

C O N T E N T S .

Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs.

1. Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium. Minutes of the Second Session held at Geneva from April 19th to 29th 1922. (French Text only) (C.416. M.254.1922.XI) 1-35pp.
2. dto English Text Only. 36-69pp.
3. dto Report on the work of the Committee during its Second Séssion held at Geneva from April 19th to 29th, 1922. (approved by the Council on July 21st, 1922. (A.15.1922. C.223(1).1922.XI.) (French Text only) 70-87pp.
4. Report of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium to the Council of the League of Nations, April 1922. (O.C.47/1.) 88-104pp.
5. dto. Minutes of the Seventh Session held at Geneva From August 24th to 31st, 1925. (C.602.M.192.1925.XI.) 105-161pp.
6. dto. Minutes of the Eighth Session held at Geneva from May 26th to June 8th, 1926. (C.393.M.136.1926.XI) 162-281pp.
7. dto Minutes of the Tenth (Extraordinary) Session held at Geneva from September 28th to October 8th, 1927. (C.557.M.199.1927.XI.10). 282-347pp.

(Communiqué au Conseil
et aux Membres de la Société).

✓ C. 416. M. 254. 1922. XI.

Genève,
le 21 juin 1922.

Société des Nations

COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM

PROCÈS-VERBAL

DE LA

DEUXIÈME SESSION

TENUE A GENÈVE DU 19 AU 29 AVRIL 1922.

League of Nations

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES

OF THE

SECOND SESSION

HELD AT GENEVA FROM APRIL 19th TO 29th, 1922.

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

| | Pages |
|--|-------|
| LISTE DES MEMBRES | 4 |
| ORDRE DU JOUR | 4 |
| PREMIÈRE SÉANCE (19 avril — 10 h. 30) | 5 |
| 1. Election du président et du vice-président | 5 |
| 2. Procédure et composition de la Commission | 5 |
| 3. Signature et ratification de la Convention de l'opium — Signature du Protocole de 1914: Situation actuelle | 5 |
| 4. Correspondance échangée avec le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas | 6 |
| DEUXIÈME SÉANCE (20 avril — 10 h.) | 7 |
| 5. Ordre du jour | 7 |
| 6. Exposé de Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 8 |
| 7. Certificats d'importation | 8 |
| 8. Projet de certificats officiels d'importation | 9 |
| TROISIÈME SÉANCE (20 avril — 15 h.) | 10 |
| 9. Approbation du procès-verbal | 10 |
| 10. Le sens du mot « légitime » dans la résolution prise par la Commission le 4 mai 1921 sur les certificats d'importation | 10 |
| 11. Signature de la Convention de l'opium | 10 |
| 12. Réexpédition des drogues importées (<i>suite</i>) | 10 |
| 13. Enquête du Comité d'hygiène sur la quantité moyenne de drogues nécessaires mentionnées au chapitre III de la Convention de l'opium | 10 |
| QUATRIÈME SÉANCE (21 avril — 10 h.) | 12 |
| 14. Approbation du procès-verbal | 12 |
| 15. Procès-verbal de la première séance | 12 |
| 16. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient | 12 |
| CINQUIÈME SÉANCE (21 avril — 15 h.) | 15 |
| 17. Adhésion de la Colombie à la Convention internationale de l'opium | 15 |
| 18. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (<i>suite</i>) | 15 |
| SIXIÈME SÉANCE (22 avril — 10 h.) | 18 |
| 19. Approbation du procès-verbal | 18 |
| 20. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (<i>suite</i>) | 18 |
| SEPTIÈME SÉANCE (22 avril — 15 h.) | 21 |
| 21. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (<i>suite</i>) | 21 |
| HUITIÈME SÉANCE (24 avril — 10 h.) | 25 |
| 22. Approbation des procès-verbaux | 25 |
| 23. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (<i>suite</i>) | 25 |
| 24. La contrebande en Extrême-Orient | 27 |
| NEUVIÈME SÉANCE (24 avril — 15 h.) | |
| 25. La contrebande en Extrême-Orient (<i>suite</i>) | 29 |
| 26. La question d'Extrême-Orient | 31 |

| | Pages |
|---|-------|
| DIXIÈME SÉANCE (25 avril — 10 h.). | |
| 27. Approbation des procès-verbaux | 33 |
| 28. Enquête sur les besoins approximatifs d'opium brut visé au chapitre I de la Convention de l'opium | 33 |
| 29. Extension des recherches permettant d'y comprendre toutes les drogues nuisibles ayant des effets analogues à ceux produits par les drogues visées à la Convention | 36 |
| ONZIÈME SÉANCE (25 avril — 15 h.). | |
| 30. Enquête sur les besoins approximatifs d'opium brut (<i>suite</i>) | 38 |
| 31. Fabrication, vente et usage de la morphine et de la cocaïne | 39 |
| 32. Télégramme du Conseil international des missionnaires | 40 |
| 33. Lettre de l'Association internationale pour la lutte contre l'opium à Pékin | 40 |
| DOUZIÈME SÉANCE (26 avril — 10 h.). | |
| 34. Départ du représentant de la Chine | 41 |
| 35. Approbation du procès-verbal | 41 |
| 36. Forme à donner au rapport annuel des gouvernements | 41 |
| 37. Proposition du Gouvernement canadien relative à un inventaire des stocks de narcotiques | 44 |
| 38. Date de l'envoi des rapports | 45 |
| TREIZIÈME SÉANCE (26 avril — 15 h.). | |
| 39. Séance publique | 46 |
| 40. Budget pour 1923 | 47 |
| 41. Lettre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge | 48 |
| 42. Lettre du Directeur du Bureau international de l'Union postale universelle | 49 |
| 43. Lettre du représentant de la Chine au Secrétaire de la Commission | 49 |
| 44. Publication du résumé des réponses au questionnaire | 49 |
| 45. Résolution de Sir John Jordan | 50 |
| 46. Déclaration de Mrs Hamilton Wright | 51 |
| QUATORZIÈME SÉANCE (29 avril — 10 h.). | |
| 47. Approbation du procès-verbal | 52 |
| 48. Rapport de la Commission au Conseil | 52 |
| 49. Publication des Documents | 56 |
| 50. Date de la prochaine Session | 56 |
| 51. Télégramme du Gouvernement chinois | 56 |
| 52. Adresse de remerciements au Secrétariat | 56 |
| 53. Adresse de remerciements au Président | 56 |
| ANNEXES: | |
| 1. Exposé de Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 58 |
| 2. Rapports relatifs à la culture du pavot dans la province de Tookien | 59 |
| 2a. Rapports relatifs à la culture du pavot dans d'autres provinces de la Chine | 61 |
| 3. Indications générales pour l'établissement du rapport annuel des gouvernements | 64 |
| 4. Lettre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge | 67 |
| 5. Lettre du représentant de la Chine au Secrétaire de la Commission consultative | 68 |

COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM

DEUXIÈME SESSION

tenue à Genève du 19 au 29 avril 1922.

LISTE DES MEMBRES

Représentants des gouvernements.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Président) | Empire britannique. |
| M. BOURGOIS (remplaçant M. KAHN), (Vice-Président). | France. |
| D ^r ANSELMINO | Allemagne. |
| M. CHAO-HSIN CHU | Chine. |
| M. J. CAMPBELL | Inde. |
| Son Excellence A. ARIYOSHI | Japon. |
| M. A. de Kat ANGELINO (remplaçant M. van WETTUM) | Pays-Bas. |
| Son Excellence M. FERREIRA | Portugal. |
| Son Excellence le prince CHAROON | Siam. |

Assesseurs.

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

Secrétaire.

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

ORDRE DU JOUR.

1. Election du Président et du Vice-Président.

A. RAPPORTS SUR LES QUESTIONS DÉJÀ EXAMINÉES LORS DE LA PREMIÈRE SESSION DE LA COMMISSION.

- Signature et ratification de la Convention de l'opium.
Signature du Protocole de 1914. — Situation actuelle.
- Correspondance échangée avec le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas.
 - Mode d'échange de renseignements.
 - Renseignements échangés aux termes de l'article 21 de la Convention.
- Réponses au questionnaire.
- Rapport annuel et renseignements complémentaires, y compris la proposition du Canada au sujet d'un relevé annuel des stupéfiants en stock.
- Enquête de la Commission d'hygiène sur la quantité moyenne de drogues nécessaires, mentionnées au chapitre III de la Convention de l'opium.
- Certificats d'importation.
- Représentations adressées par les agents consulaires en Chine.
- Article 15 de la Convention de l'opium.

B. NOUVELLES QUESTIONS.

- Enquête sur les quantités moyennes d'opium brut requises, spécifiées au chapitre I de la Convention de l'opium.
- Extension des recherches permettant d'y comprendre toutes les drogues nuisibles ayant des effets analogues à ceux produits par les drogues visées à la Convention.
- Budget provisoire de la Section de l'opium pour 1923 et rapports relatifs aux budgets de 1921 et 1922.
- Rapport à présenter au Conseil par la Commission consultative.
- Questions diverses.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM

PROCÈS-VERBAL DE LA DEUXIÈME SESSION

tenue à Genève du 19 au 29 avril 1922.

PREMIÈRE SÉANCE

tenue le 19 avril 1922, à 10 heures 30.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

1. Election du Président et du Vice-Président.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Grande-Bretagne), vice-président de la Commission pendant la première session, prend place au fauteuil présidentiel en l'absence de M. Van Wettum, président. Il déclare que le premier devoir de la Commission est de nommer un nouveau président et un vice-président, conformément au règlement.

Sur la proposition du délégué des Pays-Bas, sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE est nommé président.

Sur la proposition du PRÉSIDENT, M. BOURGOIS (France), est nommé vice-président.

2. Procédure et composition de la Commission.

Sur la proposition du PRÉSIDENT, la Commission décide de tenir deux séances par jour.

Le PRÉSIDENT rappelle que la deuxième Assemblée a recommandé que tous les Etats intéressés dans une large mesure au trafic soient représentés à la Commission. Il est regrettable que le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique n'ait pas, jusqu'à présent, jugé opportun de se faire représenter à la Commission. Le président souhaite la bienvenue au représentant de l'Allemagne, présent pour la première fois.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) remercie le président de ses souhaits de bienvenue. La question dont il s'agit est d'ordre humanitaire et non pas politique, et son gouvernement est heureux de s'associer aux efforts des Etats travaillant en commun.

3. Signature et ratification de la Convention de l'opium. — Signature du Protocole de 1914. — Situation actuelle.

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que le ministre de Finlande à la Haye a été autorisé à signer la Convention. Le Chili a aussi annoncé son intention de la ratifier.

M. BRENIER félicite le Secrétariat du travail de préparation accompli en vue de cette session et signale une petite erreur qui s'est glissée dans certains documents: il faut distinguer le Kouang-toung, province chinoise, du Kouantoung, possession japonaise.

Le PRÉSIDENT attire l'attention de la Commission sur les pays qui n'ont pas ratifié la Convention.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) fait observer que deux pays, qui sont d'importants producteurs d'opium, la Perse et la Turquie, n'ont pas encore ratifié la Convention et que, quoique la Perse ait signé la Convention, elle a fait une importante réserve au sujet de l'article essentiel 3 a.

En réponse à une question de sir John JORDAN, il explique que l'opium exporté de Perse est transbordé principalement dans les ports de Bombay, Singapour, et Hong-Kong, sans qu'un contrôle puisse être exercé par le Gouvernement de l'Inde.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que le cas de la Perse est différent de celui de la Turquie. La Perse est Membre de la Société des Nations et son représentant à l'Assemblée, en septembre dernier, a pris part aux travaux de la Commission qui s'occupait de l'opium et a adhéré à ses recommandations.

Etant donné la situation politique actuelle de la Turquie, il est probablement impossible de prendre des mesures pour le moment, mais il est à présumer que, dans tout traité qui pourra être conclu entre les Alliés et la Turquie, les mêmes dispositions relatives à l'opium seront insérées que celles qui figurent dans le Traité de Sèvres. La Commission décide de demander au Conseil qu'une pression soit exercée sur le Gouvernement persan pour que celui-ci adhère à l'ensemble de la Convention. L'attention du Conseil sera attirée sur le cas de la Turquie.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) estime important que tous les territoires producteurs d'opium de l'ancien Empire ottoman soient pris en considération.

La Commission est d'avis que, pour autant que les dits territoires ne seront pas rattachés à des pays qui ont adhéré à la Convention, il faudra les prendre en considération.

La Commission examine ensuite le cas de la Suisse.

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que le Gouvernement suisse a expliqué que c'est pour des raisons constitutionnelles que la Suisse n'a pas encore ratifié la Convention. Le commerce intérieur est de la compétence des Cantons et le Gouvernement continue à étudier la question. On fait remarquer que le contrôle de l'importation et de l'exportation des drogues relève probablement de la Confédération, et la Commission décide de prier le Conseil de recommander à la Suisse, en attendant la solution de la difficulté constitutionnelle, d'adopter le système des certificats d'importation préconisé par la Commission au cours de sa dernière session.

La Commission décide d'inviter le Conseil à insister sur la ratification de la Convention de la part des Etats membres qui n'y ont pas encore adhéré. Le Conseil pourrait agir directement dans le cas des Etats membres de la Société des Nations et indirectement par l'intermédiaire du Gouvernement hollandais, dans le cas des autres Etats.

4. Correspondance échangée avec le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas.

a) Mode d'échange de renseignements (C. 171. M. 88. 1922. XI, Annexe 10).

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que tous les Etats ont accepté d'envoyer les renseignements prévus par la Convention au Secrétariat de la Société des Nations, sauf les Etats-Unis d'Amérique, qui continuent à les adresser au Gouvernement des Pays-Bas.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT déclare qu'elle tient à la disposition de la Commission la réponse de son Gouvernement au questionnaire et les textes législatifs se rapportant à la question de l'opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT, appuyé par M. BRENIER, demande si ces documents ont un caractère officiel et fait observer qu'indépendamment du questionnaire, l'article 21 de la Convention oblige les Etats signataires à communiquer régulièrement les renseignements dont ils disposent au Gouvernement des Pays-Bas.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT déclare que c'est à la suite d'un malentendu que son Gouvernement n'a pas fait parvenir les renseignements en question au Gouvernement des Pays-Bas et que les documents qu'elle soumet à la Commission proviennent de source officielle.

La Commission décide de recommander au Conseil de demander au Gouvernement des Pays-Bas d'attirer l'attention du Gouvernement des Etats-Unis sur le fait que les renseignements prévus à l'article 21 de la Convention n'ont pas encore été fournis par celui-ci.

b) Renseignements échangés aux termes de l'article 21 de la Convention (C. 171. M. 88. 1922. XI, Annexe 6).

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que cette liste de documents ne comprend pas tous les renseignements fournis à la Société. La plupart des Etats ont fait parvenir les documents avec leur réponse au questionnaire. Il demande s'il est nécessaire que le Secrétariat communique tous les documents reçus à tous les Etats signataires, ce qui serait un travail considérable, et si on ne pourrait pas trouver une procédure plus économique.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) cite des textes de lois allemandes qui ne figurent pas dans la liste. Il veillera à ce qu'à l'avenir tous les documents soient envoyés directement au Secrétariat.

Sur la proposition de M. BRENIER, la Commission décide l'envoi périodique de la liste des documents échangés. Chaque gouvernement pourra demander au Secrétariat communication des documents qui l'intéressent particulièrement.

Communiqués à la presse.

La Commission décide de rédiger chaque jour un communiqué dont le texte sera approuvé par le président.

DEUXIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 20 avril 1922, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

5. Ordre du jour.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que certaines questions à l'ordre du jour sont connexes, mais pour faciliter la discussion, il propose de les diviser en catégories. La Commission pourrait examiner d'abord le problème de l'opium en Extrême-Orient, puis la question générale du contrôle du trafic de la morphine, de la cocaïne et de leurs dérivés dans le monde entier, et particulièrement dans les pays d'Europe et aux Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

Il est par exemple impossible de discuter le N° 4 de l'ordre du jour (Réponses au questionnaire) sans discuter en même temps les articles N° 8 et 9 (Représentations adressées par les agents consulaires en Chine; article 15 de la Convention de l'opium). Il propose que la Commission commence par l'examen du N° 7 (Certificats d'importation), qu'elle étudie ensuite la question des besoins du monde en morphine, etc., et les questions soulevées par la France relativement au contrôle des autres drogues.

M. BRENIER partage l'avis du président mais pense que la Commission ne saurait discuter la question de l'opium brut et préparé en Orient sans examiner en même temps celle de ses dérivés.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) pense que la Commission doit s'occuper d'abord des grands pays producteurs d'opium: Chine, Inde, Turquie et Perse. Elle pourrait examiner la quantité d'opium produit, consommé et exporté par chacun de ces pays. La question de l'exportation de l'opium est différente suivant les pays où il est exporté. Certains pays le manufacturent et exportent ses dérivés; d'autres se bornent à en importer suffisamment pour leur consommation intérieure. Dans le premier cas, la Commission doit s'occuper de la manufacture et du contrôle des dérivés.

Sir John JORDAN se range à l'avis du président, mais pense qu'il y a lieu de discuter le problème de l'opium en Extrême-Orient avant la question des certificats d'importation.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare que les rapports de la Commission d'enquête envoyés par le Gouvernement chinois dans les diverses provinces productrices d'opium ne sont pas encore traduits et ne peuvent être communiqués à la Commission avant la fin de la semaine.

Sir John JORDAN est surpris de ce retard. Il pensait que ces rapports avaient été reçus il y a deux mois.

Le PRÉSIDENT explique que les rapports de la Commission d'enquête du Gouvernement chinois étaient adressés à ce Gouvernement et non pas à la Société des Nations. Le délégué chinois à la deuxième Assemblée avait promis de communiquer ces rapports à la Société des Nations. Il croit comprendre que le représentant de la Chine à la Commission est prêt à le faire.

Sir John JORDAN déclare qu'au cours de la première session de la Commission, il a fait une proposition que la Commission a adoptée, mais que le Conseil de la Société des Nations a plus tard rejetée. Il croit que le Conseil a pris cette décision parce qu'il avait reçu l'assurance que le Gouvernement chinois procédait à une enquête dont les résultats seraient soumis à la Commission du trafic de l'opium. Il regrette vivement l'ajournement de cette question car il lui est impossible de rester à Genève au delà du commencement de la semaine prochaine.

M. BRENIER déclare qu'il lui est aussi impossible de rester longtemps à Genève.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant de la Chine s'il lui serait possible de donner immédiatement à la Commission un résumé de ces rapports. La Commission pourrait ensuite en attendre le texte complet.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare qu'il pensait que ces rapports seraient discutés au moment où la Commission examinerait le N° 8 de son ordre du jour (Représentations adressées par les agents consulaires en Chine). Il lui a été impossible d'apporter avec lui tous ces rapports de Londres

et il a dû en expédier quelques-uns par la poste. Ils ne sont pas encore arrivés étant probablement arrêtés à la douane. Mais tous les rapports seront prêts à la fin de la semaine.

M. BRENIER demande si le représentant de la Chine ne peut pas donner un aperçu général de la question dans les provinces les plus importantes de son pays, au point de vue de la Commission.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) répond qu'il n'a pas eu le temps de préparer un résumé. La question de l'opium est une question internationale et en tant que telle, elle intéresse d'autres pays que la Chine. La Commission peut commencer ses travaux en étudiant d'autres aspects de la question.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose de renvoyer la question de l'opium en Orient au lendemain matin afin de donner au représentant de la Chine le temps de préparer un résumé.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) fait remarquer que la discussion de son résumé n'épuiserait pas la question et que la Commission devrait attendre les rapports complets:

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) espère que la Commission pourra entendre le lendemain le résumé du représentant de la Chine car elle sera ainsi en mesure de s'occuper de la question en présence de Sir John Jordan et de M. Brenier et pourra ensuite examiner à loisir les rapports détaillés quand ils seront prêts.

Après un échange de vues entre le PRÉSIDENT, Sir John JORDAN et le représentant de la Chine, la Commission décide d'ajourner au 21 avril au matin la discussion de la question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient.

6. Exposé de Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT fait un exposé de la question générale du trafic de l'opium (Annexe 1).

7. Certificats d'importation.

Le PRÉSIDENT rappelle que le système des certificats préconisé par la Commission a été adopté par le Conseil et par l'Assemblée. Malheureusement un petit nombre seulement de gouvernements ont accepté la recommandation de la Commission et un système incomplet est très peu satisfaisant. Il pense que certains gouvernements ont mal compris le projet et il demande au représentant des Pays-Bas si la note explicative du Secrétaire général a dissipé ce malentendu en ce qui concerne le Gouvernement néerlandais.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) déclare que la note explicative ne résout pas la difficulté. En effet, son Gouvernement ne peut pas garantir qu'il ne sera jamais fait un usage abusif ou illégitime des drogues importées.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer qu'on ne demande pas au Gouvernement du pays importateur de s'engager au delà de certaines limites raisonnables. On discutera plus tard la rédaction du certificat.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) pense que cette explication satisfera son Gouvernement.

Sir John JORDAN déclare que le certificat pourra rendre des services dans les pays où l'ordre règne et où l'administration fonctionne régulièrement, mais non pas dans les pays troublés où le commerce illicite des drogues se fait sur une grande échelle.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) déclare que l'acceptation de l'Allemagne parviendra inévitablement, mais que dans des ports francs comme Hambourg et, aussi croit-il, Copenhague, la réexpédition des drogues peut se faire à l'insu des autorités, en dehors de la ligne douanière. Le Gouvernement allemand est prêt à étendre sa surveillance sur ses ports. Mais pour que le contrôle soit efficace, il faut qu'il soit exercé par tous les Etats.

M. BOURGOIS (France) déclare que son Gouvernement, qui emploie déjà le système de l'acquit à caution, ne voit pas d'objections, en principe, au système proposé. S'il a tardé à faire parvenir sa réponse, c'est qu'il a mis la question à l'étude et désire présenter une solution concrète. Pour accorder en toute connaissance de cause les certificats, il est nécessaire d'effectuer préalablement une enquête approfondie sur les besoins réels du pays et de déterminer à qui ils seront accordés: à tous les vendeurs ou à certains seulement. La direction des douanes a proposé la prohibition générale des importations de stupéfiants, des dérogations étant accordées par un Comité compétent dans les cas justifiés. On pourrait ainsi lutter contre la contrebande par colis postaux. De son côté, le Gouvernement de l'Indo-Chine prépare un projet.

Le Gouvernement français a les mêmes scrupules que le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas. Il doit être bien entendu que dans le certificat officiel d'importation, les mots: « l'envoi destiné à l'importation est nécessaire » impliquent que le gouvernement s'engage sur la nécessité des importations, mais non pas sur l'emploi des produits importés.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant du Portugal s'il a une communication à faire sur la question des certificats.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) déclare n'avoir rien à ajouter à la réponse faite par son Gouvernement au questionnaire. Pour répondre au désir exprimé par le président, au nom de la Commission, il se déclare prêt à attirer l'attention de son Gouvernement sur l'importance qu'il y aurait à accepter le système des certificats.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) informe la Commission qu'un télégramme vient d'arriver du Gouvernement de l'Inde qui accepte le principe des certificats avec des réserves éventuelles qu'expliquera un télégramme ultérieur. Il ne pense pas que ces réserves, s'il y en a, soient très importantes.

