exported, and not the quantities for the import or export of which authority may have been given. This raises another question — that of gross and net weight. It has been found that in certain statistics the weight given for the consignments was the gross and not the net weight — a circumstance connected with the practice followed by certain Customs administrations of assessing duty not on net but on gross weight. The Committee decided to call the attention of Governments to this point and ask them to base their statistics on the net weights of the narcotics imported or exported. In a special resolution the Committee also decided to ask States to classify their exports and imports of raw opium according to the country of production (Turkish, Persian, Indian, etc.), using a form to be prepared by the Secretariat (Resolution I).

Lastly, the Committee noted with great interest a communication to the effect that the Spanish Government was preparing to promulgate a law making the trade in narcotics a monopoly.

### III. EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS FROM GOVERNMENTS.

On several occasions the Committee has observed that it is essential, if its work is to progress satisfactorily, that the information furnished by Governments should be as full as possible. Great progress has undoubtedly been achieved in this respect and, thanks to the good will of a very large number of Governments, the Committee now receives information of great value. It is, however, a matter of regret that there are still certain gaps in this information, so that it is impossible for the Committee to acquire an exact idea of the situation and draw definite conclusions. It is particularly unfortunate that certain producing countries, such as Bolivia<sup>1</sup>, Greece, Peru and Persia, have not yet seen their way to supply the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to a statement made during the session by the Bolivian delegate, his Government is now preparing legislation on the subject of narcotics, and he will shortly be able to furnish the Committee with the particulars it desires.

Committee with information. The Committee therefore regards it as urgently necessary to inform the Governments of those countries how valuable their assistance in the Committee's work would be, and it adopted a resolution in this sense (Resolution II). There are still two producing or manufacturing countries — Turkey and the Soviet Republic — which are not Members of the League of Nations, but from which it is essential to obtain particulars. The League Secretariat will therefore be asked to consider whether, and, if so, in what form, the Governments of these two countries could be requested to furnish the Committee with particulars regarding their territory.

In connection with the examination of the reports, the delegates of certain countries took the opportunity of explaining to the Committee the policies of their Governments with regard to the control of the trade in narcotics. The Japanese delegate furnished important information, to which he hopes to add at a subsequent session, with regard to the extraction in Formosa of morphine from raw opium intended for the preparation of smoking opium. The reports from the Governments of the Straits Settlements and the Malay States reveal a considerable increase in the consumption of smoking opium, in which the Committee was greatly interested. The delegate of the British Government, at the request of the Committee, made a full statement on the position in these countries. He believes that the higher consumption may be attributed to the increase of Chinese immigration into these countries, and no doubt also to the improvement in the economic position of the population. Whatever may be the truth of the matter, its importance has not escaped the Committee, which will follow its development closely and endeavour to establish its real causes.

On considering the figures mentioned in the reports from Governments, particularly the figures relating to the manufacture of morphine, the Committee found that the situation was not altogether clear. These figures show that the manufacture in question would cover the normal therapeutic consumption, as determined by the calculations laid before the Geneva Conference, without leaving a margin for the illicit traffic at all commensurate with the extent of that traffic. Moreover, examination of the data obtained as to the quantities of opium which must have been used in the manufacture of morphine and other alkaloids gives figures higher than those in the official reports, even if account is taken of the quantities of opium utilised in making codeine and various substances which do not come under the Convention. Even granting that all these figures are only approximate, it would appear that we are still very imperfectly informed as to the manufacture of morphine and the sources from which the illicit traffickers in this drug draw their supplies. This is a situation, accordingly, which must be carefully examined by the Committee at a later session, and which even at this stage leads to one obvious conclusion, namely, that the Convention must be put into force as soon as possible. We think that the Convention will very shortly come into force. We may therefore assume that, as a result of the general extension of supervisory measures — more particularly of the system of licences and certificates — and of the entry on its duties of the Permanent Central Board, it will be possible to discover, with greater certitude and accuracy than at present, the sources from which the illicit trade derives its supplies, and thus improve the situation.

#### IV. EXAMINATION OF THE SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST.

The Committee has decided to request the Secretary-General to remind the Persian Government of the resolution adopted by the 1927 Assembly inviting this Government to keep the League of Nations informed of the progress made in carrying out the scheme proposed for the gradual diminution of the cultivation of the opium poppy in Persia.

With regard to China, the Committee listened with great interest to Mr. Lyall's statement on the general situation in this country. In this statement Mr. Lyall laid special stress on the contraband trade in morphine from abroad, and the harm that would be done to the interests of the morphine-manufacturing countries as soon as China wakes completely to the morphine evil, and he pointed out the absolute necessity for taking energetic steps to counteract this truly critical situation. He referred to the decision adopted by the Swiss Federal Government to subject its nationals in China to the provisions of its legislation on narcotics, and strongly recommended this measure to the attention of other Governments which had not taken action of the same kind.

The delegate of the Chinese Government also made a long statement to the Committee, in which he laid stress on the situation caused in China by the smuggling of narcotics from other countries. He requested the various Governments to co-operate to the fullest possible extent with the Chinese Government in order to enable the latter to combat effectively the illicit traffic in narcotics.

The Committee noted the action taken by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain against those of their nationals who smuggled opium on Chinese inland waterways. The British Government in particular has decided to withdraw its protection from vessels convicted of smuggling and to deprive them of the right to fly the British flag.

## V. ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

It appears from the documents submitted to the Committee that the position with regard to the illicit traffic is still highly unsatisfactory. The seizures effected in various countries, particularly in the Far East, still represent considerable quantities; a return — incomplete owing to the inaccuracy of the figures given for certain seizures and relating to a period of about eighteen months — shows the striking figures of 2,320 kilogrammes for cocaine, 1,600 kilogrammes for morphine and 1,150 kilogrammes for heroin, quite apart from a considerable number of seizures of which no precise details are given, but which represent totals perhaps as large as those given above. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the largest proportion of the narcotics illicitly distributed escapes seizure. A typical case is to be found in documents O.C.625 and 625(a) regarding a seizure in the United States. The quantity seized was 600lb. of morphine and heroin, and documentary evidence was incidentally obtained that the case was only one of nineteen cases of smuggling which had occurred during the previous eighteen months, the drugs in the remaining eighteen having escaped seizure. Though these figures cannot be used to calculate the true proportion between the quantities of drugs concerned in the illicit traffic and the quantities seized, it may be concluded that very considerable quantities escape seizure.

During the examination of the documents submitted to the Committee, a number of delegates furnished highly interesting particulars as to the various devices employed by traffickers. This examination further showed that, while the contraband traffic is at present being vigorously dealt with in many countries in a way which has already given good results, these measures should, nevertheless, be increased and strengthened. This will certainly be possible if the certificates system is generally applied. Moreover, the Committee considered that the attention of Governments should be drawn to the necessity of inflicting on traffickers heavy penalties in the form of imprisonment and fines, in view of the specially serious character of the offence and the large profits traffickers derive from their transactions. The Courts everywhere should energetically associate themselves with the action of the administrative authorities.

After considering the documents relating to seizures, the Committee held a short general discussion which resulted in the adoption of Resolution III. This summarises the view expressed by the members of the Committee in the course of this discussion.

The Committee also adopted a resolution (No. IV), recommending Governments to supply each other with all particulars necessary for enquiries conducted by the authorities in regard to persons implicated in smuggling offences, and to communicate to each other, whenever this is recognised as essential, copies of telegrams relating to the transactions of smugglers.

## VI. GRAPHS.

M. Brenier, assessor to the Committee, had asked the latter for permission to submit a graph in which he had attempted, on the basis of the figures given in the Government reports, to show in a convenient form the production and consumption of raw opium, smoking opium and morphine in 1921 and 1926. While recognising the great merit of M. Brenier's important work, the Committee observed that any graph, however carefully constructed, must necessarily reproduce the inaccuracies and approximations of the figures of which it is merely a graphical expression, and that graphs should therefore only be used with great caution and should be accompanied by detailed explanations. The same objections can, of course, be made to the graphs which the Committee had asked the Secretariat to prepare. At the same time, the Committee considered that these initial attempts at graphical representation were of great importance and should be continued, provided that all due precaution was observed.

During the discussion of the graphs, the question of codeine was again raised. As is known, codeine is manufactured from morphine, a fact which can invalidate the statistics concerning the manufacture of morphine since codeine does not come within the scope of the Convention. The Committee was therefore of opinion that Governments should obtain from manufacturers all necessary information concerning the quantities of morphine employed in manufacturing codeine and, in general, for the manufacture of substances which do not come under the Convention. Only thus can they accurately and effectively supervise the manufacture and use of morphine.