8. *Projet de certificats officiels d'importation.*

Le PRÉSIDENT demande si ce projet soulève des objections. (Document O.C. 21.)

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) estime qu'il convient de mentionner dans le certificat, outre les besoins légitimes et les besoins médicaux ou scientifiques, les besoins de la fabrication.

Le PRÉSIDENT lui fait observer que la Commission a décidé que les besoins de la fabrication étaient compris dans le texte proposé.

La Commission décide de demander au Conseil d'inviter les Puissances signataires à adopter le projet de certificat, étant entendu que les mots « est nécessaire » portent sur la nécessité de l'importation et non sur l'emploi des produits.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose de fixer une date à laquelle le système entrerait en vigueur dans tous les pays. Il fait observer que la Grande-Bretagne l'applique déjà, d'où il résulte un désavantage pour elle par rapport aux autres pays.

A la suite d'un échange de vues sur la nécessité d'informer à temps les intéressés des mesures proposées, la Commission adopte la proposition de M. CAMPBELL (Inde) tendant à ce que le système entre en vigueur le 1^{er} septembre 1922 en Europe et en Amérique, et le 1^{er} janvier 1923 dans les autres pays.

M. BOURGOIS (France) déclare qu'il transmettra cette décision à son Gouvernement, mais qu'il trouve le délai trop court pour qu'on puisse procéder à une enquête approfondie et prendre les mesures nécessaires.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) se rallie à l'avis exprimé par M. Bourgois.

M. CHAO HSIN CHU (Chine) demande quand sera abordée la question de la réexportation, et si elle ne doit pas être liée à celle des certificats d'importation.

Au cours d'un échange de vues à ce sujet, M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare qu'il comprend que, d'après le système proposé, un pays ne permettra pas l'exportation sans un certificat du pays de destination finale, si celle-ci est connue.

La Commission adopte ce point de vue.

TROISIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 20 avril 1922 à 15 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

9. Approbation du procès-verbal.

La Commission approuve le procès-verbal de la première séance, avec une légère modification proposée par le président. A la demande de M. CAMPBELL (Inde), il est noté au procès-verbal que l'Etat serbe-croate-slovène qui, par décision de l'Assemblée, avait été invité à se faire représenter à la Commission, n'a pas envoyé de représentant.

10. Le sens du mot « légitime » dans la résolution prise par la Commission le 4 mai 1921 sur les certificats d'importation.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) demande si l'Assemblée a remplacé le mot « légitime » dans la résolution de la Commission sur les certificats d'importation comme elle l'a fait dans les autres résolutions de la Commission.

Le PRÉSIDENT explique que le mot a été changé dans une autre résolution relative aux besoins en opium brut.

A la suite d'une discussion à laquelle M. CAMPBELL (Inde) et sir John JORDAN, notamment, prennent part, la Commission reconnaît que la décision de l'Assemblée, en ce qui concerne l'application du mot « légitime », n'affecte pas le commerce de l'opium brut, question qui reste pendante.

11. Signature de la Convention de l'opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que le Gouvernement lithuanien a signé la Convention de l'opium le 7 avril.

12. Réexpédition de drogues importées.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) attire l'attention de la Commission sur les drogues qui, importées dans un pays, y sont partiellement consommées, le reste étant réexporté. Il demande si un contrôle international ne pourrait pas être exercé sur les réexportations.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que s'il s'agit de commerce légitime, le système des certificats constitue un moyen suffisant de contrôle, et que s'il s'agit de contrebande il faut envisager des mesures de police spéciales.

Mrs Hamilton WRIGHT et sir John JORDAN demandent si l'on pourrait parer au danger des réexportations en ajoutant une clause au certificat.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que les réexportations ne peuvent pas être prohibées, car il existe des centres de distribution en dehors des pays exportateurs.

13. Enquête du Comité d'hygiène sur la quantité moyenne de drogues nécessaires, mentionnées au chapitre III de la Convention de l'opium.

Le Dr Norman WHITE, Directeur adjoint de la Section d'hygiène, invité par le président à fournir des précisions, déclare que l'enquête a été poursuivie en Suède, au Danemark et en Suisse.

La comparaison des résultats obtenus dans ces trois pays révèle des différences et des analogies intéressantes, mais il faut user de beaucoup de prudence avant d'employer les chiffres recueillis pour l'établissement d'une base internationale applicable à tous les pays. L'enquête a été menée en Suisse par le D^r Carrière avec le plus grand soin. Les difficultés rencontrées et la somme de travail qui a été nécessaire montrent quelle tâche formidable on assumerait si l'on voulait obtenir des chiffres analogues pour de plus grands pays que la Suisse. Même si l'on pouvait mener à bien l'enquête dans de nombreux pays, les résultats ne seraient guère concluants. On peut même se demander si le terme « besoins légitimes » peut être interprété de la même manière dans tous les pays. La France a proposé que la Commission consultative de l'opium prenne en considération des substances chimiques analogues à la morphine, la cocaïne et leurs dérivés. Il ne serait guère sage d'empêcher de quelque manière que ce soit l'usage de drogues dont l'emploi ne risque pas de dégénérer en habitude et qui peuvent remplacer avantageusement les drogues dangereuses en question. Si l'on juge nécessaire de continuer l'enquête commencée, il serait opportun qu'elle portât sur une série d'années et un plus grand nombre de pays.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), demande au D^r Norman White s'il peut fournir des renseignements sur les trois points suivants :

1. Dans quelle mesure les résultats obtenus dans les pays du Nord permettent-ils de tirer des conclusions pour d'autres pays, l'Italie par exemple ?
2. Dans quelle mesure les mêmes résultats intéressent-ils l'Inde et les pays d'Orient en général ?
3. Y a-t-il lieu de procéder à une enquête en Inde pour y évaluer approximativement les besoins légitimes ?

Le D^r Norman White répond :

1. Il n'est pas juste d'employer les résultats de l'enquête faite dans des pays du nord, comme la Suède, pour établir la moyenne des besoins légitimes des pays comme l'Italie par exemple. Les besoins légitimes dépendent entre autres de la morbidité dans les pays considérés. On peut admettre qu'en Europe le taux de la morbidité est en fonction directe du taux de la mortalité.

2. Il n'est pas juste d'appliquer les résultats obtenus en Europe aux pays orientaux, comme l'Inde par exemple, où tout est entièrement différent : les conditions de vie, la nature et le nombre des maladies, le nombre des médecins, le nombre considérable des praticiens non autorisés et les besoins de la population qui dépendent des conditions climatiques et autres.

3. La conduite d'une enquête efficace en Inde se heurterait à des difficultés presque insurmontables.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) fait observer qu'en Inde, la consommation annuelle totale d'opium sous toutes ses formes, est de 26 grains par tête (1,9 grammes). Ce chiffre est incontestable et ne se rapporte qu'à l'Inde britannique qui a une population de 240 millions d'habitants. La population de l'Inde, y compris les Etats indigènes, est d'environ 320 millions.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) remarque que la consommation de cocaïne en Suisse semble considérable. Elle n'est pas plus grande en Allemagne qu'au Danemark et l'Allemagne consomme trois ou quatre fois plus de morphine que de cocaïne. Les drogues nuisibles sont de plus en plus remplacées en Allemagne par les drogues non nuisibles qui produisent le même effet médical et coûtent meilleur marché.

Le D^r Norman White, en réponse à une question de M. BRENIER, exprime l'avis que la substitution de drogues inoffensives, c'est-à-dire dont l'usage ne dégénère pas en habitude, aux drogues dangereuses en question, contribuerait beaucoup à résoudre un problème très difficile. Il serait intéressant d'avoir les statistiques allemandes montrant ce qui a déjà été fait dans ce sens. A l'heure présente, les drogues dangereuses qui prêtent aux abus sont indispensables en médecine.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) espère pouvoir fournir ces renseignements avant la fin de l'année.

Le PRÉSIDENT constate qu'il est difficile de se prononcer sur les besoins légitimes et sur sa proposition,

La Commission décide de recommander au Conseil que la Commission d'hygiène soit invitée à continuer son enquête.

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare qu'il est extrêmement important d'obtenir que les gouvernements fournissent des renseignements statistiques sur les importations, exportations et la fabrication.

M. BOURGOIS (France) estime que la connaissance des besoins légitimes ne peut avoir que très indirectement une répercussion utile sur la lutte contre les stupéfiants clandestins. Pour lutter contre les abus, il faudrait s'attaquer à la production et au commerce illicites. Il demande si l'on peut donner dès maintenant une idée approximative du rapport entre les quantités requises pour les besoins légitimes et les quantités employées abusivement.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) croit qu'on pourra entrevoir la réponse à cette question quand on aura examiné les réponses au questionnaire.

QUATRIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 21 avril, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

14. Approbation du procès-verbal.

Le procès-verbal de la deuxième séance est approuvé, sous réserve de certains amendements.

15. Procès-verbal de la première séance.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT exprime le désir que les documents qu'elle a soumis à la Commission, relatifs à la réponse du Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique au questionnaire et mentionnés au procès-verbal de la première séance soient retirés.

16. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient.

Le PRÉSIDENT suggère que la question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient soit discutée sous les trois rubriques suivantes:

1. La culture du pavot en Chine.
2. La contrebande, surtout de la morphine, en Chine.
3. La situation dans certaines colonies et possessions d'Orient, par exemple Hong-Kong, Singapour, Indo-Chine.

Il espère que la Commission s'efforcera de tenir compte de la division proposée en discutant la question de l'opium.

Il invite le représentant de la Chine à donner lecture du résumé des rapports des commissaires chargés par le Gouvernement chinois de faire une enquête sur la culture du pavot dans les différentes provinces de Chine.

Le PRÉSIDENT, en réponse à M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare que le *Livre bleu*, publié par le Gouvernement britannique sur la culture du pavot en Chine, a été communiqué aux membres de la Commission en janvier dernier.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) explique que le Gouvernement chinois a eu à surmonter de grandes difficultés dans son enquête sur la culture du pavot, en raison de la grande étendue du territoire et des troubles qui régnaient dans certaines provinces. Il est cependant arrivé aux deux conclusions suivantes:

1. Dans certains districts, le pavot n'est pas cultivé du tout.
2. Dans d'autres districts, le pavot a été cultivé mais détruit.

Il lit ensuite un résumé des rapports relatifs à la province de Fookien (Annexe 2).

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) demande à poser quatre questions au représentant de la Chine, avant que celui-ci lise les autres rapports:

1. Combien de provinces les commissaires ont-ils inspectées ?
2. Combien de commissaires ont procédé à l'enquête ?
3. A quelle saison de l'année les commissaires ont-ils fait leur enquête ?
4. Quelle est la superficie des territoires qu'ils ont parcourus ?

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) répond:

1. Les provinces visitées sont les suivantes: Fookien, Kansu, Shensi, Shansi, Sinuyan, Hupei, Anhui, Kirin, Hei-Lung-Kiang, Jehol, Hsin-Chiang, Sse-Ichouan (Chuan Pien, marche occidentale du Sze-Chuan).

2. Cinq commissaires spéciaux ont été envoyés et pour le reste, l'enquête a été faite par les gouverneurs des provinces.

3. Quant au moment de l'année auquel les commissaires ont fait leurs voyages, tous les rapports sont datés de la fin de 1921, sauf quelques-uns qui sont datés du mois d'octobre. Les commissaires ont quitté Pékin vers le milieu de l'année 1922.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) demande si les rapports ont été datés à la fin des voyages d'enquête.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare qu'il ne sait pas exactement à quelle date a eu lieu le départ des commissaires.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime qu'il est de la plus grande importance pour la Commission de savoir à quelle saison de l'année les commissaires ont accompli leur mission. S'ils ont visité les provinces après la récolte de l'opium, il est naturel qu'ils n'aient rien découvert.

M. CHAO-HSING CHU (Chine) a la certitude que les commissaires sont arrivés avant la récolte, puisqu'ils déclarent, dans certains de leurs rapports, qu'ils ont trouvé des pavots dont ils ont ordonné la destruction; ils n'auraient pu trouver de pavots s'ils étaient arrivés après la récolte.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) estime que le représentant de la Chine s'est montré trop optimiste. On voit dans le *Livre bleu* du Gouvernement britannique que, dans certains cas, le Gouvernement chinois a procédé à son enquête après la récolte. Il en conclut que le représentant de la Chine n'est pas en mesure de dire à quelle saison exacte les commissaires ont procédé à leur enquête.

Sir John JORDAN déclare qu'il est impossible de répondre avec précision à la quatrième question de M. Campbell, relative à la superficie des territoires où l'on cultive le pavot.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) lit alors un résumé des rapports sur les autres provinces (Annexe 2a).

M. BRENIER demande, à propos des rapports présentés par le représentant de la Chine, à attirer l'attention de la Commission sur un fait qui est important, si l'on doit arriver à quelque résultat pratique. Il faut tenir compte de l'importance relative des provinces de la Chine au point de vue de la production actuelle ou possible de l'opium. La province de Fookien, dont on a longuement entretenu la Commission, n'a jamais produit beaucoup d'opium. Les renseignements officiels fournis par le Gouvernement chinois lui-même, soit à la Commission de Shanghai, en 1919, soit à la Conférence de La Haye en 1911-1912, permettent de faire un classement approximatif. On trouvera un tableau de la production de l'opium en Chine dans les documents de la Conférence internationale de La Haye, page 57 du tome II. Ce tableau montre que la production de l'opium, au moment où la campagne contre l'opium a commencé en 1907, était concentrée surtout dans les trois provinces du Sse-Tchouan, du Kouei-Tcheou et du Yunnan, qui produisaient, à elles seules, 364.000 piculs d'opium sur un total estimé à 584.000 piculs (environ 35.000 tonnes).

En réponse à une remarque de Sir John JORDAN qui discute la valeur de ce tableau, M. BRENIER lui fait observer que les chiffres ont été recueillis par les douanes maritimes chinoises qui sont au-dessus de tout soupçon et dont on connaît les sources d'informations. C'est sur ces chiffres que les décisions très importantes de Shanghai et La Haye ont été basées. En ce qui le concerne personnellement, près de deux années de déplacements continuels dans le Yunnan, le Kouei-Tchéou et le Sse-Tchouan lui permettent d'affirmer l'importance de ces provinces au point de vue de la production de l'opium dans le passé et probablement dans l'avenir.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) demande à présenter quelques observations générales sur l'exposé du Gouvernement chinois.

Tout d'abord, le Gouvernement central de la Chine n'a envoyé que cinq commissaires spéciaux et pour le reste, l'enquête a été conduite par les gouverneurs des provinces. Le *Livre bleu* publié par le Gouvernement britannique prouve que ce sont précisément ces gouverneurs qui encouragent la culture du pavot. Les accusations contenues dans le *Livre bleu* sont formelles. Il en résulte que le Gouvernement chinois se trouve dans la situation de quelqu'un qui chargerait un voleur de faire un rapport sur un délit. Il se voit obligé de déclarer que le Gouvernement de l'Inde ne peut pas accepter les rapports des gouverneurs des provinces.

M. Campbell attire également l'attention sur une déclaration de l'ambassadeur britannique à Pékin, d'après laquelle un au moins des cinq commissaires envoyés par le Gouvernement central n'était pas incorruptible (*Livre bleu*, page 116).

Le pavot est semé en octobre et l'on ne peut s'assurer de sa présence que quand il est en fleurs, ce qui a lieu en mars et avril. La date des rapports des commissaires montre qu'ils n'ont pas procédé à leur enquête au cours de ces deux mois.

Les commissaires désignés ont dû parcourir d'immenses territoires; une province à elle seule est plus grande que la France. Quelle confiance peut-on avoir dans l'enquête conduite par cinq hommes dans un immense pays, alors que pour être effective, cette enquête aurait dû être faite dans l'espace de six semaines, et qu'elle ne l'a pas été pendant la floraison du pavot.

L'exposé du représentant de la Chine rappelle d'une manière frappante certaines déclarations contenues dans le *Livre bleu*; mais les rapports, souvent, ne sont pas datés et sont si vagues qu'ils inspirent peu de confiance.

Sir John JORDAN déclare que les renseignements qu'il possède prouvent, à une exception près, l'inexactitude des rapports des commissaires et des gouverneurs des provinces. Le seul rapport qu'il puisse accepter est celui du gouverneur de Shansi. Cette province a été débarrassée de l'opium il y a plus de dix ans et depuis, malgré de grandes difficultés, l'opium n'y a plus reparu. Son gou-

verneur doit remplir la double tâche de lutter à sa frontière contre l'importation de l'opium cultivé au delà de la frontière orientale et contre l'importation de la morphine à sa frontière occidentale.

En ce qui concerne la province de Anhui, par exemple, que le représentant de la Chine a déclaré débarrassée de l'opium, le journal *North China Daily News*, qui inspire toute confiance, dit: « Le pavot a été planté et continue à l'être sur une échelle plus grande que jamais. Dans les provinces de Sse-Tchouan et Shensi la situation est meilleure, sauf dans certains districts. Les commissaires n'ont pas visité les deux provinces du Yunnan et du Kouei-Tchéou où la culture du pavot est très importante ».

En l'absence de statistiques, il est difficile de se faire une idée de l'importance de la culture du pavot en Chine, mais sir John Jordan l'évalue au quart de ce qu'elle était en 1917, date des premiers efforts pour la suppression de l'opium. Pendant les dix années qui vont de 1907 à 1917, les efforts combinés du Gouvernement britannique et du Gouvernement chinois, et de la population elle-même, avaient presque complètement supprimé l'opium. Après 1917, il y eut une recrudescence du mal. Il est regrettable que le Gouvernement chinois n'ait pas reconnu franchement cet état de choses, plutôt que d'envoyer des rapports qui ne peuvent inspirer aucune confiance.

L'état de choses actuel est dû en premier lieu aux troubles qui marquent dans la Chine le passage de la monarchie à la démocratie. Les gouverneurs militaires des provinces sont les vrais maîtres du pays. Ils encouragent et imposent la culture du pavot.

On peut signaler trois autres causes secondaires: 1^o la grande quantité de morphine qui a été envoyée en Extrême-Orient à partir de 1917, dont une grande partie a pu pénétrer en Chine; 2^o la contrebande de l'opium étranger, et enfin la politique du Gouvernement de l'Inde qui continue à envoyer de l'opium à Hong-Kong, aux Etablissements des détroits, etc. Tant que le Gouvernement de l'Inde continue à fournir de l'opium aux colons chinois dans ses propres possessions et dans celles des autres Puissances, le Gouvernement chinois peut répondre, et répond qu'il est justifié à fournir d'opium son propre peuple; c'est un fait connu et une opinion partagée par toutes les communautés britanniques d'Orient.

Lors de son premier voyage en Chine, il y a une quarantaine d'années, la culture de l'opium n'était pas considérable, mais les exportations de l'Inde en Chine ont augmenté jusqu'à atteindre 100.000 caisses par an. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que la Chine ait augmenté sa propre production d'opium. Si la Commission consultative n'agit pas avec fermeté, la Chine qui jusqu'ici n'a pas produit de morphine se mettra bientôt à en produire, plutôt que de permettre qu'elle soit importée d'autres pays.

Lettre de sympathie à M. van Wettum.

Sur la proposition du Président de la Commission, on décide d'envoyer une lettre de sympathie à M. van Wettum que la maladie a empêché d'assister à la session.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) remercie la Commission.

CINQUIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 21 avril 1922, à 15 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

17. Adhésion de la Colombie à la Convention internationale de l'Opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que le Secrétaire général a reçu de la Colombie une communication aux termes de laquelle l'adhésion de cet Etat à la Convention internationale de l'opium sera soumise au prochain Congrès. Le délégué de la Colombie à la troisième Assemblée sera autorisé à signer la Convention.

18. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (suite).

M. BRENIER déclare qu'il a suivi dès le début la lutte contre la production et l'usage de l'opium. Il tient à féliciter le Gouvernement chinois des résultats obtenus dans le passé et sir John Jordan de son activité de 1907 à 1917. Il est incontestable que des résultats importants avaient été obtenus en 1917. Depuis, il y a eu malheureusement un mouvement de recul. Le Gouvernement chinois devrait trouver le moyen de remplacer la culture du pavot par autre chose, afin que les fermiers puissent gagner leur vie.

Obligé de quitter Genève avant la fin des travaux de la Commission, il tient à déclarer dès maintenant qu'à son avis des mesures spéciales devraient être prises pour supprimer dans le monde l'emploi abusif de la cocaïne et de la morphine, par le contrôle de leur fabrication. Cette suppression est encore plus importante que celle de la production de l'opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) en réponse à M. Campbell d'après lequel les commissaires ne s'étaient mis au travail qu'après la récolte du pavot, déclare qu'ils n'avaient pas été nommés par le Gouvernement chinois avant le mois d'août.

Sir John JORDAN fait observer que certains rapports contenus dans le *Livre bleu* du Gouvernement britannique sont datés de juillet et qu'il en résulte que la saison du pavot varie suivant les provinces et que dans certains districts on fait une récolte en été.

M. BRENIER dit que dans les provinces qu'il a visitées lui-même et qui sont les plus importantes pour la production de l'opium, le pavot est semé en hiver et mûr au printemps.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que d'après une dépêche du Ministre britannique à Pékin, du 5 août, aucun des commissaires spéciaux ne s'était encore mis en route à cette date, alors que toute la récolte du pavot était terminée, excepté dans le Nord de la Mandchourie et dans un ou deux autres districts.

M. BOURGOIS (France) déclare que des renseignements français relatifs au Yunnan et au Sse-Tchouan, reçus postérieurement au *Livre bleu* britannique, confirment et même aggravent les conclusions de ce document. Il donne des détails sur la culture de l'opium dans ces deux provinces. Cette culture qui, à la suite des efforts du Gouvernement de Pékin, avait été réduite de 75 à 80 % dans certains districts, a repris l'extension qu'elle avait avant la prohibition. Les mesures prises contre la culture du pavot et l'usage de la drogue sont devenues lettre morte. La production en Yunnan sera en 1922 d'environ 300 tonnes. Le prix de vente est tombé à 0.80 cents l'once. Les communications avec Canton et le Konang Si, où s'écoulait la production, étant coupées, une contrebande intense menace la frontière du Tonkin.

Le PRÉSIDENT résume les débats comme suit:

La Commission se rend compte des grandes difficultés que rencontre le Gouvernement chinois et en faisant des propositions elle sera animée du désir d'aider et non pas de critiquer.

L'an passé la Commission a noté dans son rapport que le pavot était cultivé avec la connivence des gouverneurs des provinces et que le Gouvernement central était trop faible pour s'y opposer.

Sir John Jordan avait proposé que les représentants consulaires des Puissances qui ont un traité avec la Chine, soient chargés, avec le consentement du Gouvernement chinois, de faire d'énergiques représentations aux gouverneurs des provinces. La Commission, à l'exception du représentant de la Chine, avait adopté cette proposition, mais le Conseil et l'Assemblée ont décidé de ne prendre aucune mesure avant que le Gouvernement chinois ait terminé l'enquête dont le résultat vient d'être communiqué à la Commission. La Commission doit se prononcer sur le résultat de cette enquête et sur la réponse au questionnaire dans laquelle le Gouvernement chinois déclare que l'augmentation de la culture du pavot est minime. Les rapports des commissaires chinois contiennent la même affirmation. La réponse au questionnaire et ces rapports sont en contradiction avec le *Livre bleu* britannique et les documents soumis par le Gouvernement français. Les explications fournies par M. Campbell et sir John Jordan permettent de conclure que les rapports des commissaires du Gouvernement chinois et ceux des gouverneurs des provinces ont très peu de valeur. Si la Commission accepte le *Livre bleu* qui décrit la situation en 1920, est-elle disposée à admettre qu'il s'est produit un changement soudain et radical ? Le Gouvernement central de la Chine est extrêmement faible et au moins deux grandes armées sont aux prises dans le pays.

La conclusion est que le pavot est cultivé en Chine, à l'heure actuelle, sur une grande échelle; cela est contraire aux obligations qui incombent à la Chine du fait qu'elle est Membre de la Société des Nations.

La Commission pourrait donc prendre les décisions suivantes :

1. Elle devrait renouveler sa recommandation sur l'intervention des représentants consulaires des Puissances qui ont un traité avec la Chine; ces représentants informeraient la Société des Nations de toutes les mesures qui pourraient être prises.
2. Elle devrait demander au Conseil d'inviter le Secrétariat à suivre les événements en Chine et à rester en contact avec toutes les sources autorisées d'informations.
3. Le service des douanes maritimes chinoises devrait être invité par le Gouvernement chinois à fournir à la Société des Nations tous les renseignements relatifs à la saisie de l'opium de contrebande, de la morphine, etc.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare que le Gouvernement chinois apprécie à leur juste valeur les efforts que fait la Société des Nations pour combattre le fléau de l'opium, mais jamais le Gouvernement chinois ne tolérera l'intervention des représentants consulaires des Puissances dans les affaires intérieures de la Chine. Toute intervention étrangère serait vivement ressentie par le peuple chinois, affaiblirait la décision du Gouvernement chinois et créerait un dangereux précédent. La Société des Nations ne peut pas traiter la Chine autrement que les autres membres de la Société, cela serait une violation du Pacte. Si on applique à la Chine la méthode proposée, pourquoi ne pas l'appliquer également à tous les pays qui produisent de l'opium ?

La question de l'opium est une question internationale et elle ne peut être réglée efficacement qu'en établissant un contrôle international sur la production et la distribution de l'opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT explique que la Commission doit se prononcer sur deux questions :

- 1^o Que faut-il penser des rapports soumis par le représentant de la Chine ?
- 2^o Quelles recommandations ou suggestions y a-t-il lieu de faire au Conseil ?

Il serait heureux de connaître l'avis des membres de la Commission au sujet du résumé des débats qu'il vient de faire. Il n'a pas de résolution formelle à présenter, mais si la Commission approuve son résumé, celui-ci pourrait être incorporé dans le rapport de la Commission au Conseil.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) se déclare prêt à accepter le résumé du président.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) demande si le représentant de la Chine ne s'est pas trompé sur le caractère de la proposition qui a été faite au sujet des représentants consulaires; ceux-ci ne doivent pas gêner le Gouvernement chinois en intervenant dans les affaires intérieures du pays, et avant que des représentations soient faites par les représentants consulaires, on s'assurerait du consentement du Gouvernement chinois.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare que de toute façon les représentations des consuls seraient considérées comme une ingérence étrangère. Il rappelle à la Commission que lorsqu'elle a adopté l'an passé sa résolution sur les représentations consulaires, la Commission ne savait pas si le Gouvernement chinois donnerait son consentement. A cette occasion, M. Tang-Tsai-Fou, ignorant les vues de son Gouvernement, s'était contenté de faire une réserve, mais actuellement le représentant de la Chine a reçu des instructions précises et il est en mesure de déclarer que le Gouvernement chinois ne donnera jamais son consentement sur ce point.

Sir John JORDAN demande si le Gouvernement chinois dénie aux représentants diplomatiques britanniques en Chine le droit de faire des représentations en vertu du Traité de 1911.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) répond que cette question doit être posée officiellement au Gouvernement chinois.

Sir John JORDAN déclare que tout consul en Chine fait des représentations aux autorités chinoises locales en vertu du Traité et qu'il en a été ainsi depuis 1917 jusqu'à aujourd'hui.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) fait remarquer que la résolution adoptée l'an passé par la Commission stipulait qu'on demanderait le consentement du Gouvernement chinois. Il en résulte que le consentement du Gouvernement chinois est nécessaire.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que l'attitude du représentant de la Chine est très décevante. En adoptant sa résolution l'an passé, la Commission n'a pas songé à embarrasser le Gouvernement chinois par une intervention étrangère; elle s'est rendu compte que la recrudescence de la culture du pavot est due aux gouverneurs militaires régionaux. La Société des Nations ne songe qu'à aider le Gouvernement chinois à remplir ses obligations. Le Gouvernement chinois n'est pas en mesure de le faire par lui-même et il refuse l'assistance de la Commission.

Dans ces conditions, la Commission ne peut que suggérer au Conseil que la méthode des représentations consulaires semble le meilleur moyen d'empêcher les gouverneurs militaires régionaux d'encourager à leur profit la culture du pavot. Le Conseil devra décider si la question doit être soumise aux Puissances qui ont un traité avec la Chine et le Gouvernement chinois devra voir ce qu'il doit faire au cas où les dites Puissances l'engageraient à remplir les obligations qui lui incombent en vertu du Traité de 1911 et en qualité de Membre de la Société des Nations.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) déclare qu'il comprend les objections que soulève le Gouvernement chinois, en raison des difficultés politiques qu'impliquent les représentations consulaires. Il propose à la Commission d'adopter la résolution suivante:

« Considérant les importants résultats obtenus dans le passé par le Gouvernement chinois dans sa lutte pour la suppression de la culture du pavot,

« Ayant entendu la lecture du rapport du Gouvernement chinois sur l'œuvre accomplie par la Commission spéciale,

« Emue des difficultés que rencontre le Gouvernement chinois, notamment en ce qui concerne les présentes luttes intestines,

« Et après avoir constaté certaines divergences d'opinions sur l'état de choses en Chine,

« La Commission recommande que le Conseil invite le Gouvernement chinois à examiner quelles mesures pourraient être prises, et demande d'autre part aux Gouvernements qui ont des traités avec la Chine et qui ont contracté des obligations, aux termes notamment du chapitre IV de la Convention, d'examiner la situation et d'adresser au Secrétariat général toutes les observations et suggestions désirables. Les organisations intéressées à la suppression du trafic de l'opium pourraient être aussi invitées à donner leur avis. »

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare qu'en ce qui le concerne, il ne peut pas accepter ce projet de résolution. Il propose que la Commission se prononce à la présente séance sur la valeur des rapports présentés par le représentant de la Chine et sur la suggestion tendant à ce que la Société des Nations continue à recueillir des informations. Les autres questions pourraient être réservées à une séance ultérieure.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) propose que la question soit divisée en deux parties:

1. Adoption du résumé du président et son incorporation dans le rapport de la Commission au Conseil;

2. Mesures à prendre.

Le PRÉSIDENT approuve que la question du résumé soit examinée en premier lieu.

Sir John JORDAN propose que le résumé du président fasse l'objet d'une résolution qui serait soumise au vote de la Commission. Ce texte pourrait être télégraphié en Chine où il produirait un grand effet sur l'opinion publique.

Le PRÉSIDENT se charge de rédiger un texte qui sera soumis à la Commission à la prochaine séance. (*Adopté.*)

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) tient à répéter que le Gouvernement chinois ne peut accepter aucune résolution recommandant une intervention consulaire. Il ne doit pas y avoir de malentendu sur ce point. L'opinion publique en Chine est hostile à la culture du pavot mais ne tolérerait pas une intervention étrangère.

Sir John JORDAN déclare que jusqu'à présent les autorités britanniques et chinoises ont collaboré de la manière la plus cordiale et que l'opinion publique chinoise s'est montrée très favorable aux mesures prises. Il ne s'est jamais produit d'opposition dans le passé, bien que l'intervention consulaire ait été continuelle et beaucoup plus active qu'à présent.

SIXIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 22 avril 1922, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

19. Approbation du procès-verbal.

La Commission approuve les procès-verbaux des troisième et quatrième séances avec certaines modifications et adjonctions.

Il est entendu que M. Campbell (Inde) répondra à une séance ultérieure aux déclarations de Sir John Jordan.

20. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (suite).

Le PRÉSIDENT soumet à la Commission le projet de résolution suivant:

« La Commission consultative de l'opium de la Société des Nations, ayant examiné les rapports communiqués par le délégué chinois à la Commission, sur les enquêtes ordonnées par le Gouvernement chinois, au sujet de la reprise de la culture du pavot qui aurait été constatée dans diverses provinces; ayant tenu compte du moment, des circonstances et de la situation de certaines personnes par qui ces enquêtes ont été effectuées, et ayant comparé ces rapports avec les renseignements contenus dans le *Livre bleu* publié par le Gouvernement britannique, ainsi qu'avec d'autres renseignements soumis à la Commission;

« Regrette de ne pouvoir accepter les rapports adressés au Gouvernement chinois, et, tout en étant heureuse de reconnaître que dans certains districts des efforts ont été faits par les autorités pour assurer l'interdiction de l'opium, se voit obligée de conclure qu'il existe une recrudescence considérable de la culture et de l'usage de l'opium en Chine.

« De plus, la Commission reconnaît que la responsabilité de cette recrudescence retombe principalement, sinon entièrement sur les gouverneurs provinciaux, dans les districts intéressés, et que, étant donné la situation politique actuelle, la pression de l'opinion publique est probablement la seule force utilisable pour remédier à un état de choses qui constitue une violation des engagements pris par la Chine dans les traités conclus et qui est incompatible avec les obligations qu'elle a assumées comme Membre de la Société.

« En conséquence, la Commission recommande:

« 1) Que le Conseil rende publiques les conclusions auxquelles la Commission est arrivée;

« 2) Que le Conseil invite les Puissances qui ont des traités spéciaux avec la Chine, à prendre, par l'intermédiaire de leurs représentants en Chine, et de toute autre manière, toutes les mesures possibles pour agir sur les autorités provinciales responsables;

« 3) Qu'en exécution de la mission confiée par le Pacte à la Société, le Conseil prenne, par l'intermédiaire du Secrétariat, les mesures nécessaires pour se tenir au courant de la situation en Chine au point de vue de la culture du pavot et qu'il rende publics, de temps en temps, les renseignements qui lui parviendront. »

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare, au nom de son Gouvernement, que ce projet de résolution est inacceptable. La Commission a reconnu, l'an passé, qu'il était nécessaire d'obtenir le consentement du Gouvernement chinois; or, la Commission sait aujourd'hui que le Gouvernement chinois ne peut pas accorder son consentement à une intervention des représentants consulaires. Tous les Etats Membres de la Société des Nations sont égaux, et ce n'est pas une raison parce que la Chine est faible pour lui imposer une intervention étrangère dont elle n'a eu que trop à souffrir jus qu'ici. Les intentions de la Commission sont sans doute excellentes, mais sa résolution aurait les plus fâcheuses conséquences, si elle était adoptée. Le problème de l'opium ne se pose pas en Chine seulement; beaucoup d'autres pays, que chacun connaît, produisent de l'opium et de la morphine.

Un éditorial du *Times* de Londres (1921) a montré qu'actuellement la production de la morphine dépasse de beaucoup les besoins légitimes. Une tonne de morphine correspond à sept

tonnes d'opium et suffit pour trente-deux millions d'injections: c'est plus qu'il n'en faut pour les besoins médicaux des deux Amériques pendant une année. Or, en 1919, il a été importé 250 tonnes d'opium aux États-Unis et 372 en Grande-Bretagne. Avec ces quantités d'opium, on peut produire 36 tonnes de morphine aux États-Unis et 53 tonnes en Grande-Bretagne. Si ces deux pays retiennent une tonne chacun pour ses besoins, il leur reste respectivement 35 et 52 tonnes pour l'exportation. Ces chiffres sont confirmés par sir William J. Collins, délégué britannique à la Conférence de La Haye, en 1912: « Quand je lis, dit-il, que quelque 140.000 onces de morphine ont été exportées de Grande-Bretagne, au cours des neuf premiers mois de 1911, je ne pense pas qu'il soit exagéré de dire que la production dépasse d'une manière effrayante les besoins légitimes ou médicaux. »

La Chine ne produit pas une once de morphine et il lui est difficile de lutter contre la contrebande, en raison du régime des concessions et de l'extraterritorialité. Elle est la principale victime du scandale de la réexportation.

La Commission a-t-elle à régler la question de l'opium en Chine seulement? Elle siège sous les auspices de la Société des Nations et doit traiter le problème dans son ensemble. Quand il y a un seul voleur, il est naturel qu'une action commune soit engagée contre lui; mais s'il y a plusieurs voleurs, pourquoi s'en prendre au plus faible, sans rien entreprendre contre les autres qui sont plus forts?

La Chine est disposée à remplir ses obligations et à accepter toute résolution qui s'appliquera au monde en général, et non à un pays en particulier. Elle accepterait, par exemple, une résolution ainsi conçue:

« Une commission internationale sera chargée de procéder à une enquête dans tous les pays qui produisent de l'opium et de la morphine. »

Si la Commission désire traiter séparément le problème chinois, elle devrait renoncer à son projet de résolution qui aurait pour effet d'augmenter la contrebande de l'opium et de la morphine et adopter la résolution suivante:

« La Société des Nations invite le Gouvernement chinois à procéder à une enquête plus complète que celle de l'an passé sur la culture du pavot en Chine, afin de fournir à la Société des Nations, cette année et les années suivantes, des rapports plus sûrs.

« Outre les fonctionnaires chinois désignés par le Gouvernement chinois, la Commission d'enquête pourrait comprendre des représentants de certaines organisations du pays, telles que les Chambres de commerce, Sociétés d'éducation et autres corps particulièrement intéressés dans la suppression de l'opium. Cette Commission parcourrait les provinces où la culture du pavot serait signalée. »

C'est là la seule manière de traiter la Chine sur un pied d'égalité.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant de la Chine s'il peut donner des précisions sur la composition de la Commission mixte qu'il propose.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) répond que pour donner satisfaction à la Commission qui s'est déclarée déçue par les rapports du Gouvernement chinois, on peut envisager une Commission mixte, qui comprendrait, outre les fonctionnaires désignés par le Gouvernement, des représentants de l'opinion publique chinoise désignés par les Chambres de commerce, les Sociétés d'étudiants et autres organisations dont les intentions et la bonne volonté sont connues.

Sir John JORDAN tient à faire observer, pour éviter tout malentendu, que la proposition qu'il a faite en mai 1921 avait été suggérée par le représentant de la Chine, par l'intermédiaire du Dr Hawking Yen, et qu'il ne l'a jamais considérée lui-même que comme un pis-aller.

Il est certain que la question de l'opium devrait être examinée dans son ensemble, et le principe d'une commission internationale semble recommandable. Mais l'opinion publique en Chine n'est plus ce qu'elle était au cours des années 1907 et suivantes. Elle se préoccupe surtout, aujourd'hui, de politique et semble s'intéresser assez peu à la question de l'opium. Il s'agit donc de réveiller l'opinion publique en Chine par une active propagande.

D'autre part, on peut se demander dans quelle mesure la résolution proposée par le représentant de la Chine peut être mise en pratique. Actuellement, le Gouvernement chinois n'est pas en mesure de faire respecter son autorité dans certaines provinces. Il faudrait pouvoir s'adresser directement à certains hommes qui ont donné des preuves de leur énergie dans la lutte contre le fléau. La Commission doit faire quelque chose, sinon une année encore sera perdue et on risque de se trouver en présence d'un monopole de l'opium et de la morphine établi en Chine.

En conclusion, il semble opportun de constituer une commission internationale, mais la proposition du représentant de la Chine est insuffisante.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) présente les observations suivantes sur les deux propositions du représentant de la Chine:

I. L'institution de la commission de contrôle international proposée n'est pas possible:

a) Parce qu'une action internationale, de ce genre serait en dehors du cadre de la Société des Nations;

b) Parce qu'un contrôle international, en ce qui concerne les problèmes en question, devrait s'exercer plus particulièrement en Chine, où il se heurterait, d'après le représentant de la Chine, à l'opposition du Gouvernement et du peuple chinois;

c) Parce qu'un contrôle international ne pourrait s'exercer qu'avec le consentement des nombreux Etats qui constituent la Société des Nations; or les événements ont montré qu'il est très peu probable que ces Etats donnent leur consentement.

2. La Commission d'enquête chinoise ne pourrait pas arriver à des résultats satisfaisants, pour les raisons énumérées par sir John Jordan. Le traité entre la Grande-Bretagne et la Chine a prévu que des commissions d'enquête mixtes s'assureraient de l'exécution de ce traité. Cette solution n'a jamais soulevé aucune objection de la part du Gouvernement chinois ou de l'opinion publique en Chine; c'est pourquoi il prie le représentant de la Chine de l'accepter.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine), en réponse à M. Campbell (Inde), se réfère au *Livre bleu* (pp. 100 et 101). Il livre bleu répète que son Gouvernement s'oppose à toute intervention des consuls, que la Chine est disposée à accepter toute proposition relative à un contrôle s'exerçant sur toutes les parties du monde, ce qui montre la sincérité du Gouvernement chinois. Il est exact que l'opinion publique a marqué un fléchissement, ce qui explique le rôle joué par les gouverneurs militaires; mais l'opinion publique reste active et il suffit de l'éclairer. Il reste quelque chose des magnifiques résultats obtenus par le Gouvernement chinois avec la précieuse collaboration de sir John Jordan, dont l'activité dans ce domaine constitue la plus grande œuvre de sa vie. Comme celui-ci l'a justement fait observer, si on ne s'en prend pas à la production de l'opium et de la morphine en général, ces fléaux ne pourront pas être arrêtés en Chine.

Si la Commission adopte la résolution qu'il propose, il en télégraphiera le texte à son Gouvernement, et il est certain qu'un vaste mouvement d'opinion publique sera ainsi provoqué en Chine. La Chine tiendra compte des critiques qu'on lui a adressées et, forte de l'assistance amicale qu'on lui offre, elle demande un peu de temps pour arriver par elle-même à un résultat, sans intervention étrangère.

SEPTIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 22 avril 1922, à 15 heures.

Présents : Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

21. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient. (suite).

Sir John JORDAN rappelle que le représentant de la Chine a décidé à la séance du matin qu'il ne pouvait accepter qu'une enquête internationale, portant sur la question de l'opium dans son ensemble. On se trouve ainsi dans une impasse. Le représentant de l'Inde a déclaré de son côté qu'il ne pouvait pas accepter une enquête internationale. Mais peut-être pourrait-il suggérer une méthode qui permette de trouver une solution acceptable pour les gouvernements de la Chine et de l'Inde.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) suggère que des représentants britanniques et chinois soient chargés de faire une enquête sur l'exécution du traité passé entre les Gouvernements de la Chine et de la Grande-Bretagne. Le Gouvernement de l'Inde, non seulement a complètement exécuté le traité, mais il est allé au delà au prix d'importants sacrifices financiers. Le Gouvernement de la Chine estime que le traité n'est plus applicable parce qu'il est arrivé à expiration en 1917. Cette manière de voir est absolument injustifiable, d'autant plus que les faits soumis à la Commission prouvent que la Chine a incontestablement manqué aux obligations que lui imposait ce traité. Il est compréhensible que le Gouvernement chinois soit affecté par une intervention de la Société des Nations dans les affaires intérieures du pays, si cette intervention sort de la compétence de la Société, mais il est nécessaire de procéder, d'une manière ou de l'autre, à une enquête.

Si cette solution échoue, la Commission pourrait adopter une résolution tendant à ce que le Gouvernement britannique insiste auprès du Gouvernement chinois pour qu'il exécute le Traité de 1911 et à ce que des informations, telles que celles qui figurent dans le *Livre bleu* du Gouvernement britannique, continuent à être publiées périodiquement, afin de montrer dans quelle mesure le Gouvernement chinois se conforme au Traité. Par une déclaration finale, la résolution pourrait spécifier que la Commission ne propose pas pour le moment d'autres recommandations, bien qu'elle se rende pleinement compte des difficultés que soulève la considérable production actuelle d'opium en Chine.

Aux termes de cette résolution, c'est le Gouvernement britannique qui aurait à prendre les mesures nécessaires en vertu du traité existant, tandis que la Société des Nations n'aurait pas à intervenir en Chine.

Le PRÉSIDENT résume brièvement les propositions dont la Commission est saisie, et suggère que la discussion portât d'abord sur le projet de résolution que la Commission l'a chargé de rédiger à la suite des débats du jour précédent et qui a été soumis à la Commission à la séance du matin. Il fait remarquer que la résolution se divise en deux parties: la première résume le point de vue que la Commission est invitée à adopter, au sujet des rapports présentés par le représentant de la Chine; la seconde contient des recommandations dont l'adoption est proposée à la Commission. On pourrait commencer par mettre aux voix la première partie de la résolution.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) demande à dire son avis sur cette première partie.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que le représentant de la Chine a déjà exprimé son opinion, et que le texte en question est le résultat des débats de la veille.

La Commission décide de passer au vote.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande à la Commission d'accepter d'abord en principe les trois paragraphes de la première partie, étant entendu que des amendements pourront être introduits ensuite.

La Commission adopte en principe les trois paragraphes, par cinq voix contre une.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande si quelqu'un a un amendement à proposer au paragraphe 1.

Sir John JORDAN propose de mentionner que les provinces du Yunnan et du Kouei-Tcheou n'ont pas été visitées par la Commission chinoise et M. BRENIER suggère que mention soit faite aussi du Sud-Ouest du Sse-Tchouan, où la culture de l'opium a repris en plus de la culture signalée dans les marches du Sse-Tchouan.

A la suite d'un échange de vues, la *Commission décide* de ne mentionner spécialement aucune province ou région, et charge le président de spécifier dans un court paragraphe que certains districts importants au point de vue de la culture du pavot n'ont pas été visités par la Commission chinoise.

M. BOURGOIS (France) propose un amendement tendant à ménager la susceptibilité du Gouvernement chinois. A cet effet on pourrait ne retenir que la dernière phrase du dernier paragraphe, ainsi conçue :

« La Commission consultative de l'opium, ayant pris connaissance des informations contenues dans le *Livre bleu* publié par le Gouvernement britannique, et d'autres informations, etc..... »

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare ne pas pouvoir accepter l'amendement de M. Bourgois. Il ne croit pas que la Commission puisse atténuer les termes de la résolution par égard pour la susceptibilité du Gouvernement chinois. Celui-ci a délibérément dissimulé les faits et il est essentiel que cela soit publié. La résolution exprime la réalité et elle le fait avec modération.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer qu'il a rédigé la résolution à la demande de Sir John Jordan, qui estimait qu'une déclaration franche produirait une bonne impression sur l'opinion publique en Chine. A cet égard la résolution perdrait de sa valeur si les termes en étaient atténués.