## VII. SWEDISH RESERVATION.

It will be remembered that the Committee had been instructed by the Council to consider the reservation on which the Swedish Government had made its ratification of the Geneva

Convention contingent. This reservation referred to Article 6(c) of the Convention, which requires that chemists shall enter in their books all sales and all other distribution of narcotics, unless they file and preserve the medical prescriptions on the strength of which they have dispensed the drugs. In the report on the work of the tenth session will be found all the details of this question and the discussion to which it gave rise in the Sub-Committee appointed by the Committee. We would merely point out that, after hearing the Swedish representative, the Committee came to the conclusion that it would not be desirable to give a final opinion at this session. It expressed a hope that the information supplied to it concerning the practical working in other countries of the system outlined in the Convention would help to meet the objections of the Swedish Government. Accordingly, it felt that it might be premature to reach a decision before the Swedish Government had been able to take cognisance of this information, and of the general sense of the discussion in the Committee. It accordingly proposed to the Council that copies of that part of its report and minutes of meetings which related to this question should be officially communicated to the Swedish Government — and to the Norwegian Government, which had adopted an attitude similar to the Swedish Government's on this question — for information and consideration, and that the two Governments should at the same time be notified that the Committee proposed to discuss the question again at its next session.

This was done, with the result that the Swedish Government addressed to the Secretary-General of the League a note, dated March 31st, 1928, stating that, after careful consideration of the documents submitted, its apprehensions were not entirely dispelled and it could not therefore see its way to make any definite examination of the question of Sweden's accession until it knew whether its reservation could be accepted.

The Committee concluded from this communication that the Swedish Government was not prepared to withdraw its reservation. It therefore considered whether, in order to place no obstacle in the way of Sweden's ratifying the Convention, the Council should not be advised to accept the Swedish reservation. Certain members of the Committee thought that, from a technical point of view, the matter to which the reservation related was of secondary importance, and that consequently the acceptance of the reservation would not endanger any essential interests. On the other hand, it was urged that the reservation might have more serious consequences than were obvious at first sight — that, if it were accepted, there was some danger that, before the Convention came into force, other reservations might be put in by countries which had not yet ratified, and thereby impair the value of the Convention in advance. It was further urged that it was by no means certain that the Swedish Government's reply was to be regarded as final. A proposal to postpone any decision having been rejected, the Committee then found itself called upon to decide between the two views. It definitely decided by six votes to one, with three abstentions, to advise against the acceptance of the reservation and to forward this opinion to the Council (see Resolution V).

#### VIII. QUESTION OF BENZOYL-MORPHINE.

A document from the Health Committee reproducing a report by Professor Knaffl-Lenz relating to the question of benzoyl-morphine was communicated to the Committee. This question may be summarised as follows: Since morphine has been subject to control, a number of manufacturers have endeavoured to find substitutes for this alkaloid which would escape the supervision which is applicable only to morphine and its salts. One of these substitutes is benzoyl-morphine, which is a morphine ester, *i.e.*, a combination of morphine with an organic acid—benzoic acid. This benzoyl-morphine, which is already manufactured in comparatively large quantities, has been shown to possess all the properties of a drug of addiction. Moreover, the morphine contained in benzoyl-morphine can readily be recovered by a very simple chemical process, and hence quantities of morphine which will escape supervision can be put on the market. But another point should be noted. In addition to benzoyl-morphine, there is a whole series of other morphine esters which are derived from organic acids, such as propionic acid, valerianic acid and acetic acid (diacetyl-morphine or heroin itself is one of these esters), and which possess the same properties. It is therefore necessary to consider the possibility of applying Article 10 of the Convention to all these products. In accordance with a definite procedure, the provisions of this article can be applied to narcotics which have been proved to possess the harmful properties of those expressly mentioned in the Convention. The question, therefore, has been submitted, in pursuance of the procedure laid down in the Convention, to the Office international d'Hygiène publique at Paris, which has been asked to give its opinion as to the necessity and the possibility of bringing morphine esters under the Geneva Convention. The Committee, considering that it was an urgent question and noting that the regular procedure would still require a certain amount of time, adopted a resolution (No. VI) requesting the Council to draw the attention of Governments to the necessity of placing benzoyl-morphine under control forthwith.

#### IX. LIST OF DRUGS AND PREPARATIONS COVERED BY THE CONVENTION.

In 1925, the Committee appointed a Sub-Committee, consisting of Dr. ANSELMINO, Dr. CARRIÈRE and Dr. TSURUMI (then Japanese délégate), to study the possibility of drawing up a list showing with all necessary detail the drugs and preparations which fall under the provisions of the Convention. This Sub-Committee has already compiled a provisional list on the basis of data furnished by various countries, but the list now requires to be supplemented. As, however, Dr. Tsurumi has since left the Committee and has not been replaced by a delegate who is an expert in pharmacology, the Sub-Committee is reduced to two members and might not, therefore, in certain circumstances, be able to continue its work satisfactorily. The Committee accordingly decided, on the Chairman's proposal, to add to the Sub-Committee two experts who are not members of the Committee, namely, Dr. KNAFFL-LENZ, Professor of Pharmacology in the University of Vienna and Expert to the Health Committee, and Dr. BÜRGI, Professor of Pharmacology in the University of Berne.

#### X. QUESTION OF THE PERMANENT CENTRAL BOARD AND ITS RELATIONS WITH THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

At the tenth session, M. Fotitch had proposed that the Committee should consider the question of the respective powers of the Advisory Committee and the future Permanent Central Board. The Committee accepted this suggestion and confined the examination of the question raised by M. Fotitch to a Sub-Committee, consisting of M. BOURGOIS, Sir John CAMPBELL, Sir Malcom DELEIVINGNE, M. FOTITCH and M. VAN WETTUM.

The Sub-Committee laid before the Committee a report which the latter discussed at the tenth and eleventh meetings of the session. This report consisted of a legal and theoretical part, which examined the relations that might exist between the two bodies, and a practical and technical part, in which an attempt was made to define their respective powers. The discussion centred mainly round a general objection raised by M. Cavazzoni, who held that, as the Central Board was a non-League organisation, autonomous and not controlled by the Council and Assembly, the legality of its existence and its compatibility with the provisions of Article 23 of the Covenant were open to question. An attempt to bring the Permanent Central Board in some way under the League of Nations, as they were seeking to do, by trying to determine its powers in relation to those of the Advisory Committee, would necessitate a modification of the Convention. M. Cavazzoni concluded that a discussion on the respective powers of the Advisory Committee, a League organisation, and the Permanent Central Board, a body unconnected with the League, was for the moment of no practical value. M. Cavazzoni accordingly refused to accept the conclusions of the Sub-Committee's report. In reply to M. Cavazzoni, it was pointed out that the Assembly had settled the question of principle he had raised, *i.e.*, the compatibility of the Central Board with the provisions of the Covenant, when it resolved to place the expenditure of the Board on its budget. Accordingly, it was not for the Committee to reopen the matter by adopting M. Cavazzoni's standpoint.

After discussion, the Committee decided, however, that, under these circumstances, it would be better for the present if the Sub-Committee's report omitted all mention of theoretical and constitutional questions. The report should be confined to the practical considerations with which it ended and which dealt solely with the technical powers of the two bodies. The report, amended in this way, had been returned, for further consideration, to the Sub-Committee, on which M. Cavazzoni had agreed to sit, and which was to submit the results of this investigation to the Committee at a later session.

A new fact had, however, emerged in the meantime — the suggestion made to the Council of the League at its last session by M. Scialoja, the Italian delegate. This suggestion was that the Secretary-General should be requested to constitute the Secretariat of the Central Board as an integral part of the Social Section of the League Secretariat. M. Scialoja had added — and this was a point which some of the members of the Committee thought it necessary to emphasise — that his proposal, which incidentally constituted an interpretation of Article 20 of the Geneva Convention, was to enable all countries to supervise the work of the Central Board.

This proposal, which the Council has submitted to the Committee for consideration, temporarily relegated to the background the question of the respective powers of the Committee and the Central Board, and it was this proposal which the Committee had to consider in the first instance.