L'amendement de M. Bourgois est repoussé par quatre voix contre deux.
Le paragraphe 1 est alors mis aux voix et *adopté*.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande si quelqu'un a un amendement à proposer au paragraphe 2.

M. BOURGOIS (France) demande la suppression de la phrase suivante :

« Regrette de ne pas pouvoir accepter les rapports fournis par le Gouvernement chinois, etc..... »

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) s'oppose à l'amendement de M. Bourgois. Il estime essentiel que la résolution mentionne explicitement les rapports fournis par le Gouvernement chinois.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) demande si l'on pourrait ajouter à la résolution une phrase relative à l'emploi de la morphine en Chine. Il estime que l'opinion publique en Chine devrait être rendue attentive à cette question.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que la question de la morphine sera traitée plus tard et qu'une résolution sera prise à ce sujet.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) appuie l'amendement proposé par M. Bourgois.

L'amendement de M. Bourgois mis aux voix est *adopté* par trois voix contre une.
Le paragraphe 2 ainsi amendé est mis aux voix et *adopté* sans opposition.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose à la Commission de passer au vote du paragraphe 3 de la résolution.

M. BOURGOIS (France) estime que le mot « violation » est trop fort et inexact, l'expression « non-exécution » correspondant mieux aux circonstances.

Sir John JORDAN fait remarquer que le Gouvernement britannique estime que la Chine a violé ses engagements. Il ne pense pas que le mot doive être atténué.

L'amendement de M. Bourgois est repoussé par trois voix contre trois, la voix du président étant déterminante.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) propose que les gouverneurs des provinces mentionnés dans le paragraphe soient appelés gouverneurs militaires.

Le paragraphe 3 ainsi amendé est *adopté*.

Le PRÉSIDENT soumet alors à la Commission la première recommandation du projet de résolution :

« Que le Conseil rende publiques les conclusions auxquelles la Commission est arrivée. »

La Commission adopte cette recommandation à l'unanimité, à l'exception du représentant de l'Allemagne, qui déclare devoir s'abstenir de voter, attendu que la question a un caractère diplomatique, à part son caractère humanitaire, et que l'Allemagne n'étant pas Membre de la Société des Nations, ne peut pas prendre part au vote.

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare que les observations du représentant de la Chine, au cours de la précédente séance, l'ont amené à rédiger le texte suivant, qu'il est disposé à substituer à la deuxième recommandation, s'il est approuvé par la Commission :

« Que le Conseil propose au Gouvernement chinois que des enquêtes mixtes, analogues aux enquêtes mixtes poursuivies par des commissaires chinois et britanniques en 1917 et au cours des années précédentes, soient faites chaque année pendant la saison du pavot

dans toutes les provinces où l'on prétend que la culture du pavot existe, par des commissaires nommés en partie par le Gouvernement chinois et en partie par la Société des Nations. »

Il espère que le représentant de la Chine pourra accepter ce texte. La Commission ne peut pas, à son avis, accepter la proposition tendant à ce que les Commissions mixtes se composent uniquement de fonctionnaires chinois et de représentants de sociétés chinoises et comme la Société des Nations a été chargée de surveiller l'application de la Convention internationale de l'opium de 1912, il semble raisonnable de proposer qu'elle prenne part à l'enquête proposée.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare qu'il n'insistera pas sur les propositions qu'il a faites à la séance précédente si le nouveau projet de recommandation du président est adopté.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare qu'il s'oppose formellement à la résolution N° 2, qui est pire que la résolution proposée l'an dernier. Les obligations qui incombent à la Chine ne concernent que la Chine et le Gouvernement britannique et non pas la Société des Nations. La Société des Nations devrait adopter une politique de laisser-faire envers la Chine, si bien que la Chine puisse supprimer l'opium de sa propre initiative et sans intervention étrangère.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant de la Chine si ces remarques se rapportent au nouveau projet ou au texte primitif.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) répond qu'elles se rapportent aux deux textes, qui sont tous les deux inacceptables pour le Gouvernement chinois. Le second texte a, sous une autre forme, le même sens que le premier.

Le Prince CHAROON (Siam) déclare qu'il désire qu'il soit inscrit au procès-verbal qu'il s'abstient de voter sur la résolution en question, attendu que le Siam ne peut pas appuyer une résolution relative à un Etat particulier, alors que d'autres Etats continuent à cultiver le pavot.

Une motion d'ajournement est proposée.

Sir John JORDAN demande à la Commission de ne pas prendre une décision prématurée. La question est de première importance et il ne semble pas qu'on la traite avec la hauteur de vue désirable. Si la Commission se prononce à la légère, elle n'arrivera qu'à un pauvre compromis.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) propose l'amendement suivant au nouveau projet de recommandation du président :

« Que le Conseil propose à tous les gouvernements signataires de la Convention de faire procéder à une enquête sur la production de l'opium et de la morphine. Cette enquête serait dirigée par la Société des Nations et par des commissaires nommés en partie par le Gouvernement intéressé et en partie par la Société des Nations. »

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) dit que c'est commettre une grave erreur que de croire qu'on applique à la Chine un traitement spécial et injuste. Ce n'est pas la question de la production de l'opium en soi qui justifie une intervention, mais le fait que la Chine a manqué aux obligations qu'elle a volontairement assumées en vertu de la Convention internationale de l'opium. Elle a déclaré qu'elle ne produirait plus de pavots et elle en produit sur une grande échelle. Elle a déclaré avoir établi des lois sur la production; or il est évident que ces lois restent sans effet. Si la Chine est actuellement l'objet de critiques, c'est parce qu'elle a manqué à ses engagements et non parce qu'elle cultive le pavot. Si un autre pays producteur d'opium, comme l'Inde, par exemple, qui a signé la Convention internationale de l'opium agissait de la même manière, la Commission serait entièrement justifiée à en user de même à son égard.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que l'amendement présenté par le représentant des Pays-Bas est rédigé en termes très généraux, mais que peut-être le Gouvernement chinois pourra accepter un texte rédigé dans ce sens.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) demande à ajouter à son amendement les mots « à sa convenance ». Son projet de résolution aurait la teneur suivante :

« Que le Conseil de la Société des Nations invite, à sa convenance, les Gouvernements des Etats signataires de la Convention de l'opium, à faciliter sur leurs territoires les enquêtes de Commissions mixtes nommées en partie par le Gouvernement intéressé et en partie par le Conseil de la Société des Nations, aux fins de déterminer la production de l'opium et de la morphine. »

Sir John JORDAN approuve entièrement cet amendement, du moins quant au fond. Il s'applique à la question dans son ensemble et pas à la Chine en particulier.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT est du même avis.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) ne voit pas de raison pour que la Chine s'oppose à l'amendement du représentant des Pays-Bas. La Chine est prête à ouvrir ses portes à une enquête, mais le Gouvernement chinois ne peut pas supprimer la production de l'opium pendant qu'elle continue ailleurs. L'amendement s'applique au monde en général et il n'y a pas de raison pour que la Chine ne l'accepte pas, pourvu qu'il soit appliqué partout également.

Conformément aux instructions qu'il a reçues de son Gouvernement, le représentant de la Chine, tout en acceptant le nouvel amendement, demande que la résolution qu'il a présentée à une séance précédente soit soumise au vote de la Commission.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare que les instructions qu'il a reçues de son Gouvernement ne prévoient pas la question soulevée par l'amendement de M. de Kat Angelino, et qu'en conséquence, il se voit obligé de faire une réserve formelle. L'amendement est rédigé en termes très généraux et les gouvernements voudront connaître l'objet et la portée de l'enquête. Il tient à la disposition de la Commission tous les renseignements désirables sur la culture du pavot en Inde et il peut garantir l'exactitude de ces renseignements. C'est pourquoi, en ce qui concerne l'Inde, l'utilité d'une enquête semble douteuse tant qu'on ne précise pas l'objet et la portée de l'enquête. Il rappelle une fois de plus à la Commission que la Société des Nations ne peut pas aller au delà de son mandat.

Le PRÉSIDENT croit qu'il sera possible de s'entendre sur une formule, mais que les gouvernements pourront difficilement accepter le projet du représentant des Pays-Bas sous sa forme actuelle. Il demande la signification des mots « à sa convenance ». A son avis, le Conseil n'agirait, dans chaque cas particulier, que sur recommandation de la Commission consultative, qui a pour devoir d'éclairer le Conseil sur toutes les questions relatives au trafic de l'opium.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) dit que, si le Conseil reçoit des informations qui l'amènent à reconnaître la nécessité d'une enquête, il devrait inviter le Gouvernement à agir immédiatement.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que, conformément à la procédure habituelle, si le Conseil reçoit des informations sur un pays particulier, il s'adresserait alors au Gouvernement de ce pays. A son avis, la proposition serait plus acceptable s'il était clairement stipulé qu'il ne sera procédé à une enquête dans chaque cas particulier que sur recommandation de la Commission consultative au Conseil. Il propose l'ajournement, afin que la Commission ait le temps d'examiner les termes de la résolution.

Conformément à la demande du représentant de la Chine, le président soumet à la Commission la proposition suivante :

« La Commission recommande au Conseil de la Société des Nations de prier le Gouvernement chinois de procéder à une enquête plus complète que celle de l'an passé, sur la culture du pavot en Chine, afin de pouvoir soumettre à la Société des Nations, cette année et les années suivantes, des rapports plus dignes de foi.

« La Commission chargée de faire une enquête dans les provinces devrait comprendre, outre les fonctionnaires nommés par le Gouvernement chinois, des représentants d'organisations telles que les chambres de commerce, les sociétés d'éducation et autres corps particulièrement intéressés dans la suppression de l'opium, qui visiteraient toutes les provinces où l'on signale des cultures de pavot. »

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer qu'à son avis l'adoption de cette proposition implique le rejet de celle du représentant des Pays-Bas.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) estime que les deux résolutions ne sont en aucune façon inconciliables.

La proposition du représentant de la Chine est mise aux voix et *adoptée* par quatre voix contre une.

HUITIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 24 avril 1922, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

22. Approbation des procès-verbaux.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande si un membre de la Commission a une observation à présenter sur le fond des procès-verbaux des cinquième, sixième et septième séances, étant entendu que les corrections de forme seront, pour gagner du temps, communiquées directement au Secrétariat.

Différents amendements au procès-verbal de la septième séance sont adoptés.

Les procès-verbaux de ces trois séances sont adoptés, sous réserve d'amendements de forme.

23. La question de l'opium en Extrême-Orient (suite).

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) tient à préciser qu'il a voté la résolution du représentant de la Chine à la séance précédente dans l'idée qu'elle était compatible avec la résolution du représentant des Pays-Bas. Mais un doute a été émis à cet égard et il conviendrait de savoir exactement où l'on en est.

Le PRÉSIDENT constate que la Commission se trouve dans une situation difficile. S'il a mis aux voix la proposition du représentant de la Chine, avant la fin de la discussion sur sa propre proposition et sur celle du représentant néerlandais, c'est à la demande du représentant chinois et parce que les débats de la Commission semblaient faire prévoir un vote négatif. Il a examiné la situation avec soin pour trouver une solution. Sa propre proposition et celle du représentant néerlandais restent soumises à la Commission. Avant de faire une proposition qui pourra peut-être concilier les deux parties, il croit devoir attirer l'attention sur le rôle de la Société des Nations et sur le mandat de la Commission dans la question de l'opium.

Les termes de l'article 23 du Pacte sont très clairs. Il ne s'agit pas d'une question de politique. La Société des Nations n'a pas à s'occuper des relations existant entre la Chine et le Gouvernement britannique ou un gouvernement quelconque. D'accord avec tous les Etats membres de la Société des Nations, la Chine a chargé la Société des Nations du contrôle général du trafic de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles et de l'application de la Convention internationale de l'opium qui a imposé des obligations précises à tous les Etats signataires. La Société doit donc être en mesure d'exercer son contrôle sur tous les pays sans distinction et, à cette fin, de procéder à des enquêtes lorsque des plaintes se produisent sur la violation de la Convention. Le représentant du Siam semble avoir perdu cela de vue lors de sa déclaration à la septième séance.

Il n'est pas fait de distinction au préjudice de la Chine. La Commission a commencé son étude par la question chinoise qui venait en tête de l'ordre du jour; elle aurait pu examiner d'abord la situation dans tout autre pays. La Société des Nations doit exercer son contrôle sur tous les Etats qui sont membres de la Société.

Les renseignements parvenus montrent que la culture du pavot a recommencé en Chine et que la Chine a manqué aux obligations qui lui incombent en vertu de la Convention de l'opium. En conséquence, la Commission doit exercer le mandat que lui a confié la Société conformément aux stipulations du Pacte et de la Convention.

A son avis, la Commission ne peut pas revenir sur le vote par lequel elle a adopté la résolution du représentant de la Chine, qui paraît insuffisante. D'autre part, cette résolution semble difficilement conciliable avec les propositions présentées l'une par le Président et l'autre par le représentant des Pays-Bas. Dans ces conditions, étant donné que la culture du pavot a recommencé en Chine et que les lois prévues par la Convention n'y sont pas appliquées, il est disposé à retirer sa proposition, mais suggère que la Commission ajoute à la résolution du représentant de la Chine, adoptée par la Commission, les deux paragraphes complémentaires suivants:

« La Commission considérant que la Chine, de concert avec tous les autres Etats membres de la Société, a chargé la Société des Nations de contrôler le trafic des drogues nuisibles, adresse au Gouvernement chinois la recommandation instante d'inviter des représentants de la Société à accompagner les commissaires dans leur enquête.

« La Commission désire également faire observer qu'une enquête ne pourra avoir de résultats que si elle est faite au cours de la saison pendant laquelle le pavot est en fleurs et elle prie le Gouvernement chinois de bien vouloir prendre ses dispositions en conséquence. »

De cette façon, des représentants de la Société des Nations n'accompagneraient la Commission qu'en vertu d'une décision du Gouvernement chinois. Cette proposition a le double avantage de fournir à l'opinion publique en Chine l'occasion de se prononcer et à la Société des Nations de s'acquitter de son mandat pour le plus grand profit de la Chine elle-même.

Si la Chine repousse cette proposition, la Société des Nations se verra dans l'impossibilité d'exécuter les obligations qui lui incombent.

La proposition du président est approuvée par les représentants du Japon, de la France (qui ne croit pas que le Gouvernement chinois puisse s'opposer à une simple suggestion), de l'Inde et du Portugal.

Sir John JORDAN déclare appuyer la proposition, pour autant que le Gouvernement chinois l'accepte.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) se déclare d'accord avec le principe de la résolution du président, mais, en fait, il ne peut pas l'accepter. Une résolution a été adoptée par la majorité de la Commission et ce vote a été enregistré au procès-verbal. La procédure parlementaire doit être observée. Quand il a demandé que sa proposition soit mise aux voix à la séance précédente, il ne pensait pas qu'elle serait adoptée. A sa surprise, elle l'a été et maintenant elle ne peut plus être modifiée. La Commission ne peut pas revenir sur une décision qu'elle a prise. Il remercie les membres de la Commission qui ont voté pour sa proposition, de la sympathie dont ils ont fait preuve à l'égard du Gouvernement chinois et du désir de celui-ci de résoudre par lui-même le problème de l'opium.

La proposition du représentant des Pays-Bas ne soulève pas d'objection, car elle a un caractère général et vise une enquête internationale s'étendant à tous les pays producteurs d'opium ou de morphine.

Contrairement à ce qu'a dit le président, il lui semble que la Commission a réservé un traitement spécial à la Chine. Pendant deux jours, les débats ont porté sur la Chine seulement et non pas sur le problème de la production de l'opium en général. Cette procédure est inadmissible. Le Gouvernement et le peuple de Chine lui inspirent toute confiance. La Chine est un Etat indépendant. On devrait la laisser régler la question en dehors de toute intervention étrangère. Le Gouvernement chinois ne peut accepter qu'une résolution d'ordre général s'appliquant à tous les pays également.

Il a déjà télégraphié à son Gouvernement que sa proposition était acceptée. Elle pourra être mise immédiatement en application, tandis que la proposition supplémentaire du président devrait encore être soumise au Conseil et à l'Assemblée. Les débats de la Commission consultative recevront en Chine la plus grande publicité et l'on peut compter que l'opinion publique exercera une forte pression sur les gouverneurs militaires.

Il appuie l'avis exprimé dans le deuxième paragraphe de la proposition du président, car il est important que l'enquête ait lieu à l'époque de la floraison du pavot.

En conclusion, il demande instamment à la Commission de laisser la Chine régler la question chinoise et de passer à l'étude de l'ensemble de la question. Si la résolution complémentaire du président est adoptée, il se verra obligé de faire une réserve formelle et il est certain que son gouvernement s'opposera à toute ingérence étrangère dans une question de politique intérieure. Par contre, si la résolution est rédigée en termes généraux et si d'autres gouvernements invitent des représentants de la Société des Nations à les aider dans leur enquête, la Chine donnera son consentement.

Le Prince CHAROON (Siam) tient à expliquer pourquoi il s'est abstenu de voter à la séance précédente. Le sens de la résolution lui semblait incertain et il ne l'approuve pas pour deux raisons. Tout d'abord, à son avis, la Commission n'a pas à s'occuper de la rupture d'un traité conclu entre la Grande-Bretagne et la Chine. D'autre part, si ses souvenirs sont exacts, le représentant de l'Inde a dit au cours de la dernière session de la Commission que la culture n'était pas visée par la Convention; la Chine n'est donc qu'un des pays producteurs et ne devrait pas être soumise à un traitement particulier.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), en réponse au prince Charoon, déclare n'avoir pas dit à la dernière session de la Commission que la Convention ne visait pas la culture. Il a dit qu'aux termes de la Convention chaque Etat doit édicter les lois nécessaires au contrôle de la culture.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) constate que la Commission, en votant la résolution du représentant de la Chine, a reconnu la valeur des arguments présentés par ce dernier, mais il résulte des déclarations de M. Chao-Hsin Chu que le Gouvernement chinois est disposé à accepter un contrôle international qui aurait une application générale. En conséquence, la Commission pourrait adopter

maintenant la résolution présentée par le représentant des Pays-Bas, laquelle n'est pas incompatible, à son avis, avec la résolution déjà adoptée

Sir John JORDAN estime qu'il serait regrettable que la proposition du président fût repoussée, mais si le Gouvernement chinois la repoussait, la Commission l'adopterait en vain. Il propose donc de laisser la question en suspens pour le moment et de procéder à l'examen de l'ensemble de la question d'Extrême-Orient.

M. BRENIER approuve cette proposition.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose de mettre aux voix les trois propositions suivantes dont la Commission est saisie.

1) *Proposition de sir John Jordan, tendant au renvoi de la suite de la discussion :*

Par quatre voix contre quatre, la voix du Président étant prépondérante, la Commission décide de continuer la discussion.

2) *Résolution du représentant des Pays-Bas :*

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que si cette résolution est adoptée, elle sera insérée à part dans un chapitre général du rapport et non pas dans le chapitre réservé à la question d'Extrême-Orient.

M. BRENIER approuve le projet de résolution, mais demande que les mots « à la convenance » (*at its discretion*) soient remplacés par les mots : « quand le besoin s'en fera sentir » et que le texte mentionne explicitement la cocaïne.

Ainsi amendée, la résolution est adoptée par cinq voix contre trois.

3) *Proposition complémentaire du Président.*

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare que sa proposition n'est qu'un cas particulier de la résolution que la Commission vient d'adopter.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) s'oppose énergiquement à ce qu'il soit procédé au vote de cette résolution. La Chine ne l'acceptera jamais. Dès lors à quoi bon voter ? Si elle adopte cette résolution, la Commission montrera clairement qu'elle s'en prend directement à la Chine, à laquelle elle réserve un traitement inacceptable.

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare qu'il s'agit simplement de l'application d'une résolution générale que le représentant de la Chine a votée, et que, d'ailleurs, ce dernier a approuvé le principe du deuxième paragraphe de la résolution en question.

Par cinq voix contre trois, la Commission décide que la résolution du président doit être mise aux voix et par cinq voix contre deux, la Commission adopte la résolution.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) demande qu'on inscrive au procès-verbal sa réserve formelle et l'indignation que lui cause la procédure suivie par la Commission, alors que le Gouvernement chinois a fait connaître d'avance son refus.

24. *La contrebande en Extrême-Orient.*

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant du Japon s'il a quelques renseignements à ajouter au mémoire qu'il a présenté sur le trafic de l'opium et de ses dérivés.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) déclare n'avoir rien à ajouter aux réponses au questionnaire envoyées par son Gouvernement, mais il est prêt à fournir tous les renseignements dont il dispose.

Sir John JORDAN constate que le tableau des importations et exportations de morphine au Japon révèle une augmentation considérable des importations entre les années 1910 et 1920 et demande à quoi on peut l'attribuer.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) reconnaît qu'avant l'application de la Convention, les importations dépassaient les besoins, mais que celles qui ont eu lieu en 1920 n'étaient pas destinées à la consommation d'une seule année et le surplus a pu être mis en stock. Il ajoute, en réponse à une question de M. BRENIER, qu'on fait droit aux demandes d'exportation lorsqu'elles émanent de personnes autorisées et que ces exportations figurent dans les statistiques des exportations officielles.

M. BRENIER fait remarquer que d'après les chiffres donnés antérieurement sur ce que représente une tonne de morphine en injections, 24 tonnes de morphine importées au Japon produisent 768 millions d'injections.

Sir John JORDAN demande au représentant du Japon de bien vouloir compléter sa réponse. L'augmentation des importations s'est produite pendant plusieurs années consécutives. Les

fabricants étrangers sont d'ailleurs aussi coupables que les marchands et intermédiaires; un fait est certain, c'est qu'il se fait une grande contrebande et que le nord de la Chine est inondé de morphine.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au représentant du Japon de bien vouloir traiter certaines questions à la prochaine séance. A part les importations, les quantités de morphine manufacturées au Japon ont augmenté. Le Japon fait remarquer dans sa réponse qu'il devait produire lui-même pour pourvoir à ses besoins pendant la guerre. Formose produit aussi des quantités qui ont également augmenté. Cette production qui n'est pas enregistrée par les douanes japonaises doit-elle être ajoutée à celle pour laquelle le Japon a fourni des statistiques ?

M. BRENIER demande quelles sont les sources des importations de morphine au Japon maintenant que la Grande-Bretagne a diminué ses exportations..

NEUVIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 24 avril 1922, à 15 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs.

25. *La contrebande en Extrême-Orient (suite).*

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon), en réponse à différentes questions qui lui ont été posées à la séance précédente, déclare que le Gouvernement japonais a fourni des statistiques complètes relatives aux importations et à la production de la morphine au Japon. Il n'existe pas de statistique pour les quantités nécessaires à la consommation intérieure ni pour les stocks existants.

La législation japonaise actuelle, relative à la morphine et autres drogues, est en vigueur depuis le 1^{er} janvier 1921. Avant cette date, l'importation, l'exportation et la production n'étaient pas réglementées.

S'il y a eu augmentation de l'importation et de la production de la morphine au Japon, cela est dû au fait qu'avant l'entrée en vigueur d'une législation spéciale le commerce avait un caractère international: l'importation et l'exportation dépendaient de la fluctuation des prix. La grande demande de morphine pendant la guerre a augmenté les bénéfices des commerçants et intensifié la production.

Le Gouvernement japonais reconnaît qu'il y a eu de la contrebande entre le Japon et le nord de la Chine, mais le manque de statistiques ne permet pas de préciser l'importance de cette contrebande.

Le Gouvernement japonais vient de prendre l'initiative d'une enquête afin de déterminer les quantités de morphine existant en stocks.

Le Gouvernement japonais se rend compte de la gravité de la situation et a pris de nouvelles mesures. Il réservera toujours le meilleur accueil à toute enquête que la Société des Nations voudra faire sur le trafic de la morphine au Japon.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) déclare qu'il est en mesure de confirmer l'exactitude de quelques-unes des statistiques japonaises en les comparant avec les statistiques de l'Inde qui y correspondent. Au cours des cinq années se terminant en 1920, l'Inde a exporté au Japon 962.360 livres d'opium brut, alors que d'après le chiffre de ses importations le Japon aurait reçu 909.201 livres. Les statistiques de ce genre ne sont jamais tout à fait concordantes, surtout en raison des cargaisons en mer au commencement ou à la fin d'une période déterminée; mais les chiffres justifient pleinement les critiques de sir John Jordan. Il est incontestable que de grandes quantités de morphine venant du Japon sont entrées en Chine en contrebande. La preuve principale en est fournie par les statistiques du Gouvernement japonais. Il convient de rendre hommage à la manière honnête et loyale dont ce Gouvernement a fait connaître ses statistiques. Si tous les Etats en faisaient autant, la question serait bientôt réglée.

Il tient à faire remarquer que les chiffres cités se rapportent à la période antérieure à l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention de La Haye. Le Gouvernement japonais manifeste maintenant l'intention d'appliquer rigoureusement la Convention et cela contribuera dans une large mesure à la solution du problème en Chine. C'est là un des premiers résultats du travail de la Commission consultative. Un grand progrès a été accompli, d'autant plus que le Gouvernement japonais aurait très bien pu se contenter de citer les statistiques fournies par d'autres Gouvernements pour leurs exportations au Japon, et ainsi, pour diverses raisons, la situation eût été beaucoup plus difficile à éclaircir, mais il a préféré montrer la situation sous son vrai jour, bien que cela ne fût pas à l'avantage du Japon.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT déclare qu'une grande quantité de morphine arrive au Japon des Etats-Unis d'Amérique. Pendant cinq mois de l'année 1920 il a été exporté assez de morphine au Japon pour y faire dix injections par tête. L'Amérique a pris des mesures très sévères qui ont eu pour effet de diminuer considérablement le commerce d'exportation et une nouvelle loi est à l'étude.

Elle cite des chiffres empruntés à des déclarations faites les 8 et 11 décembre 1920 devant la Sous-Commission de la Commission dite « on Ways and Means » de la Chambre des Représentants. Ils révèlent que l'Amérique exporte beaucoup de drogues nuisibles.

Sir John JORDAN tient à s'associer à l'hommage rendu par M. Campbell à la franchise de la réponse japonaise. Il insiste sur le fait que l'importation de morphine a toujours été en étroite relation avec la question de l'opium en Chine. Il aurait désiré que l'enquête qui doit être faite en Chine portât aussi sur la morphine.

L'importation de la morphine au Japon continue, bien que sur une moins grande échelle. Dans les dix premiers mois de 1921 il a été importé au Japon 193.308 onces de morphine. Ce chiffre est considérable si l'on songe que pendant les dix années antérieures à 1917 les importations n'ont jamais dépassé 32.000 onces par an. Ces chiffres sont empruntés à une lettre de l'Ambassadeur britannique à Tôkiô et semblaient provenir de statistiques publiées par le Gouvernement japonais.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) déclare que son Gouvernement fait l'impossible pour supprimer la contrebande, mais les importations considérables en 1921 s'expliquent par le fait que des quantités, en vertu de contrats antérieurs, devaient être achetées par les commerçants japonais et ne sont parvenues qu'après la fin de 1920, et même ces quantités, comparées avec les importations de 1920, révèlent une diminution d'environ un tiers.

Le PRÉSIDENT, résumant la question en ce qui concerne le Japon, dit que le Gouvernement japonais a soumis le trafic de l'opium à un contrôle rigoureux. L'opium n'est importé que pour le compte du Gouvernement, qui le répartit entre les fabricants autorisés, et ceux-ci ne produisent que les quantités dont le Gouvernement a besoin. Il ne peut être procédé aux importations qu'au moyen de permis et les quantités importées sont réglées sur la demande.

Le Gouvernement japonais a adopté le système des certificats d'importation.

Il semble y avoir certaines contradictions, surtout en ce qui concerne la Grande-Bretagne, dans les chiffres figurant au tableau des importations et exportations qui accompagnent la réponse du Gouvernement japonais au questionnaire. D'après les chiffres indiqués, le Japon a reçu de Grande-Bretagne 11.333 livres de morphine en 1921. Or, d'après les chiffres britanniques, il n'a été accordé un permis d'exportation que pour une quantité inférieure à une livre. Le Secrétariat pourrait peut-être faire une démarche auprès des deux Gouvernements afin de mettre au point cette contradiction et quelques autres.

D'après une lettre du ministre britannique à Pékin, en date du 16 décembre 1921, on a saisi à Tien-Tsin 300 livres d'héroïne dissimulées dans un chargement de sulfate de soude, à bord d'un navire japonais chargé à Osaka. Cette héroïne avait été manufacturée par une maison japonaise et on voudrait savoir comment une si grande quantité de drogue produite par une fabrique autorisée a pu parvenir entre les mains de contrebandiers.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) dit n'avoir jamais entendu parler de cette affaire, mais les commerçants détiennent encore des stocks de morphine. Quant au Gouvernement japonais, il applique les nouvelles lois avec la plus grande rigueur.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit qu'aux termes des nouvelles dispositions prises par la Conférence de Washington au sujet du service postal en Chine les bureaux de poste étrangers seront abolis à partir du 1^{er} janvier 1923. La Chine sera donc bientôt en mesure de lutter plus facilement contre la contrebande de l'opium par colis postaux.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) désire attirer l'attention sur les statistiques japonaises relatives aux exportations de morphine et de cocaïne de Suisse au Japon. En 1920 la Suisse aurait exporté au Japon 4.963 livres de morphine et 1.640 livres de cocaïne. Elle vient donc tout de suite après les Etats-Unis pour les exportations de ces drogues au Japon. La Suisse n'a pas signé la Convention internationale de l'opium et ces chiffres semblent montrer qu'il serait essentiel qu'elle la signât.

Sir John JORDAN demande si tous les pays mentionnés dans le tableau des importations japonaises ont réglementé le contrôle de la production de la morphine.

Le PRÉSIDENT le prie de s'en référer aux réponses des différents Gouvernements.

Cette partie des débats relatifs au problème d'Extrême-Orient ne donnant pas lieu à une résolution formelle, les résultats obtenus pourraient être résumés dans le rapport de la Commission au Conseil et celui-ci pourrait alors confier au Secrétariat le soin de prendre toutes les dispositions qui lui semblent nécessaire, soit qu'il se mette en relation avec le Gouvernement japonais, soit autrement.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare que la Chine s'intéresse vivement à la question de la morphine, car elle est la principale victime de la contrebande. Les chiffres publiés prouvent que les quantités de morphine produites et exportées sont énormes et que dans tous les pays, l'offre dépasse beaucoup la demande. Le représentant de l'Inde, dans sa critique de la Chine, a dit que si on lui confiait le soin de procéder à une enquête, ce serait comme si on chargeait un voleur de faire un rapport sur son propre délit. Si la Chine est un voleur, il y a d'autres et de plus grands voleurs que la Société des Nations devrait attraper; elle ne devrait pas permettre à certains gouvernements de protéger les producteurs de morphine et d'empoisonner le reste du monde.

Il constate que trois jours durant, des résolutions ont été proposées dans le dessein d'intervenir dans les affaires intérieures de la Chine, mais qu'aucune résolution n'a été proposée tendant à une intervention dans les affaires d'aucun autre pays. Pourquoi un traitement spécial pour la Chine? La Chine est disposée à faire de son mieux, pourvu que le reste du monde la laisse tranquille. Confucius a dit: «Aucun homme dans ce monde n'est parfait, mais celui qui reconnaît son erreur est l'homme parfait».

26. *La question d'Extrême-Orient.*

La situation à Hong-Kong, Macao, dans le Siam, en Indo-Chine, dans les Etablissements des détroits, dans le nord de Bornéo, etc.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) se déclare prêt à fournir toutes les statistiques désirables sur l'Inde. Comme il l'a dit dans une séance précédente, la consommation annuelle d'opium, par tête, est en Inde de 26 grains. Ce chiffre n'a pas varié depuis trente ans.

En ce qui concerne les exportations, la réponse du Gouvernement de l'Inde au questionnaire a donné lieu à un malentendu. L'Inde n'exporte pas de morphine, en dehors de la fabrique gouvernementale de Chazipore. La morphine est exportée exclusivement à Londres, dans les mêmes conditions où elle est exportée d'autres pays en Grande-Bretagne. En réalité, il n'y a pas eu d'exportation depuis deux ans. L'Inde a adopté le système des certificats d'importation.

Il n'a pas été produit de cocaïne ou d'opium médicinal.

Une grande quantité d'opium brut a été envoyée en Grande-Bretagne pendant la guerre pour les besoins médicaux et c'est par erreur qu'elle a été classée dans les statistiques comme « opium médicinal ».

Sir John JORDAN suggère que la Commission examine la proposition du prince Charoon. Cette proposition tend à la suppression progressive du trafic par le rationnement des possessions des Puissances européennes. Elle est conforme à la disposition approuvée à Shanghai en 1909 et le principe en a été repris dans la Convention de l'opium. Il est tout à fait naturel que la proposition soit faite par le représentant du Siam. Le Siam est le seul Etat indépendant intéressé, les autres territoires intéressés sont dépendants.

Il se rend compte qu'il est impossible de supprimer immédiatement le trafic en raison des questions économiques et financières qui se posent. Cependant, on peut procéder à la suppression progressive de la production de l'opium préparé. Avant d'entrer dans les détails, la Commission devrait étudier la question dans son ensemble. Les membres de la Commission devraient inviter leurs gouvernements respectifs à fixer le minimum des quantités dont ils ont besoin; ce minimum pourrait être réduit progressivement année après année.

M. BRENIER approuve en principe la proposition de Sir John Jordan, mais il fait remarquer qu'il faut insister sur le fait qu'il est nécessaire que la Chine supprime progressivement la culture du pavot. L'Indo-Chine est aussi intéressée à la suppression de la production de l'opium en Chine que la Chine à la suppression du trafic de l'opium préparé en Indo-Chine. Il faut mettre un terme à la contrebande de l'opium brut qui part du Yunnan.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que la Commission a décidé d'examiner la proposition du prince Charoon lors de la discussion de la dixième question de l'ordre du jour. Il propose donc que la Commission passe à l'examen de cette question.

M. BOURGOIS tient à présenter à la Commission quelques renseignements sur la situation en Indo-Chine, en réponse à certaines questions posées dans le résumé des réponses au questionnaire.

Le résumé mentionne le manque d'information sur Kwang Tcheou Wan. M. Bourgois n'est pas encore en possession des statistiques de 1920 et 1921, mais il peut dès maintenant informer la Commission que le régime de la régie a été étendu à ce territoire en 1914 et que le décret de juillet 1919, tendant à la suppression progressive du trafic de l'opium en Indo-Chine, lui est applicable. L'effet de ces mesures a été immédiat. L'importation est tombée de plusieurs milliers de caisses avant 1914 à 600 caisses, puis à 300 en 1919.

En réponse à une question du président, M. Brenier déclare que le nombre des habitants de ce territoire, qui était d'environ 200.000 en 1914, doit être maintenant voisin de 300.000.

Continuant son exposé, M. Bourgois explique que la suppression totale des fumeries a été effectuée, non pas seulement dans certaines régions, mais dans tout l'Annam et dans tout le Tonkin, soit plus des deux tiers de l'Indo-Chine. Il n'y a plus de fumeries en Cochinchine que dans quelques grandes villes, telles que Saïgon et Cholon, où elles disparaîtront par voie d'extinction. Un nouveau décret de juillet 1919 a renforcé les mesures de restriction. Il y a seulement 70.000 fumeurs pour près de 20 millions d'habitants, soit environ 3 pour mille de la population totale. La population annamite n'est pas atteinte. L'Indo-Chine est, parmi les pays d'Extrême-Orient, le plus faible consommateur et le moins menacé d'intoxication.

Le résumé relève l'accroissement de la consommation au cours des années 1916 à 1918. Mais les statistiques accusent, pour cette même période, une augmentation générale et parallèle du trafic de l'opium dans tous les pays voisins. Elle s'explique, en Indo-Chine, par les conditions spéciales créées par la guerre, par la prospérité sans précédent due à deux récoltes de riz exceptionnelles, par l'élévation énorme du chiffre des exportations, par le passage d'environ 50.000 ouvriers chinois. La vente est immédiatement retombée de 114.700 kilogs en 1918 à 57.000 en 1919.

Cette période de 1916-1918 écartée, comme anormale et faussée par la guerre, les chiffres relatifs à la période 1910-1920, donnent dans leur ensemble une opinion favorable: c'est ainsi que la moyenne de 1920 et 1921 (60.000 kilogs) présente une diminution de 14 % sur la moyenne de 1910 à 1916 (60.794 kilogs). Il est du reste à noter que pour avoir une idée exacte du progrès réalisé, il convient, comme l'a fait le Gouvernement de l'Indo-Chine, de faire remonter les statistiques à l'année 1907, point de départ de la lutte de ce Gouvernement contre l'opium et qu'ainsi

c'est bien le chiffre de 45 % de diminution qui donne la mesure véritable de l'effort exercé et des résultats obtenus.

En résumé, de quelque façon que l'on groupe les chiffres, ils permettent d'affirmer que les mesures prises pour la suppression progressive en Indo-Chine du trafic de l'opium, se montrent efficaces et que cette suppression progressive, poursuivie sans interruption, ralentie peut-être par la guerre, mais reprise énergiquement par le décret de 1919, se présente actuellement en bonne voie de réalisation.

On a aussi signalé le manque d'information au sujet des narcotiques. En 1920, les importations en Indo-Chine s'élevèrent à 63 kilogs pour une population de 18 millions d'habitants, ce qui représente 4 milligrammes par tête, c'est-à-dire moins du douzième de la quantité par tête importée par la Suisse.

Sir John JORDAN estime ces explications satisfaisantes. Cependant, si la Commission tient à entrer dans les détails de ce genre, il se verra obligé d'attirer son attention sur de nombreux cas. Dans certaines possessions britanniques, par exemple, la quantité d'opium par tête est d'environ 1 livre. Il est certain que si l'on comparait les quantités moyennes d'opium consommées par les habitants de la Chine et par les populations chinoises vivant à l'étranger, le pourcentage serait très inférieur pour les Chinois à l'intérieur du pays.

Sur la proposition du PRÉSIDENT, la suite de la discussion est ajournée à la prochaine séance.

DIXIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 25 avril, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs, à l'exception de M. BRENIER.

27. Approbation des procès-verbaux.

Le procès-verbal de la huitième séance est approuvé sous réserve de certains amendements.

28. Enquête sur les besoins approximatifs d'opium brut visé au chapitre I de la Convention de l'opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que la Commission ne s'est occupée jusqu'ici que du problème d'Extrême-Orient et qu'elle doit examiner maintenant le contrôle de la fabrication, la distribution et l'usage de l'opium, de la morphine et de la cocaïne dans le monde en général et particulièrement dans certains pays d'Europe et d'Amérique. Elle n'a donc pas encore épuisé la question des réponses au questionnaire.

Conformément à la demande faite par sir John Jordan à la dernière séance, il propose d'aborder, en même temps que le n° 10 de l'ordre du jour, la question soulevée par la lettre du prince Charoon à Dame Rachel Crowdy.

La résolution du Conseil relative au numéro 10 de l'ordre du jour est ainsi conçue:

« Qu'étant donné l'intérêt témoigné par le monde entier à l'attitude de la Société des Nations à l'égard de la question de l'opium, et le désir universel de limiter la production de l'opium à la quantité nécessaire aux besoins légitimes, la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium soit invitée à étudier, au cours de sa prochaine séance, la possibilité de procéder à une enquête afin de déterminer la quantité moyenne d'opium brut spécifiée au chapitre I de la Convention pour les besoins légitimes dans les différents pays, et à présenter un rapport à ce sujet. »

Le prince Charoon propose dans sa lettre que chaque pays soit invité à indiquer les quantités approximatives d'opium brut qu'il lui faut chaque année pour satisfaire aux besoins des fumeurs et consommateurs d'opium préparé et pour les besoins médicaux ou scientifiques.

Le prince CHAROON (Siam) estime que c'est de là qu'il faut partir pour atteindre le but que la Commission a en vue. Les chiffres que l'on obtiendrait n'auraient pas un caractère scientifique, mais ils seraient assez précis pour permettre à la Commission d'évaluer les besoins de chaque Etat. Le docteur Norman White a déclaré à la Commission que l'enquête conduite par la Commission d'hygiène de la Société des Nations avait prouvé qu'il était impossible de recueillir des statistiques qui établissent d'une manière absolue les besoins légitimes de chaque pays.

On peut répondre que les réponses au questionnaire indiquent les quantités nécessaires. Mais, pour cela il faudrait un expert qui sache interpréter les statistiques et qui dispose de beaucoup de temps. Il n'a pas la prétention d'être lui-même cet expert et il ne croit pas que les membres de la Commission puissent consacrer le temps voulu à un examen aussi minutieux des réponses au questionnaire.

En conséquence, afin de fournir à la Commission une indication suffisamment précise des besoins du monde en opium brut, il soumet la résolution suivante:

« Afin de recueillir les renseignements nécessaires à l'élaboration d'un plan d'action général en vue du contrôle et de la répression du trafic illégitime des drogues nuisibles, la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium demande au Conseil de la Société des Nations d'inviter les gouvernements de tous les Etats signataires de la Convention de 1912, ainsi que les autres Etats membres de la Société, à faire parvenir au Secrétaire général de la Société un relevé indiquant la quantité annuelle totale d'opium et de ses dérivés dont ont besoin leurs pays respectifs pour la consommation

intérieure. La Commission consultative estime qu'il y aurait lieu pour chaque gouvernement de signaler dans ce relevé les besoins du pays pour tous usages en indiquant les quantités requises pour les besoins médicaux, scientifiques et autres. Ce relevé devra parvenir au Secrétaire général le 1^{er} avril 1923 au plus tard ».

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) se déclare entièrement d'accord avec la proposition du prince Charoon, mais il ne voit pas bien quel avantage pratique la Commission en retirera. Ce que le prince Charoon et sir John Jordan considèrent comme un idéal à atteindre dans l'avenir est en réalité, à son avis, un résultat que la Commission a déjà obtenu actuellement. La Convention de La Haye et le système des certificats d'importation permettent de contrôler les exportations d'opium brut des pays producteurs, signataires de la Convention, et limitent ces exportations aux quantités certifiées nécessaires pour les besoins légitimes. La responsabilité des importations d'opium incombe clairement, publiquement et directement à l'Etat importateur. Il ne semble pas que la résolution du prince Charoon aille aussi loin.

En ce qui concerne le commerce de l'opium entre le Siam et l'Inde, l'Inde n'expédie pas d'opium au Siam, sauf sur demande du Siam pour ses besoins légitimes et il en est de même pour tous les pays qui importent de l'opium de l'Inde. La Commission ne doit pas oublier que la vraie difficulté réside dans le fait que certains pays, par exemple, la Turquie et la Perse, échappent au contrôle, n'étant pas signataires de la Convention. Il n'y a pas lieu de mentionner la Chine, qui ne semble pas importante pour le moment au point de vue des exportations. Aucune formule, ni aucune procédure ne pourront remédier à cette difficulté fondamentale.

La résolution du prince Charoon devrait subir certaines modifications de forme pour être d'accord avec les vues des Etats-Unis. L'importance donnée à la consommation intérieure semble être quelque peu en contradiction avec le sens général de la résolution. Si les Etats sont invités à indiquer les besoins de la consommation intérieure, il semble illogique de leur demander aussi d'indiquer les quantités dont ils ont besoin pour la fabrication, puisque les pays qui préparent l'opium exportent en général la plus grande partie des drogues produites. La demande de produits fabriqués variera aussi naturellement.

Enfin, la résolution devrait laisser plus de liberté aux Gouvernements pour la fixation de leurs besoins. Ceux-ci varieront sans doute d'année en année. Il est très possible, par exemple, qu'il se produise une renaissance de l'industrie du caoutchouc dans les Etablissements des détroits et il en résulterait une augmentation de la main-d'œuvre chinoise qui entraînerait une augmentation des importations d'opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) appuie la résolution du prince Charoon parce qu'il considère que c'est la seule solution du problème de l'opium, particulièrement en ce qui concerne l'Extrême-Orient. Comme il l'a dit à une précédente séance, une tonne de morphine est suffisante pour 32 millions d'injections: c'est plus qu'il n'en faut pour les deux Amériques. L'année passée, l'Amérique a produit environ 34 tonnes de morphine et l'Angleterre 53 tonnes. Il estime qu'une tonne suffit aux besoins de l'Amérique entière, deux tonnes à ceux de l'Europe et six à ceux de l'Asie. En tenant compte de toutes les éventualités, il suffirait de dix tonnes pour satisfaire aux besoins du monde entier. En conséquence, quand la Commission aura reçu de tous les Etats les statistiques relatives à leurs besoins en opium, morphine et autres drogues, elle pourra, l'année suivante, demander à ces Etats qui produisent de l'opium et de la morphine pourquoi leur production dépasse les besoins du monde. La proposition du prince Charoon est très pratique et si elle est adoptée, la Commission sera bientôt en mesure de procéder à la limitation de la production.

Le PRÉSIDENT déclare qu'il ne veut pas interrompre les débats, mais les chiffres donnés par le représentant de la Chine appellent une mise au point. M. Chu a dit que la Grande-Bretagne produisait 53 tonnes de morphine par an, ce qui représenterait 1.899.520 onces. Or, les statistiques fournies par la Grande-Bretagne, dans sa réponse au questionnaire, montrent qu'en 1919 la production était 547.000 onces et en 1920 de 643.000 onces. En dehors de la période de guerre, pendant laquelle la Grande-Bretagne a fourni ses alliés de morphine, la quantité moyenne produite a varié entre 486.000 onces et 643.000 onces (production de 1920).