The discussion dealt mainly with one point. Was it permissible, under Article 23 of the Covenant, to incorporate the Secretariat of the Central Board with the Secretariat of the League or one of its Sections? Two opposite opinions were expressed on this point. On the one hand, M. Cavazzoni held that, in virtue of Article 23 of the Covenant, which entrusts the League with the supervision over the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs, it is not permissible to create an organisation independent of the League of Nations and the Secretariat. On the other hand, it was pointed out that M. Scialoja's proposal was not in conformity with Article 20 of the Geneva Convention, and that, while Article 23 of the Covenant entrusts the League with the supervision over the traffic in opium, this supervision should be exercised in accordance with the stipulations of the Conventions in force. These two opinions are

embodied in two draft resolutions. One, submitted by M. Cavazzoni, was subsequently withdrawn by him in favour of a draft resolution amended and submitted by M. Bourgois, with which M. Cavazzoni declared himself to be in agreement. The other was submitted by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The latter resolution, which is given in the Minutes, was afterwards withdrawn by its author in favour of a draft resolution submitted by M. Sato, which Sir Malcolm Delevingne accepted. This last resolution, while not adopting the Scialoja proposal, might be regarded as a compromise. The text of the two resolutions is as follows :

*Resolution submitted by M. Bourgois (No. VII).*

“ At the request of the Council, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs considered the proposal made by the representative of the Italian Government on the Council to constitute the Secretariat of the Permanent Central Board, which was provided for in the Opium Convention of February 19th, 1925, as an integral part of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

“ The Advisory Committee considers that the proposal is in complete agreement with the stipulations of Article 20, paragraph 1, of that Convention, whereby the Secretary-General of the League of Nations is requested to provide for the control of the staff in administrative matters.

“ This proposal, moreover, does not in any way affect the right, which is conferred on the Central Board by paragraph 2 of the said Article 20, to nominate the members of its staff, who will be appointed by the Secretary-General, subject to the approval of the Council.”

*Resolution submitted by M. Sato.*

“ The Committee has carefully considered the proposal of the Italian representative on the Council that the Secretariat of the Central Board under the Geneva Convention should be constituted by the Secretary-General as part of the Social Section of the League Secretariat. In considering the proposal, the Committee had to bear in mind the terms of Chapter VI of the Convention.

“ In view :

“ (1) Of the special duties and powers entrusted by the Convention to the Board, especially the power of deciding that a particular country is in danger of becoming a centre of the illicit traffic in drugs and making recommendations to other Governments to cease exporting the drugs to such a country :

“ (2) Of the necessity of ensuring that the information to be supplied by the various countries in regard to their trade in drugs should not become public to the detriment of the legitimate commercial interest of any country :—

“ It is provided in Chapter VI :

“ (a) That the Board shall be independent in the discharge of its duties and its decisions, subject only to an appeal to the Council ;

“ (b) That the Board shall nominate its own Secretariat, subject to the approval of the Council ;

“ (c) That the Board shall ensure that the information supplied to it shall not become public (for which purpose it appears to the Committee that the Board must have the control of its own documents).

“ It is necessary therefore that the Board should be so constituted and its work so organised as to ensure that full effect is given to the Convention in respect of these three points.

“ On the other hand, the Convention provides for the control of the staff of the Board in administrative matters by the Secretary-General and it follows from this that the Secretariat of the Board will form an integral part of the staff of the League, but always without prejudice to the three provisions above stated.

“ The Committee does not feel able to define more precisely than the Conference was able to do the exact nature of the arrangements to be made for organising the work. The arrangements were left by Article 20 of the Convention to be settled when the Board has been appointed in consultation between the Council and the Central Board, and will naturally be subject to modification from time to time as experience may dictate.”

On a vote, which was taken by roll-call, the Bourgois resolution was adopted by six votes (China, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) to four (Great Britain, India, Japan and the Netherlands) and three abstentions (Bolivia, Siam and Switzerland).

The principle of the proposal submitted to the Council by M. Scialoja, which the Council had forwarded to the Committee for its consideration and opinion, was thus adopted by the latter by a majority.

After this vote, the Committee considered that it was unnecessary for the moment to continue consideration of the question of the respective powers of the Committee and the Central Board, and that, before taking the matter up again, they should wait and see how the situation created by the Committee's vote would develop.

#### XI. CAVAZZONI MEMORANDUM.

At the Committee's tenth session which, it will be remembered, had been convened expressly to consider, as a result of certain suggestions made by the Italian delegate, the question of the illicit traffic, M. Cavazzoni submitted a memorandum outlining a system of supervision capable of giving really effective results.

After a preliminary discussion, the Committee decided to instruct a Sub-Committee, consisting of Dr. ANSELMINO, M. BOURGOIS, Dr. CARRIÈRE, M. CAVAZZONI, Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE and M. VAN WETTUM, to prepare a general report on the administrative supervision of the traffic in narcotic drugs, taking into account the suggestions submitted by M. Cavazzoni and, at the same time, the measures employed in a number of countries whose value has been proved by experience. The Sub-Committee's terms of reference compelled it therefore to consider the whole question of administrative control, and for this investigation it required the necessary information. The collection of this material was entrusted to the Secretariat, which had received from a number of countries detailed information on which the Sub-Committee based its investigation. The investigation necessitated, in the first place, a thorough examination of M. Cavazzoni's memorandum. After this, the Sub-Committee was to select from the memorandum and from the information placed at its disposal provisions which it considered sound or which had proved their value in practice, and to embody them in a standard set of regulations or code for the supervision of the traffic in narcotics; this code might be submitted to Governments for their consideration and decision. It should be added that M. Cavazzoni had prepared, for the use of the Sub-Committee, a document in which the proposals in his memorandum and the stipulations of the Hague and the Geneva Conventions were placed in parallel columns.

On examining M. Cavazzoni's memorandum, the Sub-Committee found that, while certain of the provisions of the memorandum could be adopted and would probably give very good results, others were complete innovations on the methods of supervision at present in force (such as the provision for the storage of imported narcotics in Government warehouses and the formality of the official approval-of-delivery certificate for imports and the home trade), that they would be difficult to apply, and that the same results might be obtained by other provisions taken from the regulations at present in force in various countries. When the first part of this work was completed, the Committee took up the second part, consisting of the drafting of the code of regulations. The results were submitted to the Committee in a report which the latter approved by a majority, M. Cavazzoni dissenting. He embodied his views in a declaration which he read at the close of the discussion, and which is appended to the report of the Sub-Committee.

This report will be annexed to the Minutes of the session: the part constituting the code is printed separately and is attached to the present report, with a request that the Council should ask the Secretary-General to forward it, with an explanatory letter, for the consideration of the Governments.

The Committee considers that this code might assist Governments in framing or amending their respective regulations at the time that the Convention comes into force.

#### XII. RESOLUTIONS.

##### *Resolution I.*

The Committee requests that the Governments should be asked to classify their exports and imports of raw opium according to the country of production (Turkish, Persian, Indian, etc.), and that a form of table for the purpose should be prepared by the Secretariat and sent to the Governments.

##### *Resolution II.*

In view of the failure of certain Governments to furnish annual reports on the trade in opium and drugs in their territories, as recommended by the Assembly and Council of the League, the Committee asks the Council to instruct the Secretary-General to send a reminder to any Government which fails to send in its report (by July 1st in the case of European countries and November 1st in the case of countries outside Europe). If no reply is received to the reminder, a second reminder should be sent (by cable when necessary) not less than one month before the date of the annual meeting of the Committee.

##### *Resolution III.*

The careful examination which the Committee had made of the numerous reports in regard to the illicit traffic which have been received since the meeting in October last, and

which show that this traffic continues on an enormous scale, emphasises in the strongest way the urgent necessity for : (a) the immediate ratification and enforcement by all States Members of the League of the Geneva Convention of 1925 ; (b) the adoption and strict application of the other measures which have been recommended by the Committee from time to time and in particular the following :

1. Withdrawal of the licence to manufacture or trade in the drugs from any firm if there is sufficient evidence to show that the firm is engaged in or is knowingly supplying drugs for the illicit traffic.

2. Strict control over exports to countries not exercising adequate supervision over trade in the drugs, and the rigid limitation of such exports to the quantities that may reasonably be required for medical purposes in the country itself.

3. Immediate communication of the fullest particulars relating to any important seizures of smuggled drugs to the Government of any countries in which the persons connected with the transaction may be or may have been residing at the time or in which any part of the transaction may have taken place.

4. Immediate and full investigation, on the receipt of particulars of such a transaction, whether directly or from the League, by the Government ;

5. Exercise of an adequate control by every Government to ensure as far as possible that its territories shall not be used for the transit or transshipment of consignments of drugs (whether declared as such or not) for the illicit traffic.