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) déclare que ses chiffres sont empruntés au *Times* et qu'il s'efforcera de fournir la référence exacte.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit qu'une tonne correspond à 35.840 onces de morphine. Il n'est pas en mesure d'indiquer d'une manière absolue quels sont les besoins légitimes de l'Angleterre, mais ils ont été évalués très approximativement par des personnes autorisées à environ 30.000 ou 50.000 onces par an. Si ce chiffre est exact, une population inférieure à 50 millions consomme au moins une tonne par an et c'est la quantité que le représentant de la Chine croit suffisante pour les deux Amériques. Pour la seule Amérique du Nord, qui a une population d'environ 130 millions, il ne faut pas moins de trois tonnes.

Les chiffres qu'il vient de donner ne sont qu'approximatifs et il ne les a cités que pour réfuter ceux du représentant de la Chine qui, à son avis, ne correspondent nullement à la réalité.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT cite des statistiques empruntées à un document du Sénat N° 377, 61^{me} Congrès, 2^{me} session. Elle suggère que ces statistiques soient soumises aux pays qu'elles concernent, avec prière d'en vérifier l'exactitude. De cette manière, la Commission saurait sur quelle base évaluer les besoins légitimes.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande à Mrs. Hamilton Wright de bien vouloir communiquer ces statistiques dans un mémorandum.

Sir John JORDAN se déclare entièrement d'accord avec la proposition du prince Charoon. Il tient à éviter toute controverse, mais il ne peut pas admettre le point de vue de M. Campbell d'après lequel ladite résolution n'irait pas au delà des résultats obtenus par la Commission. Elle marque un excellent point de départ. Il ne veut pas critiquer l'Inde, mais il est de notoriété publique que de grandes quantités d'opium sont exportées dans les pays du monde, particulièrement dans les pays orientaux. Les quantités importées dépassent les besoins de ces pays. La Convention de La Haye de 1912 a envisagé la suppression progressive du trafic de l'opium, mais on n'a pas fait grand'chose dans ce sens ces dernières années. Il serait bon que la résolution mentionnât explicitement la suppression progressive du trafic.

La proposition a en outre l'avantage de permettre à la Commission d'examiner des statistiques se rapportant aux besoins à venir, tandis que les réponses au questionnaire contiennent des statistiques se rapportant à l'année passée.

La résolution devrait être amendée de manière à spécifier plus exactement, comme le Président l'a fait lui-même, les différents usages de l'opium dans la consommation intérieure. Il voudrait également qu'on ajoute la phrase suivante à la fin de la résolution :

« Il est particulièrement important que les informations relatives aux quantités requises dans les pays d'Extrême-Orient où des Chinois sont les principaux consommateurs soient fournies à la même date. »

Tout le monde désire que la Chine limite la culture du pavot. Les mots ci-dessus l'inciteraient à cette limitation, car ils montreraient que les Puissances étrangères réduisent leur consommation et que la production doit être réduite en proportion.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) appuie la proposition du prince Charoon. Les besoins de l'Allemagne sont comme ceux de l'Angleterre, d'ordre purement médical. Il y a des abus, mais peu. La vente de la morphine et autres drogues pernicieuses est contrôlée par les certificats des médecins. Les droguistes sont rationnés et leur certificat doit être renouvelé tous les trois mois. Ce certificat mentionne les quantités de drogues qu'ils peuvent avoir en leur possession et pour toute quantité supplémentaire une autorisation spéciale est nécessaire. De cette façon, toutes les quantités des drogues sont enregistrées et il est très facile de connaître les besoins légitimes de l'Allemagne.

En ce qui concerne les quantités nécessaires à la fabrication, la situation est plus difficile, car les quantités manufacturées dépendent de la demande d'autres pays. Quand le système de certificats d'importation aura été universellement adopté, il sera plus facile d'avoir des chiffres précis.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) appuie la résolution du prince Charoon et les amendements de sir John Jordan.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) appuie également le prince Charoon.

Le PRÉSIDENT appuie la résolution et estime, d'accord avec sir John Jordan, que le texte en devrait être précisé.

La quantité de morphine contenue dans l'opium varie avec la qualité de l'opium. L'opium européen est le plus riche en morphine, ensuite vient celui de Turquie, puis celui de Perse, puis celui de l'Inde et enfin celui d'Extrême-Orient. Il faut donc qu'en indiquant leurs besoins d'opium brut, les pays stipulent la qualité d'opium qu'ils désirent importer.

Il faut aussi que les chiffres des besoins en dérivés soient donnés sous une forme précise. Des pays qui ne fabriquent pas eux-mêmes importent toute espèce de préparations de morphine. En conséquence, les chiffres ne devraient pas mentionner le poids de ces préparations, mais le poids de morphine qu'elles contiennent. D'accord avec sir John Jordan, il estime que les quantités requises pour les besoins médicaux, les produits manufacturés, et pour les fins commerciales devraient être indiquées séparément dans les statistiques.

Il est à la fois optimiste et pessimiste quant aux résultats de la proposition. Certains pays, le Japon et l'Italie par exemple, ainsi qu'il ressort de leurs réponses au questionnaire, seront en mesure de fournir des chiffres assez précis, mais il n'en est pas de même pour d'autres pays. Ainsi, lors de l'enquête faite par la Commission d'hygiène, l'Autriche a répondu qu'il n'existait pas de statistiques sur lesquelles baser une évaluation des besoins légitimes de l'Autriche et que la seule chose à faire serait d'envoyer une lettre circulaire à tous les droguistes. Il faudrait du temps pour recueillir de cette façon des informations qui seraient loin d'être complètes.

Si donc la Commission adopte la proposition, elle ne doit pas s'attendre à recueillir autre chose que des chiffres approximatifs.

Il appuie cependant la proposition et suggère, que le prince Charoon et lui-même, assistés par le Secrétariat, rédigent à nouveau la résolution en tenant compte des différents amendements proposés.

La Commission approuve cette procédure.

Le PRÉSIDENT, considérant que la question n° 10 de l'ordre du jour est épuisée, propose que la résolution du prince Charoon, que le Comité vient d'adopter, soit transmise au Conseil, accom-

pagnée d'une note disant que la Commission considère que cette résolution marque le premier pas dans l'exécution des instructions qu'elle a reçues en ce qui concerne les enquêtes à faire sur les besoins en opium brut.

29. *Extension des recherches permettant d'y comprendre toutes les drogues nuisibles ayant des effets analogues à ceux produits par les drogues visées à la Convention (N^o 11 de l'ordre du jour.)*

M. BOURGOIS (France) constate que la Commission a deux points à examiner. Le premier porte sur l'extension des études aux drogues synthétiques non visées par la Convention internationale de l'opium de 1912, et l'autre sur les avantages qu'il y aurait à convoquer une nouvelle conférence internationale.

Le Gouvernement français a fourni à la Commission une liste de drogues dont quelques-unes ne rentrent pas dans la catégorie visée par la Convention. Elles font l'objet d'un important commerce clandestin. En France, le commerce de ces produits est réglementé par la législation, et les services de répression peuvent atteindre les infractions. La Commission doit examiner d'abord si le trafic de ces produits, et en particulier de la cocaïne synthétique, est réglementé dans les différents pays et il demande aux membres de la Commission s'ils ont quelques renseignements sur la législation en vigueur dans leurs pays respectifs.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) déclare qu'au Japon les drogues synthétiques n'ont pas donné lieu jusqu'ici à des abus mais que s'il paraît nécessaire de les contrôler, on leur appliquera immédiatement les règlements applicables à la morphine, à la cocaïne et autres drogues. La section III de l'article 12 du règlement porte que: tout médicament qui, de l'avis du ministre de l'Intérieur, a les mêmes effets que ceux mentionnés dans les deux sections précédentes, est soumis aux mêmes dispositions que la morphine, la cocaïne et leurs sels respectifs.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) remarque que d'après le Gouvernement français, la liste qu'il a soumise ne contient — excepté l'apomorphine qui est seulement émétique — que des produits dont les effets sont analogues à ceux de la morphine, c'est-à-dire des produits narcotiques, ou des produits dont les effets sont analogues à ceux de la cocaïne, c'est-à-dire des produits anesthésiques. En Allemagne, toutes les préparations tombent sous le coup des dispositions qui s'appliquent aux drogues dangereuses vendues par les pharmaciens.

Il ne croit pas que toutes les drogues soient nuisibles au même degré que la morphine et la cocaïne. Des recherches scientifiques ont montré qu'il n'est pas fait le même abus de ces drogues que de la morphine et de la cocaïne.

La dionine et la péronine ont les mêmes qualités que la codéine qui n'est pas nuisible. Ces produits sont analogues en composition chimique. L'emploi de la codéine, de la dionine, de l'éty-morphine, de la péronine, de la benzylmorphine ne dégénère pas, comme pour la morphine et la cocaïne, en morphinisme et en cocaïnisme.

La cocaïne artificielle est probablement aussi nuisible que la cocaïne, mais cette question doit être examinée et l'emploi de ce produit n'est pas encore très étendu. Il ne semble pas que l'holocaïne donne lieu à des abus analogues à ceux de la cocaïne; ce point aussi reste à examiner. La novococaïne et, dans certains cas, l'eucaine B et l'euphthalmine sont d'excellents succédanés non nuisibles. L'anesthésine est une préparation pour usage externe. Elle n'est pas soluble dans l'eau. Sa préparation soluble dans l'eau est la subcutine qui n'est pas semblable à la cocaïne. L'alypine est une préparation synthétique qui ne donne pas lieu à des abus. La stovaine est un excellent stupéfiant dont se servent beaucoup de chirurgiens. Elle a été inventée par le professeur Fourneau de Paris.

La tropacocaïne n'est guère connue.

Comme le Dr Norman White l'a dit l'autre jour, les préparations synthétiques qui peuvent remplacer les drogues nuisibles doivent être encouragées. Les chimistes et les médecins doivent produire des substances non nocives afin d'éliminer la morphine et la cocaïne.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) déclare que toutes les informations relatives à la législation néerlandaise se trouvent dans la réponse au questionnaire.

M. BOURGOIS (France) estime que si quelques-uns de ces produits synthétiques sont déjà visés par la législation d'un certain nombre de pays, la Commission pourrait immédiatement les ajouter aux listes de produits sur lesquels portent ses enquêtes, ou visés par les mesures qu'elle propose.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande au Dr Norman WHITE son avis sur la liste des drogues fournie par le Gouvernement français. Il n'est pas lui-même en mesure de fournir des renseignements sur la situation en Grande-Bretagne car il n'a reçu la liste des drogues envoyée par le Gouvernement français que juste avant le commencement de la session.

Le Dr Norman WHITE (Directeur adjoint de la Section d'hygiène du Secrétariat) hésite à donner son avis après ce que le représentant allemand vient de dire. Il lui semble toutefois que certaines drogues ont été portées sur la liste par erreur. L'apomorphine, par exemple, n'est employée que comme émétique et ne peut guère donner lieu à des abus. La Commission pourrait s'adresser aux différents gouvernements pour leur demander quelles drogues donnent lieu à des abus et si une

réglementation est nécessaire. Les réglementations peuvent être suffisamment élastiques pour qu'on puisse ajouter à la liste toute drogue qui donne lieu à des abus.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) fait observer que certaines drogues, la péronine et la dionine, par exemple, ont des effets beaucoup plus durables que la morphine. Toutefois, tant qu'il ne sera pas prouvé que ces drogues donnent lieu à des abus il ne croit pas nécessaire de les ajouter à la liste.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) remarque que le Gouvernement français a voulu assurer un contrôle sur certaines drogues synthétiques et d'origine minérale qui ne sont pas visées par la Convention de La Haye. Or, la liste qu'il a dressée comprend quelques drogues visées par la Convention et le D^r Norman White devrait être invité à écarter, si possible, les drogues déjà visées, afin que la liste soit réduite à des proportions raisonnables.

Le PRÉSIDENT donne lecture de l'article 14 de la Convention internationale de l'opium de 1912, qui stipule qu'en plus des préparations qui contiennent de la morphine, de la cocaïne et de l'héroïne, la Convention vise tout nouveau dérivé de la morphine, de la cocaïne, ou de leurs sels respectifs, ou tout autre alcaloïde de l'opium, qui pourrait, à la suite de recherches scientifiques généralement reconnues, donner lieu à des abus analogues et avoir pour résultat les mêmes effets nuisibles. Cela signifie que la Convention ne s'applique qu'aux nouveaux dérivés, qui, d'après les recherches scientifiques, peuvent donner lieu à des abus. Avant donc que la Commission puisse recommander leur insertion dans la liste, il faut que le corps médical et l'opinion scientifique se prononcent.

Le D^r Norman WHITE explique que plusieurs de ces drogues sont d'abord à base alcaloïde, et qu'elles sont ensuite transformées. La Convention ne parle pas des produits non alcaloïdes et les alcaloïdes peuvent être tirés de corps beaucoup plus simples que l'opium.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) dit que la morphine est nuisible parce qu'elle contient un groupe phénylique ouvert. Quand ce groupe est fermé par un groupe alcoolique, la morphine perd ses effets nuisibles et ne donne pas lieu à des habitudes funestes. La codéine dérive de la morphine par le groupe méthylique. La dionine est encore moins nuisible par rapport à l'habitude que la codéine parce que son groupe éthylique est plus difficile à enlever que le groupe méthylique.

Le PRÉSIDENT suggère que le D^r Anselmino prépare un mémorandum contenant les observations qu'il a soumises à la Commission. Il pourrait être assisté du D^r Norman White, de M. Miyajima et de M. Campbell.

La Commission doit déterminer si les dérivés de la morphine et autres alcaloïdes de l'opium sont reconnus comme donnant lieu à des abus. Si oui, la Convention de La Haye leur est applicable automatiquement.

Après consultation avec le représentant de la France, il est décidé que la liste soumise par le Gouvernement français sera envoyée aux gouvernements en leur demandant de faire parvenir les observations de leurs départements d'hygiène. Quand les informations scientifiques nécessaires auront été recueillies, la Commission sera en mesure de faire une recommandation précise. En attendant, la Commission peut ajourner la question de la convocation d'une nouvelle conférence internationale.

La Commission approuve cette suggestion.

ONZIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 25 avril 1922, à 15 heures.

Présents : Tous les membres de la Commission et les assesseurs, à l'exception de M. BRENIER.

30. - Enquête sur les besoins approximatifs d'opium brut (suite).

Le PRÉSIDENT lit la résolution suivante:

« La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements de tous les Etats signataires de la Convention de 1912 et les autres Etats Membres de la Société des Nations, à fournir au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations un relevé des besoins totaux de leur consommation intérieure annuelle de l'opium et de ses dérivés, en indiquant séparément, si possible, les quantités employées respectivement pour des usages médicaux, scientifiques et autres. Ce relevé devra établir une distinction entre les sortes d'opium utilisées, et, dans le cas des dérivés de l'opium, les quantités seront indiquées d'après la teneur en morphine.

La Commission consultative estime en outre que ce relevé devra parvenir au Secrétaire général le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard, et qu'il est de la plus haute importance que les chiffres relatifs aux quantités d'opium nécessaires à la consommation des pays d'Extrême-Orient, où les Chinois sont les principaux consommateurs, parviennent au Secrétariat à cette date au plus tard.

La résolution est adoptée.

Le PRÉSIDENT lit ensuite un extrait d'une lettre de Smyrne du 31 mars 1922, relative au marché de l'opium. D'après cette lettre, la vigoureuse campagne menée aux Etats-Unis et en Grande-Bretagne contre le trafic de l'opium a eu pour effet d'arrêter dans une large mesure les exportations d'opium de Smyrne, Constantinople et Salonique. Mais de grandes quantités d'opium sont vendues aux trafiquants et transportées par terre à travers la Sibérie et autres contrées asiatiques jusqu'en Extrême-Orient. On s'attend à ce que ce trafic se développe considérablement quand la paix aura été établie en Asie Mineure. Le Président fait remarquer que ces informations confirment celles qui ont déjà été données sur le trafic de l'opium entre l'Afghanistan, le Turkestan et la Chine.

Sir John JORDAN espère que la Commission examinera cette question. Il se fait beaucoup de contrebande dans le nord de la Chine par la Mandchourie. Le pavot est cultivé au Turkestan et l'opium transporté par des Afghans et peut-être par des Hindous, protégés britanniques, jusqu'en Extrême-Orient, à travers le territoire russe. Les journaux ont parlé d'un monopole de l'opium qui aurait été institué à Vladivostok.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) remercie sir John Jordan d'avoir attiré l'attention sur ces faits. Son gouvernement l'a chargé d'informer la Commission de ce trafic de l'opium par voie terrestre.

On dit que des sujets britanniques sont occupés à ce trafic à Kashgar. La culture est permise en territoire russe, et à Vladivostok une compagnie a été autorisée officiellement à faire le commerce de l'opium. Le Consul général chinois à Vladivostok a été chargé de protester.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) explique que le monopole en question a été accordé par les autorités russes de Vladivostok à des Coréens qui ne sont pas soumis au contrôle du Gouvernement japonais. Il a demandé là-dessus des informations supplémentaires au Japon.

Sir John JORDAN dit que d'après les journaux, l'opium en question est transporté de Vladivostok à Chinanpoo et vendu par une compagnie de Japonais et de Chinois.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) dit avoir vu dans les journaux des statistiques qui montrent que de l'opium est transporté de l'Afghanistan dans le Turkestan chinois et en Chine, par voie terrestre. Il croit que cet opium a poussé en partie dans l'Afghanistan, mais provient principalement de Perse. On dit que le trafic a cessé à cause de la baisse du prix de la drogue en Chine. En effet, le transport par dessus les montagnes est très coûteux et le commerce ne produit pas de bénéfices quand les prix sont normaux.

La Commission peut avoir l'assurance qu'aucune partie de cet opium ne vient de l'Inde. On se trouve ici en présence de la difficulté du contrôle des exportations provenant de pays qui ne sont pas signataires de la Convention de l'opium. L'Afghanistan n'est ni signataire de la Convention, ni Membre de la Société des Nations. La Compagnie de Vladivostok a demandé à recevoir de l'Inde un minimum de 180.000 livres d'opium. La Commission peut être certaine qu'aucune quantité d'opium ne sera exportée de l'Inde en réponse à cette demande.

Il n'est pas en mesure de dire si des sujets de l'Inde britannique s'occupent de la culture et du transport de l'opium à Kashgar et dans le Turkestan chinois. Ses souvenirs ne sont pas précis sur ce point, mais il pense que des rapports publiés il y a deux ans, montrent que le Consul de Kashgar a procédé à une enquête à la suite de plaintes et puni les coupables, mais la nature du pays rend évidemment très difficile l'exercice d'un contrôle efficace.

Sur la proposition du PRÉSIDENT, la Commission décide que le Secrétariat demandera au Gouvernement de l'Inde de lui fournir toutes informations non confidentielles reçues des représentants britanniques dans le Turkestan chinois.

3. Fabrication, vente et usage de la morphine et de la cocaïne.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose que la Commission examine la question du contrôle de la fabrication de la vente et de l'usage de la morphine et de la cocaïne en général, en s'attachant particulièrement aux pays où ces drogues donnent lieu à des abus. Les déclarations du représentant de la France à la deuxième Assemblée et d'autres sources d'informations ont révélé qu'il se fait un trafic illicite considérable de ces drogues dans les pays d'Europe occidentale et en Amérique. De grandes quantités de cocaïne sont introduites frauduleusement en Grande-Bretagne, la police fait souvent des saisies et les colporteurs de cocaïne sont poursuivis. Il n'a pas été possible jusqu'ici de découvrir la source de ces importations ni les personnes à qui incombe réellement la responsabilité de ce trafic. La France est encore plus atteinte. Elle est grandement intéressée à ce qu'on dépiste les trafiquants et surveille le commerce. Le seul moyen efficace est de contrôler la production. La cocaïne n'est pas facile à préparer et ne peut l'être que par des experts chimistes. Il s'agit de découvrir les centres de production, les intermédiaires et les acheteurs. Le Gouvernement hollandais n'a pas pu fournir de statistiques sur la production de la fabrique d'Amsterdam. Les Gouvernements suisse et allemand n'ont pas fourni de statistiques. La première chose à faire est d'obtenir de chaque pays qu'il indique les fabriques, les quantités produites et autres renseignements relatifs par exemple à l'écoulement des produits. On pourra alors se mettre d'accord sur les quantités nécessaires aux besoins du monde et sur les méthodes de vente.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) regrette de ne pas être en mesure de donner maintenant des chiffres exacts sur la production et la consommation de la cocaïne aux Pays-Bas. Cependant, les chiffres seront donnés pour 1922 et aussi, si la Commission le désire, pour 1921. Les faits connus prouvent suffisamment que les Pays-Bas sont loin d'être en tête des producteurs de cocaïne, bien qu'on l'ait prétendu¹. Le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas l'a chargé de faire cette déclaration qui sera confirmée plus tard par des chiffres exacts. Il n'y a aux Pays-Bas qu'une maison qui fournisse de la cocaïne et elle est placée sous le contrôle du Gouvernement. Le système des certificats d'importation est déjà appliqué pour les exportations de cocaïne dans les pays où les importations sont limitées ou interdites.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) dit qu'après la guerre le commerce illicite de la cocaïne et de ses succédanés a pris une certaine extension en Allemagne. Mais le gouvernement a pris des mesures législatives et le mal a diminué. Les grandes maisons allemandes qui produisent de la cocaïne tiennent essentiellement à lutter contre le commerce illicite et sont au-dessus de tout soupçon. Les stocks de produits manufacturés et de matière brute doivent être déclarés au Gouvernement tous les trois ou six mois. Les chiffres sont soigneusement examinés au Ministère de l'Hygiène qui fait procéder à des enquêtes immédiates s'il relève des irrégularités.

Le Gouvernement allemand enverra au Secrétariat les statistiques de la production.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) dit qu'on trouvera au tableau 4 du résumé rédigé par le Secrétariat les statistiques de la production japonaise pour 1920.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que le Secrétariat obtiendra certainement des renseignements des autres pays producteurs.

En réponse à une question du Président, le Dr ANSELMINO dit que toute la cocaïne préparée en Allemagne est faite avec des feuilles de coca importées du Pérou et de Bolivie.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande si la Convention vise les feuilles de coca et l'ecgonine et s'il y a lieu de recueillir des renseignements sur la production et le commerce des feuilles de coca.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) ne croit pas que la Convention s'applique à ces objets.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT dit que le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis admet qu'elle s'y applique.

¹ Voir le procès-verbal du Comité provisoire d'hygiène, p. 34.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que le Gouvernement britannique considère que la Convention vise les feuilles de coca.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) estime que le texte de la Convention justifie cette manière de voir.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) en réponse au Président explique qu'il est impossible de dire combien de cocaïne peut être extraite d'une quantité donnée de feuilles de coca. La quantité varie avec les envois et diminue à l'emmagasinage. Avec les feuilles on produit l'ecgonine, d'où la cocaïne et autres drogues sont synthétisées.

Le PRÉSIDENT, en raison de ce renseignement, retire sa suggestion tendant à ce qu'on recueille des statistiques sur les feuilles de coca et l'ecgonine.

Il suggère que les gouvernements intéressés soient invités à indiquer le maximum de leurs besoins en cocaïne.