6. Provision in each country's national law of severe penalties for persons convicted of organising the smuggling of drugs whether into that or into other countries.

#### *Resolution IV.*

The Committee has had its attention called to the difficulties experienced by the authorities in their investigations as to the persons responsible for the smuggling of a large quantity of drugs which were recently seized in New York through their inability to obtain from the Government of the exporting country photographic or other facsimiles of certain cables sent from that country to the United States and the names of the persons sending them. In view of the extreme importance of obtaining all possible information as to the persons who organise the illicit traffic, and who for this purpose abuse the facilities afforded by the telegraphic and other means of communication, the Committee would urge that every Government should in such cases, on the application of a responsible Government and on being satisfied that the information is necessary for the investigations by the responsible authorities in the country of seizure, furnish facsimiles of the telegrams sent in connection with a smuggling transaction and the names of and other particulars relating to the persons sending them, and, if the power to do so does not exist at present, should, if possible, obtain such power.

#### *Resolution V. (Swedish Reservation.)*

The Committee would point out that the Convention allows two alternatives : the registration by the pharmacist of the details of the supply of the drug or the retention by the pharmacist of the prescription ; that the difficulties in the way of registration are not, in its opinion, such as to justify a reservation on the point ; and that it deprecates, for the reasons which appear in the Minutes of the discussion of the Committee, the acceptance of the Swedish reservation.

#### *Resolution VI.*

The Committee desires to draw the attention of the Council to the attempt which has been successfully made to evade the existing system of control over the traffic in drugs by the manufacture of benzoyl-morphine and other esters of morphine which fall outside the provisions of most national laws but from which morphine can easily be recovered and which, so far as known, are liable to give rise to the same abuse ; and it would urgently recommend that, pending the completion of the procedure under Article 10 of the Geneva Convention for bringing such substances within the scope of the Convention, the Governments should immediately apply to benzoyl-morphine, and possibly other similar substances if manufactured, the same control over manufacture, distribution, export and import as in the case of morphine.

*Resolution VII.*

At the request of the Council, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs considered the proposal made by the representative of the Italian Government on the Council to constitute the Secretariat of the Permanent Central Board, which was provided for in the Opium Convention of February 19th, 1925, as an integral part of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

The Advisory Committee considers that this proposal is in complete agreement with the stipulations of Article 20, paragraph 1, of that Convention, whereby the Secretary-General of the League of Nations is requested to provide for the control of the staff in administrative matters.

This proposal, moreover, does not in any way affect the right, which is conferred on the Central Board by paragraph 2 of the said Article 20, to nominate the members of its staff, who will be appointed by the Secretary-General, subject to the approval of the Council.

---

LIST OF ANNEXES.

---

	Page
1. The Hague Opium Convention of 1912 : List of Ratifications, etc. . . . .	16
2. Agreement drawn up by the First Opium Conference, February 11th, 1925 : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions. . . . .	17
3. Convention drawn up by the Second Opium Conference, February 19th, 1925 : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions. . . . .	17
4. Statement with regard to Annual Reports received from Governments Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912 . . . . .	18
5. Import Certificate System. . . . .	20
6. Shipments of Persian Opium known to have been shipped from the Port of Bushire during the period December 1st, 1926, to December 31st, 1927 . . . . .	21
7. Letter from the Swedish Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations concerning the Ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1925 . . . . .	23
8. Code for the Administrative Control of the Drug Traffic . . . . .	23

---

ANNEX 1.

THE HAGUE OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1912: LIST OF RATIFICATIONS, ETC.

<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures of Protocol putting Convention into force</i>
Albania	Albania
Australia	Australia
Austria	Austria
Belgium	Belgium
Bolivia	Bolivia
Brazil	Brazil
Bulgaria	Bulgaria
Canada	Canada
Chile	Chile
China	China
Colombia	Colombia
Costa Rica	Costa Rica
Cuba	Cuba
Czechoslovakia	Czechoslovakia
Danzig	
Denmark	Denmark
Dominican Republic	
Ecuador <sup>1</sup>	Ecuador <sup>1</sup>
Estonia	
Finland	Finland
France	France
Germany	Germany
Great Britain	Great Britain
Greece	Greece
Guatemala	Guatemala
Haiti	Haiti
Honduras	Honduras
Hungary	Hungary
Iceland <sup>1</sup>	Iceland <sup>1</sup>
India	India
Irish Free State	Irish Free State
Italy	Italy
Japan	Japan
Latvia	Latvia
Liberia	Liberia
Luxemburg	Luxemburg
Mexico <sup>1</sup>	Mexico <sup>1</sup>
Monaco <sup>1</sup>	Monaco <sup>1</sup>
Netherlands	Netherlands
New Zealand	New Zealand
Nicaragua	Nicaragua
Norway	Norway
Panama	Panama
Peru	Peru
Poland	Poland
Portugal	Portugal
Roumania	Roumania
Salvador	Salvador
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Siam	Siam
Spain	Spain
Sweden	Sweden
Switzerland	Switzerland
Union of South Africa	Union of South Africa
United States of America <sup>1</sup>	United States of America <sup>1</sup>
Uruguay	Uruguay
Venezuela	Venezuela

<sup>1</sup> Not Members of the League.

ANNEX I.

C.266.1928.IX.

REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARBITRATION  
AND SECURITY.

*Submitted by M. ANTONIADE, Representative of Roumania, and adopted by the Council on June 4th, 1928.*

The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference established, at its meeting on November 30th, 1927, the Committee on Arbitration and Security.

This Committee, at its first meeting in December 1927, fixed its programme of work and asked three Rapporteurs, M. HOLSTI, M. POLITIS and M. RUTGERS, to prepare memoranda on arbitration, security and on certain Articles of the Covenant.

These memoranda, submitted by Dr. Beneš, Chairman of the Committee and by the Rapporteurs, served as a basis for very useful discussions at the Committee's second session held from February 20th to March 7th, 1928, at Geneva.

During this second session, the Committee drafted a certain number of model treaties, for conciliation, arbitration, non-aggression and mutual assistance, whose second reading will take place at the third session in June. The Committee will also consider at this meeting a memorandum by M. Rolin Jaequemyns on preventive measures.

The Committee further discussed and drew up a series of draft resolutions for submission to the Assembly : resolutions with regard to the recommendation for the model treaties, the good offices of the Council, accession to the Optional Clause of Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Articles of the Covenant, rapid communications with the League in cases of emergency, etc.

The Security Committee recommended that the results of its second session should be communicated to all States early enough for their discussion at the next Assembly.

The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference supported this recommendation in the following terms :

" The Commission expresses its satisfaction with the results achieved and its approbation of the general spirit in which the Committee carried out the work.

" According to precedent, the report of the Committee on Arbitration and Security on the work of its second session, together with the Minutes of that session, will be communicated to all Governments. The Commission seconds the recommendation adopted by the Committee that these documents should be forwarded in sufficient time to allow of their discussion at the next session of the Assembly."

I think it important that the Council should at once decide to insert the question of the work of the Committee on Arbitration on the Assembly agenda.

I therefore propose that the Council should adopt the following resolution :

" The Council,

" Having taken note of the work already done by the Committee on Arbitration and Security and of the programme for its future work :

" Instructs the Secretary-General to insert on the supplementary Assembly agenda the question of the work and the proposals of the Committee on Arbitration and Security.

" The Secretary-General is also requested to forward the Minutes of the present meeting to the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for Disarmament and the Chairman of the Committee on Arbitration and Security."

---

ANNEX 2.

AGREEMENT DRAWN UP BY THE FIRST OPIUM CONFERENCE,  
FEBRUARY 11<sup>TH</sup>, 1925: LIST OF SIGNATURES, RATIFICATIONS AND ADHESIONS.

<i>Agreement</i>	<i>Signatures</i>		<i>Ratifications</i>	
	<i>Protocol</i>	<i>Final Act</i>	<i>Agreement</i>	<i>Protocol</i>
France	France	France	France	France
Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain
India	India	India	India	India
Japan	Japan	Japan		
Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands
Portugal	Portugal	Portugal	Portugal	Portugal
Siam	Siam	Siam	Siam	Siam

ANNEX 3.

CONVENTION DRAWN UP BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE,  
FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup>, 1925: LIST OF SIGNATURES, RATIFICATIONS AND ADHESIONS.

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Signatures</i>		<i>Ratifications</i>	
	<i>Protocol</i>	<i>Final Act</i>	<i>Convention</i>	<i>Protocol</i>
Albania	Albania	Albania		
Australia	Australia	Australia	Australia	Australia
Austria			Austria	
Belgium		Belgium	Belgium	
Brazil		Bolivia		
Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Brazil		
Canada	Canada	Bulgaria	Bulgaria	Bulgaria
Chile	Chile			
Cuba	Cuba	Cuba		
Czechoslovakia	Czechoslovakia	Czechoslovakia	Czechoslovakia	
Denmark		Denmark		
France		France	France	
Germany	Germany	Germany		
Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain	Great Britain
Greece	Greece	Greece		
Hungary		Hungary		
India	India	India	India	India
Irish Free State		Irish Free State		
Japan	Japan	Japan		
Latvia	Latvia			
Luxemburg	Luxemburg	Luxemburg	Luxemburg	Luxemburg
Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands		
New Zealand	New Zealand	New Zealand	New Zealand	New Zealand
Nicaragua	Nicaragua	Nicaragua		
Persia	Persia	Persia		
Poland		Poland	Poland	
Portugal	Portugal	Portugal	Portugal	Portugal
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes		
Siam	Siam	Siam		
Spain		Spain		
Sudan	Sudan		Sudan	Sudan
Switzerland		Switzerland		
Union of South Africa	Union of South Africa		Union of South Africa	Union of South Africa
Uruguay		Uruguay		

*Adhesions*

Bolivia<sup>1</sup> (*ad referendum* and under reservations)  
 Danzig  
 Dominican Republic (*ad referendum*)  
 Egypt  
 Finland  
 Monaco  
 New Hebrides  
 Roumania (*ad referendum*)  
 Salvador  
 San Marino  
 Venezuela (*ad referendum*)

ANNEX 4.

STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO ANNUAL REPORTS RECEIVED FROM  
 GOVERNMENTS MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE AND PARTIES  
 TO THE OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1912.

× denotes that a report has been sent.  
 — denotes that no report has been sent.

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
Abyssinia	Letter despatched to the Secretariat on October 23rd, 1923. No manufacture, consumption or traffic. Small quantities imported for medical purposes.					—
Albania	Letter despatched to Secretariat on March 10th, 1923. Cannot answer questions in annual report form. Dangerous drugs only used for medical purposes.					
Argentina .....	—	—	—	—	—	×
Australia .....	×	—	×	×	×	—
Austria .....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Belgium .....	×	×	×	×	×	—
Bolivia .....	×	×	—	—	—	—
Brazil .....	—	×	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria .....	—	—	×	×	—	×
Canada .....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Chile .....	×	×	×	—	—	—
China .....	—	×	—	—	×	—
Colombia .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Costa Rica .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cuba .....	×	×	×	—	×	×
Czechoslovakia .....	—	—	×	×	×	×
Danzig .....	—	—	×	×	×	×
Denmark .....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Dominican Republic	Letter despatched to the Secretariat on January 10th, 1924. No manufacture. Imports chiefly from France and the United States.					—
Ecuador .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Finland .....	—	—	×	×	×	×
France .....	—	—	×	×	×	×
Germany .....	×	—	—	—	×	×
Great Britain .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Greece .....	×	×	×	×	×	—
Guatemala .....	×	×	—	—	—	—
Haiti	Letter despatched to the Secretariat on January 8th, 1924. No year stated, but annual imports, exports and consumption given.					—
Honduras .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Iceland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—

<sup>1</sup> Bolivia will not undertake to restrict the cultivation and production of coca in the country or to forbid the use of coca leaves among the native population  
 Export of coca leaves will be under the control of the Bolivian Government by means of export certificates.  
 As regards the export of coca, the Bolivian Government has authorised the following places of export: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
India .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Irish Free State .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Italy .....	—	×	—	×	×	×
Japan .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Latvia .....	—	—	—	—	×	×
Liberia .....	Letters despatched May 8th, 1923, and February 20th, 1924. No traffic in the country.					—
Lithuania .....	×	×	×	×	—	—
Luxemburg .....	—	—	—	—	—	×
Mexico .....	—	—	—	—	—	×
Monaco .....	Letter despatched on November 8th, 1923. No year given.					See document O.C. 23 (j) 8.
Netherlands .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
New Zealand .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Nicaragua.....	—	—	—	—	—	×
Norway.....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Panama .....	Letter despatched on March 26th, 1923, stating that details were sent in reply to questionnaire of 1921.					—
Paraguay.....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Persia.....	×	×	—	—	—	—
Peru .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Portugal .....	—	—	—	—	×	×
Roumania .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Salvador .....	No year given. General information despatched to the Secretariat on June 20th, 1923.					—
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.....	—	—	—	—	×	×
Siam.....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Spain.....	—	—	×	× <sup>1</sup>	× <sup>1</sup>	×
Sweden .....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Switzerland .....	Statistics for 1921, 1922 and 1923 sent by Dr. Carrière (document O.C. 206).				× <sup>2</sup>	×
Union of South Africa.....	×	×	×	×	×	×
United States of America ...	×	×	×	×	×	×
Uruguay .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Venezuela .....	×	—	—	—	—	—

STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO ANNUAL REPORTS RECEIVED FROM THE MORE IMPORTANT COLONIES, POSSESSIONS OR TERRITORIES BELONGING TO STATES MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE.

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
<i>British:</i>						
Ceylon.....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Hong-Kong .....	—	×	×	×	×	×
Malay States (Federated)	×	×	×	×	×	×
Malay States (Unfederated) .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Straits Settlements.....	×	×	×	×	×	×
<i>French:</i>						
Indo-China .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
<i>Japanese:</i>						
Chosen .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Formosa .....	×	×	×	×	×	×
Kwantung Leased Territory.....	×	×	×	×	×	×

<sup>1</sup> Figures of consumption only.

<sup>2</sup> Imports and exports for the last five months only.

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
<i>Netherlands :</i>						
Netherlands East Indies .	×	×	×	×	×	×
<i>Portuguese :</i>						
Macao .....	—	×	×	×	×	×

ANNEX 5.

IMPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

*States which have accepted the system and put it into force.*

*States which have accepted the system but have not yet put it into force.*

*States which have accepted the system but have not yet intimated whether it is in force or not.*

1. Albania
2. Australia
3. Austria
4. Belgium
5. Bulgaria
6. Canada
7. Cuba
8. Czechoslovakia
9. Danzig
10. Denmark
11. Finland
12. Germany
13. Great Britain
14. Greece
15. Guatemala
16. Haiti
17. Hungary
18. India
19. Irish Free State
20. Italy
21. Japan
22. Latvia
23. New Zealand
24. Norway
25. Panama
26. Poland
27. Portugal
28. Roumania
29. Salvador
30. Siam
31. Spain
32. Sweden
33. Switzerland
34. Union of South Africa
35. United States of America.

1. China<sup>1</sup>
2. Netherlands<sup>2</sup>

1. Brazil
2. Lithuania

COLONIES, POSSESSIONS AND MANDATED TERRITORIES.

*British :*

*Note.* — The British Government has accepted the system on behalf of 39 colonies. It is also in force in Newfoundland and in the following British mandated territories :

Palestine  
Iraq

Togoland  
Cameroons

Tanganyika

*Japanese :*

Chosen  
Formosa  
Kwantung Leased Territory

<sup>1</sup> See statement made by M. Chao Hsin Chu at the fourth meeting of the ninth session of the Advisory Committee.  
<sup>2</sup> The system will be enforced from April 1st, 1928, as regards export to European countries and from July 1st, 1928, as regards export to other countries.

*Netherlands :*

Curaçao  
Netherlands East Indies

*New Zealand :*

Western Samoa (Mandated Territory).

ANNEX 6.

SHIPMENTS OF PERSIAN OPIUM KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN SHIPPED FROM  
THE PORT OF BUSHIRE DURING THE PERIOD DECEMBER 1st, 1926,  
TO DECEMBER 31st, 1927.

(Communicated in continuation of previous memorandum (document O.C.417(c)  
appearing as Annex 10 to the Report of the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee.)