Cette proposition est adoptée.

Le PRÉSIDENT suggère en outre que le Secrétariat s'adresse aux gouvernements intéressés pour leur demander des précisions sur la fabrication et les modes de vente de la morphine et de la cocaïne, afin de présenter un rapport à la prochaine session.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) demande si avant de recueillir des renseignements supplémentaires sur la morphine le Secrétariat ne devrait pas étudier à loisir les renseignements déjà obtenus. Ces renseignements donnent peut-être une idée assez exacte de la quantité de morphine produite par les différents pays. La situation du Japon, par exemple, a déjà été exposée à la Commission. A son avis, une étude des renseignements obtenus permettrait à la Commission de savoir assez exactement où en sont les autres pays.

Le PRÉSIDENT reconnaît qu'on peut en effet ajourner une nouvelle demande de renseignements sur la morphine. Le Secrétariat n'a pas encore eu le temps de tirer tout le parti possible des statistiques qui sont à sa disposition.

M. BOURGOIS (France) dit que le Gouvernement français est convaincu que le seul moyen de régler la question est de contrôler la production. La contrebande est extrêmement facile. Le développement de ce commerce illicite préoccupe beaucoup le Gouvernement français. Un projet de loi adopté par le Sénat le 20 janvier 1921 est actuellement soumis à la Chambre des Députés. Il élève les pénalités de 10.000 à 30.000 francs d'amende, de 2 à 5 ans d'emprisonnement et prévoit une interdiction de séjour de 5 à 10 ans.

32. Télégramme du Conseil international des missionnaires.

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission que le Conseil international des missionnaires offre, par télégramme, de fournir à la Commission consultative des informations sur l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles. Cette offre devrait être prise en sérieuse considération. Les missionnaires ont été de précieux collaborateurs pour les fonctionnaires britanniques chargés de la préparation du *Livre bleu* sur la culture du pavot en Chine.

Sir John JORDAN dit que l'information du Gouvernement dépend presque entièrement des missionnaires en Chine et en Perse. L'offre devrait être acceptée.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (Chine) demande si cette offre doit exercer un effet sur l'enquête prévue en Chine.

Le PRÉSIDENT répond que les deux questions sont distinctes.

La Commission décide d'accepter l'offre du Conseil international des missionnaires.

33. Lettre de l'Association internationale pour la lutte contre l'opium à Pékin.

Le PRÉSIDENT rappelle la lettre que la Commission a reçue l'an passé de l'Association internationale pour la lutte contre l'opium à Pékin.

La Commission estime que la demande relative à l'intervention de la Société des Nations contenue dans cette lettre a déjà trouvé sa réponse dans les décisions prises au cours de la présente session.

DOUZIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 26 avril 1922, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission, sauf M. CHAO-HSIN CHU, et les assesseurs sauf M. BRENIER.

34. *Départ du représentant de la Chine.*

Le PRÉSIDENT informe la Commission qu'il a reçu une dépêche de M. CHAO-HSIN CHU qui, appelé d'urgence à Londres, ne pourra pas assister aux autres séances de la Commission.

35. *Approbation du procès-verbal.*

Le procès-verbal de la neuvième séance est approuvé par la Commission.

36. *Forme à donner au rapport annuel des gouvernements (Annexe 3).*

Sir John JORDAN, se référant au paragraphe 5 du projet de rapport, propose de demander aux gouvernements des détails sur la nationalité et le nombre des consommateurs d'opium, et sur le bénéfice produit par la vente de l'opium. Les gouvernements devraient indiquer le nombre de chinois qui consomment de l'opium dans des pays comme le Siam et Singapour, ainsi que le nombre total de chinois qui y résident. Cela permettrait à la Commission de comparer la consommation moyenne d'opium en Chine avec la consommation moyenne des populations chinoises hors de Chine.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que la question soulevée par sir John Jordan est en partie réglée par le dernier sous-paragraphe du paragraphe 5b. Il propose que les mots suivants remplacent la dernière phrase:

« Indiquer le nombre de Chinois résidant dans le territoire, ainsi que le nombre de ressortissants d'autres pays, si beaucoup d'entre eux sont adonnés à l'opium. »

Sir John JORDAN propose l'insertion de la clause suivante:

« Prière d'indiquer, le cas échéant, le revenu provenant de la vente de l'opium préparé et ce qu'il représente par rapport aux rentrées principales d'impôts dans le pays. »

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas), estime qu'il est dangereux de comparer la consommation chinoise à l'intérieur et hors du pays. La population chinoise hors de Chine se compose surtout de travailleurs non mariés, et une comparaison risquerait d'induire en erreur, à moins que l'on ne tienne compte des conditions particulières de chaque pays.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que ces conditions particulières détermineraient les conclusions de la Commission.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) propose que le projet de rapport soit examiné paragraphe par paragraphe:

Cette proposition est adoptée.

Paragraphe 1

Sur la proposition de M. CAMPBELL (Inde), le mot « importants » est inséré après le mot « règlements » et les mots suivants sont ajoutés à la fin du paragraphe: « de nature à intéresser la Commission consultative ». Le but de ces amendements est d'éviter la transmission au Secrétariat de renseignements sans importance.

Le paragraphe 1 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 2.

Adopté.

Paragraphe 3.

Sur la proposition de M. CAMPBELL (Inde), les mots suivants sont ajoutés dans la première phrase du paragraphe : « sur tout point nouveau présentant un intérêt ou une importance particulière concernant ». Dans le deuxième sous-paragraphe, les mots « un tableau » sont remplacés par les mots « fournir tous les renseignements possibles sur ». Il serait en effet très difficile de donner le détail, ou même un résumé des poursuites et des condamnations pour les différents districts de l'Inde.

Le PRÉSIDENT, en réponse à M. Campbell, dit que la dernière phrase du paragraphe 3 se rapporte aux drogues visées par le chapitre III de la Convention de l'opium.

Le prince CHAROON (Siam), dit que le Gouvernement du Siam sera dans l'impossibilité de donner les renseignements visés dans la dernière phrase du paragraphe 3, attendu qu'il n'exerce pas de contrôle sur les sujets étrangers vivant au Siam. La législation indigène relative aux licences, ne s'applique pas aux résidents étrangers.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que le Gouvernement du Siam pourrait attirer l'attention sur ce fait, dans son rapport à la Commission.

Le paragraphe 3 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 4.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), se référant au paragraphe 4, fait observer que dans de nombreux cas, les gouvernements ne peuvent pas dire quels itinéraires suivent les transports d'opium brut, et qu'il serait difficile d'indiquer même les lieux de destination. Il propose la suppression des mots « ainsi que les itinéraires ».

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) reconnaît qu'il serait difficile d'indiquer les itinéraires.

La Commission décide de supprimer la phrase en question.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) dit que le Gouvernement de l'Inde est dans l'impossibilité d'indiquer la quantité d'opium en stock détenue par les petits détaillants, visée au paragraphe 4 f. Il remarque que la Commission doit examiner maintenant la question des stocks en même temps que la proposition canadienne tendant à ce qu'il soit procédé à un inventaire général.

La Commission décide d'ajourner l'étude de la question jusqu'au moment où la proposition canadienne viendra en discussion.

Paragraphe 5.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) propose que le paragraphe 5 a soit amendé. Il estime désirable que les Gouvernements soient invités à indiquer la nature des difficultés auxquelles ils se heurtent dans la lutte contre le commerce illicite de l'opium. Les divers Gouvernements devraient être mis en garde contre ces difficultés, afin de pouvoir collaborer plus efficacement.

Après un échange de vues, les clauses suivantes sont ajoutées :

« Sinon, quelles nationalités s'adonnent à cette habitude ? Quelle est la nature des difficultés rencontrées dans la lutte contre cette habitude, et dans quelle mesure l'opium est-il illicitement importé ? Quelles mesures législatives ont été prises ? Nombre des poursuites, etc. »

« La collaboration d'autres pays est-elle nécessaire pour arriver à une suppression absolue ? Dans l'affirmative, indiquer les formes de cette collaboration. »

Sur la proposition de M. CAMPBELL (Inde) les mots « si possible », sont ajoutés après le mot « indiquer » dans le deuxième sous-paragraphe du paragraphe 5 b, et les mots suivants sont supprimés : « ou si le cas se présente, la quantité d'opium brut employée à fumer ».

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) revient sur l'amendement proposé par sir John Jordan au commencement de la séance. Aux termes de cet amendement, les Gouvernements seraient invités à fournir des renseignements sur les bénéfices provenant de l'opium. Il rappelle que la Commission a décidé l'an passé de ne pas demander de renseignements de ce genre, attendu que la question des impôts échappe au contrôle de la Société des Nations et qu'une telle demande ne manquerait pas d'irriter certains Gouvernements. D'ailleurs, dans la plupart des cas, les chiffres nécessaires se trouvent dans les statistiques publiées.

Sir John JORDAN insiste pour que son amendement soit maintenu. La situation actuelle en Chine est plus grave que jamais. La Commission doit prouver qu'elle traite la question dans son ensemble. Officiellement l'usage de l'opium est interdit en Chine, mais l'interdiction n'est pas respectée. Le régime en vigueur est pour ainsi dire celui du libre commerce. Cependant, dans d'autres

pays, des monopoles de l'opium ont été institués et si la situation actuelle n'est pas modifiée il est à peu près certain qu'à l'exemple de ces pays la Chine instituera un monopole d'Etat. Elle sera d'autant plus tentée de le faire que l'impôt sur l'opium peut produire des sommes considérables et que les finances de la Chine sont maintenant dans une situation désespérée. La situation de chaque pays doit être précisée avec franchise et le problème considéré équitablement dans son ensemble.

La deuxième Assemblée a estimé que la consommation d'opium dans l'Inde était légitime, bien que le représentant de la Chine ait demandé que l'emploi de ce mot « légitime » soit strictement réservé aux besoins médicaux.

Il cite, en terminant, des chiffres empruntés à un rapport qu'il a reçu du Gouverneur de Hong-Kong. Ces chiffres montrent que les Chinois prennent des mesures efficaces, du moins dans certaines localités. En 1920, 8.000 livres d'opium d'Amoy ont été saisies à Hong-Kong; mais en 1921, il n'en est pour ainsi dire pas venu d'Amoy. La Chine a fait des efforts sincères pour la suppression du trafic, mais si des mesures ne sont pas prises, elle suivra l'exemple des autres Puissances et instituera un monopole.

Le PRÉSIDENT donne les statistiques complètes des saisies à Hong-Kong; elles montrent que si Amoy ne produit plus d'opium, les saisies d'opium chinois provenant d'autres régions ont beaucoup augmenté.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), M. BOURGOIS (France) et le PRÉSIDENT déclarent qu'en ce qui concerne leurs Gouvernements respectifs, ils acceptent l'amendement proposé par sir John Jordan.

En conséquence, l'amendement est adopté.

Le paragraphe 5 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 6.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) fait observer à propos du paragraphe 6 c qu'il ne sera possible de donner des renseignements sur le lieu de destination des drogues exportées que si les pays intéressés acceptent le système des certificats d'importation.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que la Commission doit admettre que le système des certificats d'importation sera adopté d'une manière générale, sinon l'œuvre de la Société des Nations sera gravement compromise.

Sur la proposition de M. BOURGOIS (France), la Commission décide de demander au paragraphe 6 b des renseignements sur les propriétaires, la situation et la production des différentes fabriques qui s'occupent de la préparation de la morphine.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que le paragraphe 6 d règle en partie les points soulevés dans la résolution du prince Charoon. Il estime cependant qu'elle ne doit pas être discutée en même temps que le projet de rapport, mais séparément.

Le paragraphe 6 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 7.

La Commission décide d'ajouter une note au paragraphe 7 pour indiquer que les renseignements demandés doivent « comprendre la morphine transformée en héroïne, codéine et autres substances, en indiquant les quantités ainsi transformées. »

M. BOURGOIS (France) demande que des renseignements soient recueillis sur toutes les drogues visées par la Convention.

La Commission décide d'ajouter un paragraphe général sur ce point.

Le paragraphe 7 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 8.

Adopté.

Paragraphe 9.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) demande si à la suite de la discussion de la veille, il n'y a pas lieu de supprimer au paragraphe 9 la mention des feuilles de coca.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) reconnaît qu'une information de ce genre n'aurait guère de valeur.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer qu'en Grande-Bretagne les feuilles de coca sont employées pour la préparation des vins de coca.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) dit que cet usage est sans importance.

La Commission décide de supprimer aux 9 a et paragraphes 9 b la mention des feuilles de coca.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) dit que le Gouvernement allemand aura de la peine à fournir des renseignements sur la production des différentes fabriques. Beaucoup de fabriques appartiennent à un important syndicat et il ne sera pas possible de distinguer la production de chacune d'entre elles.

Il est en outre décidé de supprimer au paragraphe 9a la mention des préparations contenant de la cocaïne.

Le paragraphe 9 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 10.

Adopté.

Paragraphe 11

Adopté.

Paragraphe 12.

Il est décidé de remplacer les mots « give references » par les mots « reports as » dans le texte anglais.

Le paragraphe 12 amendé est adopté.

Paragraphe 13.

Le prince CHAROON (Siam) suggère qu'autant que possible les renseignements des Gouvernements se rapportent aux mêmes périodes, car l'année adoptée pour les statistiques varie suivant les pays.

A la suite d'un échange de vues, la *Commission décide* de demander aux Gouvernements de fournir, si possible, leurs statistiques pour l'année du calendrier.

Le paragraphe 13 amendé est adopté.

La Commission approuve les notes du projet de rapport annuel.

37. Proposition du Gouvernement canadien relative à un inventaire des stocks de narcotiques.

Le PRÉSIDENT dit que le Gouvernement canadien a suggéré que les Gouvernements intéressés soient invités à fournir des renseignements sur les quantités de narcotiques et autres drogues dangereuses existant en stock à une date donnée, étant donné que cette information serait utile pour le contrôle des exportations.

Il fait observer qu'il serait difficile de procéder à un inventaire de ce genre dans les pays où il y a un grand nombre de détaillants et où les drogues sont vendues sous des formes diverses.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) est du même avis que le Président. Il sait, par expérience, qu'il est très difficile d'obtenir des chiffres satisfaisants sur les stocks; ces chiffres inspirent, d'habitude, plus de confiance qu'il n'en méritent. De plus, il est difficile de comparer les chiffres d'un pays avec ceux d'un autre pays où les règlements sont différents. Par exemple, les quantités mises en entrepôt figurent, dans certains pays, au chapitre des importations, mais pas dans d'autres pays. Le Gouvernement de l'Inde ne peut fournir des chiffres que pour les stocks du Gouvernement.

Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT estime qu'il faut s'efforcer d'obtenir cette information. On peut faire l'inventaire aux Etats-Unis où chaque pharmacien doit être pourvu d'une autorisation avant de recevoir une quantité déterminée de drogues, et où tout fabricant est tenu de fournir des renseignements sur la vente.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japon) dit qu'il sera très difficile d'inventorier au Japon, à une date donnée, les stocks des petits détaillants. Il ne sera possible d'inventorier que les stocks importants des maisons de gros.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) dit qu'en Allemagne, les stocks des fabricants sont inventoriés tous les trois mois et ceux des marchands tous les six mois. Il serait très difficile d'inventorier les stocks des détaillants.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) propose que la question soit ajournée jusqu'à ce que le Secrétariat ait examiné plus complètement les statistiques reçues.

Cette proposition est adoptée.

38. *Date de l'envoi des rapports.*

Le PRÉSIDENT propose que les gouvernements soient invités à envoyer leur rapport pour le 1^{er} juin, chaque année.

Le D^r ANSELMINO (Allemagne) et M. CAMPBELL (Inde) doutent que leur Gouvernement soit en mesure d'envoyer un rapport pour une date si rapprochée.

A la suite d'un échange de vues, la *Commission décide* de suggérer aux Gouvernements les dates suivantes:

Pour les Gouvernements européens: 1^{er} juillet.

Pour les Gouvernements non européens: 1^{er} octobre.

TREIZIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 26 avril 1922, à 15 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission, à l'exception de M. CHAO-HSIN CHU, et les assesseurs, à l'exception de M. BRENIER.

39. Séance publique.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande s'il y aura lieu de tenir une séance publique quand le rapport de la Commission au Conseil sera discuté. A son avis, il ne paraît pas désirable de tenir une séance publique, attendu que le texte d'aucune des résolutions adoptées par la Commission n'a été communiqué à la presse et que la Commission ayant un caractère purement consultatif, ses décisions doivent être approuvées par le Conseil.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) et M. BOURGOIS (France) sont du même avis.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) est également du même avis. Il est essentiel que la Commission puisse discuter avec une entière franchise, ce qui serait impossible en public.

Sir John JORDAN rappelle qu'au cours de la première session, il a déclaré que la publicité était l'arme principale dont il fallait se servir dans la question de l'opium, c'est pourquoi il a préconisé les séances publiques. L'opinion publique en Chine est la seule force réelle sur laquelle on puisse compter. Il a assisté à la Conférence de Washington et rien ne l'a plus frappé, au cours des débats, que la manière dont l'opinion publique a été tenue au courant de tout ce qui se passait. Chaque sous-commission chargée d'une question particulière publiait ses décisions chaque jour et les parties importantes de ces décisions étaient résumées par la presse. Quand la question était abordée en séance plénière, l'opinion publique était préparée et la Commission avait à faire à un public bien informé. Il était facile de voir à Washington que les hommes d'Etat sentaient que le public était le maître. A son avis, la question de la publicité est très importante et il regrette que la Commission ne croie pas devoir tenir une séance publique.

Un des grands inconvénients du mécanisme de la Société des Nations réside dans le retard apporté à l'exécution des décisions. La Commission prend une décision en avril, le Conseil l'examine quelques semaines plus tard, et dans certains cas en réfère à l'Assemblée, qui ne se réunit pas avant trois mois. Dans de telles conditions, le public se désintéresse des questions.

Le Dr ANSELMINO (Allemagne) estime qu'une discussion franche est impossible en public.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer à sir John Jordan que dans le cas présent le retard ne serait pas considérable. Le Conseil se réunit dans une quinzaine de jours et s'il approuve le rapport de la Commission, les décisions seront immédiatement appliquées par le Secrétariat. Le rapport sera alors publié.

Un échange de vues s'engage entre sir John JORDAN, le PRÉSIDENT et M. CAMPBELL (Inde) sur le changement apporté par la deuxième Assemblée à la résolution de M. Wellington Koo que le Conseil avait adoptée le 28 juin 1921. L'Assemblée a remplacé les mots « médicaux et scientifiques » par le mot « légitime » et omis le mot « strictement ».

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) fait remarquer que l'Assemblée a modifié une résolution que le Conseil avait prise contrairement à la recommandation de la Commission consultative. L'Assemblée a repoussé la décision du Conseil et approuvé l'avis de la Commission.

Sir John JORDAN demande à présenter une motion avant la fin de la présente séance. Il voudrait que l'Assemblée qui a décidé que l'usage de l'opium en Inde était légitime fût invitée à entreprendre une enquête aux fins de savoir si l'usage de l'opium en dehors de l'Inde est légitime ou illégitime. Puisqu'elle a tranché la question dans un cas, elle devrait, à son avis, la trancher dans l'autre cas. Il voudrait avoir un jugement définitif sur la question de l'usage de l'opium. Si l'Assemblée estime que cet usage est légitime, alors l'attitude de la Chine est justifiée. Si elle est d'un autre avis, des mesures doivent alors être prises pour la suppression progressive et générale de l'opium, conformément à la Convention de 1912.

Le PRÉSIDENT, pour éviter tout malentendu, demande à attirer l'attention sur le mandat de la Commission consultative.

La Commission a été instituée pour éclairer le Conseil sur toutes questions relatives au contrôle du trafic de l'opium et des autres drogues nuisibles. Elle travaille sous la direction générale du Conseil. Elle est, en outre, chargée de préparer un rapport annuel sur la question, dans son ensemble pour l'information de l'Assemblée. Le Président prie sir John Jordan de soumettre sa proposition par écrit.

La Commission décide de ne pas tenir de séance publique.

40. Budget pour 1923.

Le PRÉSIDENT attire l'attention de la Commission sur le rapport préparé par la Section financière du Secrétariat sur le budget de 1922 et sur les prévisions pour 1923. On n'a que peu de renseignements sur les dépenses engagées pendant la présente année financière. Les 4.262 francs-or dépensés pendant le premier trimestre ne comprennent pas les frais d'une session de la Commission, ni les traitements du personnel supérieur de la Section d'opium. Le D^r Hawking Yen, Secrétaire de la Commission consultative pendant l'année dernière a été absent durant plusieurs mois; aucune dépense n'a donc été engagée pour son traitement pendant ce temps. Dans ces conditions, la Commission ne peut guère savoir si le budget de 1922 justifie les prévisions pour 1923.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) fait remarquer que les prévisions budgétaires pour 1922 étaient estimées en francs-or. Cette année les mêmes prévisions budgétaires sont estimées en francs suisses.

Le PRÉSIDENT demande à sir Herbert Ames, directeur financier, d'expliquer la différence entre le franc-or et le franc-suisse.

Sir Herbert AMES (Directeur financier de la Société des Nations) répond qu'au début du séjour du Secrétariat à Genève, le budget de la Société des Nations a été évalué en francs-or. Le franc-or était avant la guerre l'étalon de l'Union monétaire; sa valeur était réglée par le dollar américain. Le dollar américain valait 5,1826 francs-or. Le franc-or était adopté afin que les quotes-parts des Etats puissent être calculées d'après une unité stable. Actuellement la valeur du franc-suisse est augmentée; elle est devenue presque égale à celle du franc-or. Entre les deux valeurs il y a un écart de 1 %. En conséquence, la deuxième Assemblée a décidé que les prévisions budgétaires pour 1923 seraient évaluées en francs-suisse. Les 96.250 francs suisses qui ont été alloués cette année à la Commission consultative sont en fait équivalents aux 96.250 francs-or alloués l'année passée.

La Commission examine successivement les différents articles du budget.

Art. 1: Sessions de la Commission consultative.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose que le crédit de 13.000 francs suisses soit porté à 15.000 pour couvrir les frais d'une deuxième session en septembre.

La Commission approuve cette proposition.

Art. 2. — Traitements du Secrétariat.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que c'est l'article le plus important du budget et qu'il est indispensable qu'un personnel permanent s'occupe avec continuité de la question de l'opium. D'importants travaux préparatoires doivent être faits avant que la Commission se réunisse et le rapport de la Commission au Conseil devrait, à son avis, mentionner la nécessité d'un personnel suffisant. Il propose qu'une personne de la catégorie administrative soit adjointe au chef de la Section pour s'occuper du travail administratif.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) appuie la proposition du Président. La Commission se rend pleinement compte du travail considérable imposé au personnel du Secrétariat. Actuellement les documents arrivent à intervalles irréguliers et par paquets. Certains de ces documents sont importants, mais si on ne procède pas à une distribution plus uniforme, il est impossible de donner à ces documents l'attention qu'ils méritent.

Le PRÉSIDENT félicite le Secrétariat des travaux préparatoires qu'il a exécutés et demande à Dame Rachel Crowdy de donner son avis sur la question du personnel.