*Forwarded by the British Representative.*

<i>Vessel.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Number of cases.</i>	<i>Declared destination.</i>	<i>Flag.</i>	<i>See Note.</i>
<i>Varsova</i>	6.XII.26	700	Batavia	British	
		200	Singapore		
		240	Bangkok		
<i>Varsova</i>	26.XII.26	230	Bangkok	British	
		50	Keelung		
		90	Singapore		
<i>Varela</i>	3. I. 27	110	Singapore	British	
		200	Batavia		
<i>Kumamoto Maru</i>	22. I. 27	693	Dairen	Japanese	A.
<i>Varela</i>	23. I. 27	200	Batavia	British	
<i>Chakla</i>	30. I. 27	100	Batavia	British	
		240	Bangkok		
		100	Dairen		
<i>Varela</i>	14. II. 27	400	Singapore	British	
<i>Chakla</i>	20. II. 27	200	Bangkok	British	
<i>Varsova</i>	13.III. 27	620	Batavia	British	
		200	Bangkok	British	
<i>Varela</i>	27.III. 27	80	Batavia	British	
<i>Varsova</i>	15. v. 27	100	Dairen	British	
		5	Saigon		
		444	Singapore		
<i>Philadelphia</i>	6.VI. 27	218	Vladivostok	Chinese	B.
<i>Varela</i>	14.VIII.27	100	Dairen	British	
		50	Keelung		
<i>Varsova</i>	28.VIII.27	100	Dairen		
<i>Kumamoto Maru</i>	6.IX. 27	328	Vladivostok	Japanese	A.
<i>Falkenfels</i>	11.IX. 27	5	Hamburg	German	
<i>Kairu Maru</i>	12.IX. 27	460	Vladivostok	Japanese	
<i>Varsova</i>	18.IX. 27	100	Singapore	British	
<i>Goyo Maru</i>	8. x. 27	425	Vladivostok	Japanese	
<i>Kohatsu Maru</i>	19. x. 27	546	Vladivostok	Japanese	C.
<i>Ho Ping</i>	28. x. 27	350	Vladivostok	Chinese	D.
<i>Varsova</i>	20.XI. 27	10	Marseilles	British	
<i>Varsova</i>	25.XII.27	130	Dairen	British	

The total amount of Persian opium mentioned in this table as having been exported from Bushire is 8,024 cases, or approximately 573 tons.

Total amounts of Persian opium declared for the following places :

	Cases	Tons approx.
Vladivostok . . . . .	2,327	165
Batavia . . . . .	1,900	135 ½
Singapore . . . . .	1,344	96
Dairen . . . . .	1,223	87
Bangkok . . . . .	1,100	79
Keelung . . . . .	100	7
Saigon . . . . .	5	

(For the purpose of these calculations, the weight of a case has been taken as 160 lb.).

Of that declared for Vladivostok<sup>1</sup>, 1,759 were carried on Japanese and 568 on Chinese vessels. The opium carried to all other ports was covered by import certificates issued by the Government of the country of destination.

#### NOTES.

A. For a previous shipment on *Kumamoto Maru*, see document O.C.417(a). The cargo on this occasion was made up of one consignment of 693 chests shipped by Haji Cholam Ali and Haji Mohammed Baqir Behbehani & Sons, a consignment of two chests shipped by Haji Mirza Gholam Hussein Kaserooni & Sons, and one chest shipped by Haji Abdur Ra'isuttujjar & Son.

In document O.C.631, furnished by the Japanese Government, the first officer of the vessel is reported to have stated, when examined by the Dairen authorities, that, after having loaded 173 cases of opium at Bushire, the ship sailed on January 20th for Macao, where she arrived on February 15th, and unloaded the *entire* cargo of 173 cases of opium.

The Japanese representative, at the tenth session of the Opium Advisory Committee, said that the cargo of 173 cases had been landed at Macao with the approval of the Portuguese authorities, and that he had received a telegram from the Portuguese representative on the Committee stating that all was in order.

As a result of enquiry made at Sabang, where the vessel touched on its way from Bushire to Macao, it has been ascertained that the master of the vessel informed the authorities there that there were on board 404 "bags", weighing 118,400 lb. (inclusive of packing), of which 231 "bags" were stowed in hold No. 5 and 173 "bags" and two small packets in hold No. 4.

It would appear, therefore, that what happened in this case was that the cargo of 696 chests was divided into two consignments, namely, one of 173 bags in hold No. 4, which was landed at Macao, and the other of 231 bags in hold No. 5, which was discharged somewhere before the vessel reached Dairen; and that the first officer made a false statement to the Japanese authorities at Dairen.

Where was this second consignment landed? The time spent on the voyage between Sabang and Macao renders it unlikely that it was landed between those ports. It is probable that, as in the case of the *Kohatsu Maru* (see Note C below) and previous cases, the 231 bags of opium were put into junks off the Chinese coast, ultimately reaching Shanghai, Soochow and Nanking.

B. For previous shipments by s.s. *Philadelphia*, formerly s.s. *Cochinchine*, see Note D of documents O.C.417(a) and (c). The opium on this occasion was shipped by Messrs. Haji Mohammed Baqir Behbehani & Sons.

C. The Japanese representative has communicated the following report:

The Japanese authorities, having been informed by their diplomatic representative at Teheran, and also by the British Ambassador at Tokyo, that the *Kohatsu Maru* left Bushire on October 16th, 1927, with Persian opium declared for Vladivostok, took an immediate step to investigate the case and found that the ship was registered at Dairen. The authorities of the Kwantung Leased Territory now report the result of their enquiries.

On November 25th, 1927, the *Kohatsu Maru* arrived at Dairen without cargo and her captain, Tomiichi Tsutsui, and the officers and crew were questioned by the authorities. According to their testimonies, the ship belonged to Shizuo Sugiura, domiciled at 34 Kagacho, Dairen. It was on January 12th, 1927, the owner of the ship and the charterer Liashêng met at Dairen and Li entered a contract with Sugiura to charter the ship at 5,500 yen a month for three years, and the ship was to be under the direction of Li. Up to the end of August last, the vessel made voyages between Dairen and Port Arthur and ports in Japan proper and Swatow in South China.

On August 30th, Li and four other Chinese came on board at Port Arthur and directed the ship to sail for Singapore. On September 11th, as the ship was approaching Singapore, he again directed her to proceed to Bushire, where the ship arrived on the 30th. On October 15th, at about 9 p.m., the ship was loaded with some 500 cases as personal luggage of the Chinese, and, after completing the Customs formalities, left Bushire on the next day bound for Tsingtau. But on November 15th, at about 7.50 a.m., as she was near Woosung, Shanghai, a Chinese ship came alongside the *Kohatsu Maru* and then unloaded some 450 or 460 cases of cargo which had been loaded at Bushire, and three Chinese on board left the *Kohatsu Maru* with the cargo. At about 11.30 a.m., of the same day, the ship turned to southward, bound for Amoy, and on the 18th, at 7.15 p.m., stopped near the port of Amoy. There came a motor-boat with fourteen or fifteen Chinese and they unloaded the remaining cases of cargo, with which the other two Chinese left the *Kohatsu Maru*.

The ship then proceeded northward, and on the 22nd touched Tsingtau, and arrived at Dairen on November 25th.

<sup>1</sup> The following shipment has been reported since the end of the year: *Nichiyei Maru*, 18. III. 28, 590 cases; declared destination, Vladivostok; Japanese flag.

The Marine Bureau of Dairen, after hearing this case, ruled that Tomiichi Tsutsui, the captain of the *Kohatsu Maru*, should be deprived of the licence of captainship for two months, as he has violated the provision of Clause 6 of Article 1 of the Seamen's Disciplinary Law of Japan.

D. For a previous shipment on the *Ho Ping*, see document O.C.417(c). On this occasion the vessel arrived at Bushire under the Japanese flag, but sailed from Bushire under the Chinese flag. The crew, it is understood, were Chinese. The *Ho Ping* appears in Lloyds Register as being registered in Chefoo under the Chinese flag.

---

ANNEX 7.

12/3263/324. I.

LETTER FROM THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS CONCERNING THE RATIFICATION  
OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION OF 1925.

Stockholm, March 31st, 1928.

In pursuance of a Council resolution of December 6th, 1927, M. Avenol, in his letter dated January 10th last, was good enough to transmit to me for consideration that part of the report submitted to the Council by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs on the work of its tenth session which refers to the possible accession of the Royal Government to the Geneva Convention of 1925, together with a copy of the relevant Minutes. The report shows that the Committee considered it would be premature, until the Swedish Government had had an opportunity of examining this information, to come to any final decision in the matter, which will be reconsidered by the Committee at its session starting on April 10th next.

The Royal Government has submitted these documents to the competent Swedish authorities for their careful consideration. Great as are the interest and importance of these documents — more especially of the details they contain as to the operation of the control system established in other countries, in conformity with the provisions of the Convention — they have not, however, entirely removed the apprehensions of the said authorities in regard to the consequences of Sweden's unconditional accession to the Convention. In these circumstances, the Royal Government does not feel able to undertake a final examination of the question of Sweden's possible accession until it is certain whether the reservation mentioned in my letter of January 14th, 1927, would be allowed.

As the Swedish point of view was set forth at length in my letter above mentioned and was, moreover, explained orally by the Swedish delegate to the Advisory Committee at its last session, the Royal Government does not consider it necessary to send a representative to the Committee's forthcoming session.

(Signed) Eliel LÖFGREN.

---

ANNEX 8.

CODE FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF THE DRUG TRAFFIC.

INTRODUCTION.

At the tenth session of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, the Italian delegate, M. Cavazzoni, submitted a memorandum formulating a number of rules in accordance with which he thought that the administrative control of the drug traffic should be organised; and, after examining this document, the Committee decided to appoint a Sub-Committee to study it. At the same time it instructed this Sub-Committee to make a general investigation of the question of the administrative control of drugs, and to select from M. Cavazzoni's memorandum, and from the regulations already enforced by certain countries which have a complete system of control, those provisions which it regarded as genuinely valuable, in order to establish a code which could be submitted to the Governments for their opinions. The Committee felt that such a document, collecting a number of provisions which had stood the test of practical application, might be of service to Governments in organising control in their respective countries when the Geneva Convention came into force.

The text following is the outcome of this work of selection carried out by the Sub-Committee and approved by the majority of the Committee :

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS. LICENCES. GUARANTEES.

*Concentration and Unification of Supervision.*

1. In countries the administrative organisation of which allows of such a procedure, the supervision of the trade in narcotics as a whole should be in the hands of a single authority, so that all supervisory measures over this trade may be unified. In countries where this supervision is in the hands of several authorities, steps should be taken to establish co-ordination among them.

*Licences.*

2. Firms and persons desiring to manufacture any narcotics covered by the Convention or to handle, transform or to make pharmaceutical preparations containing them or in any way to trade in these drugs must be authorised to do so by the competent authority (licence). Exceptions may, however, be made to this rule in the case of dealers in certain countries who sell coca leaves for consumption in the raw state.

As a general rule, by trading is meant manufacturing, preparing, possessing, offering, carrying, buying and selling (on commission or otherwise), importing, exporting or conveying in transit. The granting of the licence, which is an essential part of the supervisory organisation, should, like every other part of the organisation, be placed in the hands of a single authority.

The licence should only be granted after careful enquiry by means of which the authorities will have assured themselves that the applicant is of good repute, and is engaged mainly in manufacturing or trading in chemical products or medicaments, and also that the professional qualifications of the applicant are unimpeachable. Commission agents (brokers), that is to say persons who act as intermediaries between producers and buyers in whatever country the latter may live but who do not themselves hold any stocks of narcotics, must obtain a licence like all other traders. The licence may be granted for all products coming under the Convention, or for certain of these drugs only.

The licence shall be granted on submission of an application with a statement of reasons, accompanied by all documents and necessary data in support, such as :

(a) Surname and christian name of the applicant or, in the case of a firm, surnames and christian names of the persons responsible to the authorities for compliance with the provisions of the law;

(b) Trade address (locality, street, number);

(c) Extract from the entry in the Register of Commerce (in countries where such Register exists);

(d) Document proving the nature of the applicant's occupation (manufacture of or trade in chemical products or medicaments);

(e) Nature of the licence applied for (manufacture, transformation, preparation, trade or procuring);

(f) Description of the narcotics to be covered by the licence;

(g) Specification of the premises and plant used for the manufacture, safe-keeping and sale of narcotics.

Before granting the licence, the authorities must inspect the premises to make sure that they fulfil all the required conditions.

If the holder of the licence changes his trade address, he must apply for a new licence.

Chemists' shops open to the public, under the management of a qualified chemist, will not require a licence, nor will this formality be necessary in the case of doctors, dentists, and veterinary surgeons allowed under the laws of the country to dispense medicaments to their clients and for this purpose to possess private dispensaries.

Chemists' shops open to the public which also supply narcotics to other chemists' shops, in other words, which act as merchants, will be obliged, however, like all other merchants, to obtain a licence.

Hospitals not possessing a dispensary directed by a qualified pharmacist must also obtain a licence in order to procure the narcotics they require for the treatment of patients. The application for a licence must be signed by the medical director of the hospital, and the licence will be granted on this doctor's personal responsibility.

Scientific institutions wishing to obtain the narcotics necessary for their research work must also obtain a licence, their directors being held responsible.

The licence shall be valid for one calendar year, and shall be renewable from year to year at the request of the licensee so long as the conditions under which it was issued remain unchanged.

The licence may be withdrawn if, in the opinion of the authorities, the licensee no longer fulfils the conditions under which the licence was granted, if he can reasonably be believed to be engaging in illicit trade, or if he has been sentenced for infringing the law. The duration of this withdrawal shall be determined by the authorities.

The licence shall lapse on the death of the licensee or in the case of the transfer or liquidation of the business. Any licensee transferring or liquidating his business must immediately inform the authorities of the fact. When a licence is withdrawn or cancelled, an exact inventory of the stocks of narcotics shall be handed to the authorities. The latter shall then sequester the stocks and dispose of them as they think fit.

#### *Caution Money.*

3. The authorities may require persons to whom they have issued a licence to deposit sufficient caution money or provide a banker's or any other solid guarantee considered to be equivalent thereto.

## II. MANUFACTURE.

#### *Manufacturer's Register.*

4. The manufacturer must keep a register on a model approved or prepared by the authority, in which he must enter the quantities of raw materials introduced into the factory, with the date of entry and the exact name of the material; the quantities of raw materials used for the manufacture of drugs coming under the Convention; the quantities of manufactured products delivered, with the date of despatch and the exact name of the product; the quantities destroyed and the losses occurring in course of manufacture; and the quantities used for the manufacture of products not coming under the Convention. All these entries will be made from day to day as the operations in question take place.

This register will be open for inspection by the authority, who, when carrying out the inspection, must verify the particulars entered in it, and must in particular ascertain the actual use made of raw materials and manufactured products employed for the preparation of drugs not coming under the Convention. The manufacturer will be bound to supply the authority with any further particulars required as a check on the details shown in his register.

#### *Storage of Manufactured Products.*

5. Manufactured narcotics must be stored apart from any other goods in premises which can be locked up and which are approved by the authority as fulfilling the required conditions.

#### *Numbering of Receptacles.*

6. Manufactured narcotics will be placed in the receptacle intended for them as soon as possible after manufacture. These receptacles will be provided with marks and serial numbers so as to be identifiable at any time.

#### *Losses in course of Manufacture and Other Losses.*

7. Losses occurring in course of manufacture (normal losses) will be entered in the manufacturer's register. Losses incurred through misappropriation, theft or any similar occurrence (accidental losses) must be notified to the authority without delay.

#### *Periodical Statements.*

8. Manufacturers must supply the authority with periodical statements of raw materials received, manufactured products despatched and stocks held. These statements will be made on forms approved or prepared by the authority.

#### *Inspections.*

9. The authority will make periodical inspections to ensure that the registers are properly kept and to check stocks.

## III. IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

#### *Authorisation and Permit.*

10. Any firm or person authorised to trade in narcotics who desires to import or export consignments must apply to the competent authority, who, if the request is deemed to be in order, will issue the necessary permit for imports or exports, and, in case of imports, an import certificate intended to be submitted to the authority of the exporting country. A duplicate of the permit may take the place of the import certificate.

### *Registration of Permits.*

11. The permits issued must be entered by the authority in registers kept for the purpose, and must be numbered consecutively. They will only be valid for a limited period (say, two months for exportation and three months for importation). They shall not be transferable.

### *Particulars to be entered in Permits.*

12. The permit shall indicate the name and profession or status of the importer and exporter, the quantities of drugs to be imported or exported, their exact name, the period within which they must be imported or exported, the number, marks and numbering of packages (for export), the Customs office through which the goods are to enter or leave the country, the route to be followed, and any other particulars which the authority may deem necessary. A duplicate of the permit shall be furnished to the Custom-house through which the goods are to be imported or exported.

### *Exportation to Countries which have and to those which have not adopted the Certificate System.*

13. If a consignment is to be sent to a country which only allows narcotics to be imported subject to possession of an authorisation issued by the importing country, the exporter must produce evidence that the authorisation has been granted.

In the case of countries which have not adopted the certificate system, it is recommended that the authorities of the exporting country should ascertain as far as possible, before granting the export permit, that the consignee is a reputable person and that the goods are not intended for illicit purposes.

### *Import Permit.*

For purposes of importation, the import certificate or, in its place, a copy of the permit will be sent by the importer to his supplier abroad, who will show it to the authorities of his own country in order to obtain the permission to export the goods. Once the export authorisation has been given, the authority of the exporting country shall hand over to the person concerned an export permit which shall accompany the goods, and shall send a copy of the permit to the authority of the importing country in conformity with the provision of Article 13 of the Geneva Convention. When the goods enter the country, the Customs will certify on the import permit that the goods have been duly imported, and will return the permit to the importer for discharge. The importer will record on the permit that he has received the goods, and will send the permit to the supervisory authority. The Customs will return to that authority the duplicate import permit sent by it to them, and will state that the goods have been cleared.

### *Verification on Importation.*

14. On the arrival of the consignment, the Customs must inspect it to see that it corresponds to the particulars given in the import permit and that the address shown is actually the address of the consignee.

### *Export Permit.*

15. Every consignment of narcotics to a foreign country must be accompanied by an export permit. The Customs will record the export of the consignment on the permit, which must accompany the consignment to its destination. The duplicate export permit sent to the Customs office will be returned by the latter, with certification of export, to the supervisory authority, who will thus be satisfied that the goods have left the country.

### *Postal Consignments.*

16. If consignments are sent by post, the postal authorities must place the papers accompanying the consignment, including the export permit or import certificate, at the disposal of the Customs office of export.

### *Prohibition of Re-exportation.*

17. If the authority does not wish to allow imported goods to be re-exported, a special note to that effect must be made on the import permit.

### *Unused Permits.*

18. Unused import or export permits must be returned to the supervisory authority both by the party concerned and by the Customs offices to which duplicate permits have been sent.

Statistics of imports and exports must be based on the quantities actually imported or exported, omitting those the permits for which are either not used or are cancelled.

### *Transit.*

19. The conveyance of narcotics in transit will only be authorised if the consignment is accompanied by an export permit issued by the exporting country. If the exporting country has not adopted the certificate system, an import permit issued by the importing country must be produced.

ANNEX 2.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT CONCERNING THE REPORT OF  
THE COMMITTEE ON ARBITRATION AND SECURITY ON THE WORK OF ITS  
SECOND SESSION.

(See document C.165.M.50.1928.IX, pages 185-225.)

*Letter from the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations*

Helsingfors, June 6th, 1928.

[*Translation.*]

In accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Arbitration and Security, the results of the Committee's second session were communicated to all the Members of the League of Nations with a view to their discussion at the next Assembly.

Similarly, the suggestions submitted by the German delegation during the second session of the Committee were communicated to Governments to enable the latter, in due course, to forward to the Secretary-General of the League any observations they might have to make.

The Finnish Government, having examined the results so far obtained and recognising the great importance of the work of the Committee on Arbitration and Security and of the suggestions submitted by the German delegation, has the honour to forward to you herewith a few observations thereon.

For the Minister:

(Signed) A. S. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN,  
Secretary-General.

OBSERVATIONS BY THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT.

CONVENTION A.

*Article 25.*

[*Translation.*]

In view of the fact that the reservations mentioned in Article 36 are such as to limit recourse both to arbitration and judicial settlement — since the latter also may be preceded by a recourse to conciliation — it is desirable to add, in paragraph 2 of Article 25, after the words "recourse to arbitration" the words "or judicial settlement".

Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the decisions of the Conciliation Commission have to be taken by a majority. If, in spite of the elasticity of this provision, the Commission's efforts are of no avail, there is not much hope that recourse to the Council will be successful unless the parties can be allowed to agree upon certain modifications for the purpose of relaxing the rigidity of this procedure.

There appear to be two alternatives which might be offered to the parties by means of special agreements. In the *first* place, they might agree that, if the report of the Council is accepted by a majority, simple or qualified (the votes of the parties to the dispute not being counted), the Members of the League will none the less be under an obligation not to resort to war against a party which complies with the conclusions of the report. In the *second* place, the parties might agree to empower the Council to decide upon the dispute — even if only by a unanimous decision — within the limits of a special agreement drafted by the parties.

*Article 32.*

It is important to remember that in Chapter IV we are concerned with *disputes other than those with regard to which the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights* (cf. Articles 4, 9 and 25); accordingly, the phrase "if the dispute cannot be settled by the application of the rules of law alone" is not quite appropriate, since the main characteristic of the disputes in question is their non-judicial element. Moreover, the alternatives of "the application of the rules of law alone" and "the functions of a friendly mediator" are placed too strongly in contrast, since there are, so to speak, intermediate or transitional stages (solutions *ex æquo et bono*, conclusions by analogy). For these reasons, a formula such as the following might be preferable:

"In so far as the dispute cannot suitably be dealt with by the application of a rule of law or some other of the guiding principles laid down in the said clause (Article 38 of the Statute), the tribunal shall exercise the functions of a friendly mediator."

*Article 36.*

The reservations contained in this article are open to serious objections. The Finnish Government ventures to indicate these briefly.

(a) Questions relating to the facts which actually caused a dispute may sometimes give rise to interminable differences of opinion.

Narcotics may only be imported, exported or sent in transit through the Customs offices appointed for that purpose.

*Prohibition of placing in Bond or in free Ports.*

20. In general, narcotics may not be placed in a private warehouse. Narcotics stored in a free port or in a Government warehouse shall be subject to the supervision exercised in the country itself, and may not be exported without an export permit.

*Prohibition of Export by Letter and of the Despatch of Consignments addressed to a Post Office Box or a Bank.*

21. In accordance with the Postal Convention, the import or export of narcotics by ordinary or registered letter post is prohibited.

The posting of consignments of narcotics to a post office box or to a bank to the account of a third party should also be prohibited.

*Seizure of Consignments unaccompanied by Permits.*

22. Consignments of narcotics unaccompanied by an import or export permit will be seized by the Customs office and placed at the disposal of the supervisory authority.

#### IV. INTERNAL TRADE.

*Trade Registers.*

23. Persons and firms authorised to trade in narcotics must enter all their transactions in special registers, showing the date when the goods purchased were received, together with the exact name and the net weight of the substances, etc., the quantities sold, with the name of the purchaser and the date of sale; in the case of a proprietary remedy, the register should show, for the sale as well as for the purchase, the manner in which the remedy is put up (box, tube, ampoule, etc.).

*Storage of Narcotics.*

24. Narcotics must be stored apart from any other goods in premises which can be locked up and which are approved by the authority as fulfilling the required conditions.

*Supply of Narcotics.*

25. Drugs may only be supplied to persons, firms, hospitals and institutions holding a licence. This provision is without prejudice, however, to the regulations regarding public pharmacies and those regarding doctors, dentists and veterinary surgeons.

Any person possessing a licence and desiring to obtain narcotics from another person possessing a licence to supply them must first apply to the authority, on a special form.

An alternative procedure might be to require the supplier only to notify the authority without delay, by means of a "delivery" voucher, of the quantities he supplies. These vouchers (of authorisation or delivery) will be kept by the authority, and a comparison of them with the books of the parties concerned will enable the regularity of transactions to be checked.

Another method would be as follows: Any person wishing to obtain narcotics must show his licence to the supplier, who will enter on it the quantities supplied. Licences must be periodically sent in for inspection to the authority.

*Pharmacies.*

26. Public pharmacies may only supply narcotics on production of a prescription issued by a doctor, dentist or veterinary surgeon having State-recognised qualifications. The prescription, which as a rule may only be made up once, must be kept by the pharmacist for not less than three years. It may prove expedient to allow exceptions to this rule in special cases, whereby prescriptions may be made up not more than three times in all, and only when explicitly indicated in writing by the doctor who signs the prescription.

Public pharmacies and doctors, dentists and veterinary surgeons authorised to keep private pharmacies must keep a register of prescriptions, in which prescriptions containing narcotics will be entered, stating the name of the patient and the date when the prescription was made up. Pharmacists will also enter the name of the doctor, dentist or veterinary surgeon who has given the prescription.

"Doctors' samples" may only be sent by means of an order form signed by the doctor, dentist or veterinary surgeon in question.

Public pharmacies may be authorised to supply as urgent remedies for immediate use the following opium preparations: tincture of opium, laudanum and Dover's powders. The quantities supplied in these circumstances must not contain more than 0.25 gramme of opium, and must be entered, together with the patient's name, in the register of prescriptions.

Hospitals possessing pharmacies may only dispense narcotics for their hospital patients. The narcotics so dispensed must be entered day by day in a register kept for the purpose.

---