Dame Rachel CROWDY (Secrétaire en exercice de la Commission consultative) répond qu'une des raisons de la grande et soudaine presse dans le travail, c'est que de nombreux Gouvernements n'ont pas envoyé leur réponse au questionnaire à la date demandée et que d'autres ont attendu au dernier moment. De plus, plusieurs Gouvernements ont envoyé leur réponse dans d'autres langues que le français ou l'anglais. Le Secrétariat a dû s'occuper de quarante réponses au questionnaire au cours du dernier mois. Onze d'entre elles n'étaient ni en français ni en anglais. La réponse de la Chine, par exemple, était en chinois. La Section de traduction du Secrétariat a traduit soixante réponses au questionnaire en sept ou huit semaines; quelques-unes d'entre elles, celle du Japon,

par exemple, atteignent 80 pages. Les Sections de traduction et des publications du Secrétariat ont fait, en moins d'un mois, le travail qui aurait dû être fait normalement en cinq mois et il est désirable que la Commission attire l'attention des Gouvernements sur l'importance qu'il y a à envoyer les réponses à la date spécifiée et dans l'une des deux langues officielles de la Société.

Le membre du Secrétariat chargé de préparer le résumé n'a eu qu'une quinzaine de jours pour résumer environ soixante-dix réponses au questionnaire.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime qu'un crédit de 50.000 francs suisses au moins devrait être alloué pour les traitements du Secrétariat.

La Commission se déclare du même avis.

Art. 3. — Assistance temporaire.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose à la Commission de réduire ce crédit de 8.000 francs suisses à 7.000 francs suisses et d'ajouter les mille francs ainsi obtenus au crédit de l'article 1.

La Commission approuve cette proposition.

Art. 4. — Frais de voyage du Secrétariat.

Le PRÉSIDENT constate que ce crédit est très inférieur à celui de l'année passée. Le Secrétariat doit rendre visite de temps en temps aux Gouvernements.

La Commission approuve l'article 4.

Article 5. — Publications.

La Commission approuve le crédit.

Articles 6 et 7. — Câbles, télégrammes, etc., frais divers.

La Commission approuve les crédits.

Article 8. — Dépenses imprévues.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose de réduire de 1.000 francs suisses ce crédit et de les ajouter au crédit de l'article 1.

La Commission approuve cette proposition.

La Commission approuve les prévisions budgétaires.

41. Lettre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge (Annexe 4).

Le PRÉSIDENT rappelle que le délégué de la Perse à la deuxième Assemblée a proposé que la Société des Nations organise une propagande dans les pays d'Orient, contre l'usage de l'opium et d'autres drogues nuisibles. La Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge, qui a été consultée, a répondu qu'elle s'adresserait à toutes les sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge dans les pays intéressés, pour leur demander de prendre, avec le concours des Gouvernements, des mesures pour combattre les abus de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles.

La Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge a également proposé qu'un représentant de la Société des Nations assiste à la Conférence des sociétés orientales de la Croix-Rouge à Bangkok en novembre et que ce représentant fasse un voyage à travers la Chine, le Japon, les Etablissements des détroits, l'Inde et peut-être la Perse, afin de se rendre compte lui-même des conditions du trafic de l'opium dans ces pays et d'exposer les vues de la Société des Nations à la Conférence de Bangkok.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), ne croit pas que cette proposition puisse être mise en pratique, attendu que le budget ne contient pas de crédit pour un tel objet. L'envoi d'un représentant dans les pays mentionnés soulève toute espèce de difficultés et ne serait d'aucune utilité quelconque.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que la Commission pourrait adopter la première proposition de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge et, d'accord avec elle, entreprendre une propagande pour lutter contre le fléau de l'opium. Cela n'entraînerait aucune dépense pour la Société des Nations.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), ne voit pas d'objections à cette première proposition.

La Commission approuve la première proposition contenue dans la lettre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait remarquer que la nomination d'un représentant chargé d'assister à la Conférence de Bangkok, soulève de grandes difficultés. On pourrait peut-être s'entendre avec quelqu'un se trouvant déjà au Siam et s'intéressant à la question; on lui fournirait tous les renseignements disponibles. Il ne semble pas qu'on puisse faire plus. Si on ne trouve personne sur place, la Commission pourrait peut-être inviter la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge à prendre des dispositions afin que la Conférence de Bangkok étudie à fond la question de l'opium au point de vue de l'hygiène.

Sir John JORDAN estime que c'est là tout ce que la Commission peut faire.

La Commission approuve la suggestion du Président.

42. *Lettre du directeur du Bureau international de l'Union postale universelle.*

Le PRÉSIDENT attire l'attention de la Commission sur les nouvelles règles que la dernière conférence de l'Union postale universelle a adoptées au sujet de l'expédition de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles par colis postaux.

L'expédition de ces drogues par lettres est absolument interdite; elle n'est autorisée par colis postaux et colis recommandés qu'à destination des pays qui consentent à recevoir l'opium par cette voie.

43. *Lettre du représentant de la Chine au Secrétaire de la Commission (Annexe 5).*

La Commission prend acte de la lettre adressée par le représentant de la Chine au secrétaire de la Commission, relative aux différentes résolutions adoptées par la Commission, et prend acte en même temps des observations du président.

La Commission prend acte aussi d'un extrait du télégramme reçu par le représentant de la Chine de son Gouvernement et communiqué à la Commission pour son information.

44. *Publication du résumé des réponses au questionnaire.*

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) demande si l'on publiera le résumé des réponses au questionnaire (Documents C. 171. M. 88. et O. C. 22).

Le PRÉSIDENT répond que le document C. 171. M. 88 contient l'ordre du jour de la session et le résumé des réponses au questionnaire et qu'il sera certainement publié ultérieurement. Il serait très regrettable que les renseignements qu'il contient ne fussent pas portés à la connaissance du public.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) fait observer que ces deux documents ne mettent en relief que certains points qui sont au seul désavantage de son pays. On y parle d'excès de consommation, d'exportation clandestine, de l'affermage défectueux et de possibilité de la limitation des importations.

Sir John JORDAN demande si les faits sont inexacts. Ils semblent donner une idée juste de la situation présente sous une forme très modérée.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) estime qu'on ne doit pas envisager le problème de la lutte contre le trafic de l'opium seulement dans la situation présente. Pour pouvoir se prononcer, il faut avoir en vue une certaine période de temps. En effet, le Portugal importait en 1908 avant la Convention de l'opium de 1912, 3249 caisses d'opium. Après la Convention de La Haye de 1912, nous voyons l'importation baisser à 2043 caisses et à la suite de la signature du Traité du 14 juin 1913, l'importation se chiffre par 531 caisses. Dans l'article 90 de ce même traité, on envisage la réduction de l'importation cinq ans après sa signature, et, en effet, l'année 1918 nous montre une importation de 400 caisses, diminution qui s'accroît l'année suivante par l'importation de 374 caisses. Cette régression dans les chiffres d'importation démontre d'une façon saisissante que le Portugal remplit ses obligations.

Sir John JORDAN se déclare prêt à envisager une série d'années. Les chiffres pour 1910 et 1911 confirment ce qu'il a toujours maintenu, à savoir que de grandes quantités d'opium ont été expédiées dans les colonies d'Extrême-Orient qui ne les consommaient pas, mais qui les réexportaient ailleurs, principalement en Chine. En 1913, le traité passé entre le Portugal et la Grande-Bretagne a permis au Gouvernement de l'Inde d'envoyer 500 caisses d'opium par an à Macao. Sur ces 500 caisses, 260, croit-il, étaient destinées à l'exportation et 240 à la consommation locale. Il ne voit pas la nécessité de ces réexportations, mais il pense que 240 caisses pour une population d'environ 85.000 personnes dépassent manifestement les besoins légitimes. Sur cette base, quelle serait la consommation de 400 millions de Chinois? Il regrette que le représentant du Portugal ait soulevé cette question, car il n'avait pas l'intention de revenir sur des événements passés, que ceux-ci soient

l'œuvre du Gouvernement britannique ou de n'importe quel autre Gouvernement. Macao n'est pas le seul pays qui ait reçu plus d'opium qu'il n'en avait besoin. Les colonies britanniques reçoivent actuellement plus d'opium qu'il ne leur en faut, et tant que cette question ne sera pas réglée, le problème de l'opium en Extrême-Orient ne pourra pas être résolu.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde), fait observer qu'il possède des renseignements très précis sur l'affaire en question, et que le représentant du Portugal ferait mieux de laisser le résumé tel qu'il est. Si on lui donnait un démenti, le Secrétariat pourrait fournir un exposé complet de la question, qui ferait beaucoup plus de tort au Portugal que celui contenu dans le résumé. Si l'on admet à Macao une consommation de 240 caisses pour une population de 100.000 habitants et si l'on prend pour base de la consommation actuelle en Chine le quart des chiffres cités par le représentant de la Chine à la Conférence de Shanghai en 1907, les quantités moyennes consommées à Macao, en Chine et en Inde, seraient les suivantes:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Macao | 2352 grains par tête |
| Chine | 367 » » |
| Inde | 26 » » |

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) prie sir John Jordan de lui permettre une observation. Le chiffre de l'importation de l'opium brut à Macao n'est pas arbitraire; il est basé sur les dispositions du traité signé à Londres le 14 juin 1914 et ces dispositions se basent à leur tour sur le chiffre de la population de la province de Macao. Seulement, le traité en question a pris comme base de calcul le recensement de 1910 et ce recensement effectué trois ans avant la signature du traité ne donne pas la population actuelle. En effet, le recensement de 1920 constate une augmentation de population d'au moins 20 % sans compter l'afflux de population chinoise au moment des fêtes de la nouvelle année chinoise.

M. Ferreira fait encore remarquer que les documents auxquels il fait allusion signalent le système d'affermage comme défectueux parce qu'il a été abandonné dans d'autres pays par suite des abus qu'il entraînerait forcément. Il dit qu'il ne peut pas se rallier à une telle critique car le concessionnaire ne peut pas agir librement. Ce régime de concession est entouré d'un certain nombre de garanties, de la part du Gouvernement portugais, qui empêchent les abus. Il ne faut pas non plus oublier que dans les réponses au questionnaire le Gouvernement portugais a signalé les pénalités qui ont été appliquées aux abus dans le commerce de l'opium.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que le résumé soumis à la Commission est à la fois critique et analytique. Ce n'est pas seulement un résumé des réponses, il a pour but de faciliter le travail de la Commission et en le préparant, le Secrétariat a attiré l'attention sur les points qui semblent mériter l'examen de la Commission. En agissant ainsi, le Secrétariat s'est entièrement conformé aux instructions reçues. S'il y a des inexactitudes, elles doivent être corrigées, mais en ce qui concerne Macao, les faits sont incontestables.

Sir John JORDAN estime que le résumé aurait été absolument inutile s'il n'avait pas contenu ces critiques et son rédacteur doit être félicité. Le Portugal n'est pas seul mentionné. Le Japon, par exemple, l'est aussi et il n'a pas protesté contre l'exposé des faits relatifs à la morphine. Il a reconnu franchement les faits et fourni ses explications à la Commission.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose de donner satisfaction au représentant du Portugal en ajoutant quelques mots pour indiquer que les importations ont diminué depuis 1913.

La Commission adopte cette proposition.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) remercie le Président pour sa proposition et ajoute que l'activité du Gouvernement portugais dans la lutte contre l'opium répond de sa bonne volonté dans l'avenir pour poursuivre cette lutte d'une façon progressive et efficace.

45. Résolution de Sir John Jordan.

Sir John JORDAN propose la résolution suivante relative à la suppression de l'opium préparé:

« La Commission prend acte de la décision par laquelle l'Assemblée a déclaré, en septembre 1921, que l'usage de l'opium en Inde était légitime dans certaines conditions.

« Afin que ses efforts pour la suppression progressive et efficace de l'opium préparé, conformément à l'article 6 de la Convention de l'opium de 1912, soient facilités, il suggère que l'Assemblée entreprenne une enquête sur l'usage que les fumeurs font de l'opium et donne à la Commission son avis autorisé sur la question de savoir si elle considère cet usage comme légitime ou illégitime. »

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que la deuxième Assemblée a supprimé de la résolution du Dr. Wellington Koo la mention de l'opium préparé, précisément parce que l'opium préparé est déclaré illégitime par la Convention de l'opium, et que cette Convention a pris des dispositions pour sa suppression progressive. Si la résolution de Sir John Jordan est adoptée, l'Assemblée sera invitée à se prononcer sur une question déjà réglée.

Sir John JORDAN consent à retirer sa proposition.

46. *Déclaration de Mrs. Hamilton Wright.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT demande à faire une déclaration générale sur la question de l'opium. Physiquement et moralement, l'opium a été un fléau pour l'humanité. Au point de vue économique, une marchandise qui détruit son propre marché ne peut pas faire l'objet d'un commerce durable. La Chine a fait un effort désespéré pour se débarrasser de l'opium et on ne peut pas nier que de grands progrès ont été accomplis, mais des drogues plus pernicieuses ont pris sa place. L'an passé, la Chine a fait un nouvel effort pour réduire l'usage de l'opium aux besoins médicaux et scientifiques.

Cependant l'Assemblée a remplacé les mots « médicaux et scientifiques » par le mot « légitime ». Mrs. Hamilton Wright demande sur quelle autorité scientifique l'Assemblée se fonde pour dire que la consommation de l'opium est d'un usage légitime. Une définition précise du mot « légitime » doit être donnée si l'on veut vraiment obtenir des résultats. La Chine ne restera pas indéfiniment dans la voie difficile où elle se trouve actuellement et lorsqu'elle se sera mise à produire l'opium et la morphine elle-même, elle distancera aisément toute concurrence et contrôlera les marchés du monde. Si elle en vient là, la responsabilité en incombera à la Commission consultative, et si l'on ne trouve pas le moyen de s'en prendre aux principes fondamentaux, le travail de nombreuses années aura été fait en vain.

QUATORZIÈME SÉANCE

tenue le 29 avril 1922, à 10 heures.

Présents: Tous les membres de la Commission sauf M. CHAO-HSIN CHU et M. ARIYOSHI qui est remplacé par M. MIYAJIMA. Mrs. Hamilton Wright, assesseur, est aussi présente.

47. Approbation du procès-verbal.

La Commission approuve le procès-verbal de la treizième séance sous réserve des amendements de forme que les membres de la Commission pourront demander ultérieurement.

48. Rapport de la Commission au Conseil.

Le PRÉSIDENT rappelle que la Commission a pour double tâche de formuler des avis et des vœux pour éclairer le Conseil et de présenter un rapport annuel sur la situation générale. Le présent rapport répond à ces deux objets, mais il estime qu'un rapport annuel sur la situation générale devrait être préparé d'avance par le Secrétariat afin que les membres de la Commission puissent l'adopter après avoir présenté leurs observations. Un second rapport enregistrant les recommandations de la Commission serait rédigé à la fin de la session.

La Commission examine ensuite le projet de rapport qui est adopté avec les amendements suivants:

Il est décidé de demander aux différents gouvernements d'envoyer chaque année quinze exemplaires de leur rapport.

On ajoute une note tendant à ce que, en attendant la ratification de la Convention, la Suisse soit invitée à adopter le système des certificats d'importation.

Un paragraphe est ajouté tendant à ce que les Etats qui désirent rendre plus rigoureuse la réglementation des exportations, puissent introduire une clause à cet effet dans le certificat.

Il est décidé, d'accord avec la résolution proposée par le représentant des Pays-Bas, de supprimer toute mention d'un pays particulier. Il est également décidé que les enquêtes porteront sur « toute question relevant de la Convention de l'Opium » et le texte de la résolution fut modifié en conséquence.

Sur la proposition de M. BOURGOIS (France), les mots suivants « relatifs au Sse-Tchouen et au Yunnan » sont ajoutés après les mots « par le représentant de la France à la Commission ».

Le PRÉSIDENT propose la suppression du paragraphe relatif à l'inexactitude des rapports des commissaires chinois et des gouverneurs provinciaux.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) et Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT approuvent cette proposition.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) croit que beaucoup de personnes ne tiennent pas à être convaincues que la Chine produit de l'opium. A son avis, le paragraphe en question devrait être maintenu; mais il n'insiste pas.

Les représentants de la France, du Japon, du Siam et du Portugal approuvent la suppression du paragraphe et il en est ainsi décidé.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) demande s'il ne devrait pas être fait mention des efforts faits par la Commission pour obtenir du représentant de la Chine qu'il consente à ce qu'une enquête soit faite, celle qui est prévue par le Traité de 1911 entre la Chine et la Grande-Bretagne. A son avis, une mention de ce genre devrait figurer dans le rapport, afin de bien montrer que tous les moyens de conciliation ont été épuisés.

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que les mots suivants : « contre toute idée d'enquête, semblable à celle de la Commission anglo-chinoise de 1917 » devraient être ajoutés après les mots « la recommandation adoptée l'année dernière par la Commission ».

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) estime qu'il ne faut pas faire allusion à cette enquête.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) aimerait que toutes les propositions faites par la Commission figurent dans le rapport afin de montrer que la Commission a fait de son mieux pour trouver une solution.

La proposition du Président est adoptée à la majorité.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Pays-Bas) propose la suppression du paragraphe exprimant l'avis que la nouvelle enquête envisagée par le Gouvernement chinois ne serait pas plus efficace que la précédente. Ce paragraphe peut avoir l'effet contraire à celui que vise la Commission.

La Commission approuve la suppression du paragraphe.

Sur la proposition du représentant du Japon, après les mots « pour mettre fin à ce commerce illicite », les mots suivants sont ajoutés: « le Gouvernement japonais désirerait vivement collaborer étroitement avec les pays exportateurs pour le contrôle du trafic des stupéfiants ».

M. MIYAJIMA (Japon) demande qu'on substitue au tableau des importations et fabrications de la morphine, un tableau comparatif des importations japonaises provenant de Grande-Bretagne et des exportations de Grande-Bretagne au Japon, dans le supplément à l'annexe II du document 171.

Le PRÉSIDENT fait observer que cette substitution montrerait simplement quelles quantités de morphine sont importées de Grande-Bretagne au Japon.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) propose de remplacer le tableau en question par l'insertion du paragraphe suivant dans la même page:

« La Commission désire également appeler l'attention sur le fait que les chiffres japonais pour les importations de certains pays sont très supérieurs aux chiffres des exportations de ces pays au Japon ».

M. MIYAJIMA (Japon) se déclare prêt à retirer son amendement si le texte de M. Campbell est adopté.

L'amendement de M. Campbell est adopté.

M. MIYAJIMA (Japon) propose que la première phrase après le tableau soit conçue comme suit:

« Tout en tenant compte de l'augmentation provoquée par les besoins de la médecine pendant et après la guerre... »

La Commission approuve ce texte.

M. MIYAJIMA (Japon) demande en outre que la fin de la phrase soit rédigée comme suit:

« la Commission ne saurait douter qu'une grande partie de cette morphine n'ait pris le chemin de la Chine ».

Le PRÉSIDENT estime que cela modifierait le sens de la phrase et il espère que le représentant du Japon n'insistera pas sur ce point.

Après un échange de vues, l'amendement est retiré.

Le PRÉSIDENT, afin de donner satisfaction au représentant du Japon, propose que la phrase commençant par les mots: « Elle souhaiterait que le Conseil » soit modifiée comme suit:

« La Commission prend acte de la promesse faite par le représentant du Japon, au nom de son Gouvernement, de procéder à une enquête aussi serrée que possible sur l'état actuel du trafic clandestin ».

Ce texte est adopté.

M. BOURGOIS (France) estime qu'on n'a pas prêté assez d'attention à l'importance qu'il y a à prévoir des peines très sévères pour les trafiquants de stupéfiants. L'attention du Conseil devrait être attirée sur ce point.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) est du même avis et propose de remplacer les mots: « la seule méthode efficace » par les mots: « la méthode la plus efficace ».

Le PRÉSIDENT propose l'insertion du paragraphe suivant:

« L'expérience a prouvé, dans différents pays, qu'en raison des énormes bénéfices produits par le trafic clandestin de la cocaïne, les amendes ne constituent pas une peine suffisante, et la Commission suggère que les Gouvernements examinent la question de l'emprisonnement pour ces délits ».

Sur la proposition du représentant des Pays-Bas, ce texte est légèrement modifié, de manière à comprendre les stupéfiants en général.

La Commission adopte cette proposition et celle de M. Campbell.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose l'insertion d'un nouveau paragraphe ainsi conçu:

« Offre d'assistance du Conseil international des missionnaires.

« Ce Conseil, qui représente des associations de missionnaires de toutes les parties du monde et comprend les églises de l'Inde, de la Chine, d'Afrique et d'autres pays.

a offert d'aider à la Commission, en suggérant des sources d'information et en obtenant lui-même des renseignements sur les problèmes relevant de la Commission. La Commission a été heureuse d'accepter cette offre. »

La Commission approuve l'insertion de ce paragraphe.

Le PRÉSIDENT propose l'insertion du paragraphe suivant supplémentaire:

« Echange de lois et règlements. »

« L'article 21 de la Convention stipule que les Puissances contractantes se communiqueront les textes des lois et des règlements administratifs existants. En ce qui concerne les Membres de la Société, cet échange se fait maintenant par l'intermédiaire du Secrétariat. Ces lois sont devenues très nombreuses et la Commission est d'avis qu'au lieu de communiquer tous les documents reçus, il suffirait — et ce serait une économie de temps et d'argent — de faire tenir périodiquement aux Gouvernements une liste de toutes les lois et règlements reçus, en laissant à chaque Gouvernement le soin de demander les lois et règlements qu'il désirerait recevoir. La Commission est d'avis qu'il n'y aurait pas d'objection à ce que le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas adopte la même procédure. »

Le rapport est approuvé.

Résolutions annexées au rapport.

Le PRÉSIDENT invite la Commission à examiner les résolutions annexées au rapport et qui résument les recommandations contenues dans le rapport.

**RÉSOLUTIONS ADOPTÉES PAR LA COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE
DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIUM.**

La Commission consultative a adopté les résolutions suivantes:

1. Le Conseil de la Société est invité à insister auprès de tous les Etats, en particulier auprès de la Suisse, de la Perse et de la Turquie, qui n'ont pas encore mis en vigueur la Convention de l'opium de 1912 dans son intégralité, sur l'importance d'y procéder sans retard

2. Il est éminemment souhaitable que le système des certificats d'importation adopté à l'unanimité par le Conseil et l'Assemblée de la Société soit mis en vigueur le 1^{er} septembre 1922 au plus tard dans les pays d'Europe, l'Amérique, l'Afrique et l'Australie, et le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard par tous les autres pays; et que les gouvernements soient invités à adopter le modèle de certificat proposé par la Commission consultative.

3. La Commission d'Hygiène de la Société des Nations devrait être invitée par le Conseil à poursuivre ses enquêtes sur les quantités de morphine et autres drogues dont ont besoin les différents pays pour des fins médicales ou scientifiques.

4. La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements de tous les Etats signataires de la Convention de 1912 et les autres Etats Membres de la Société des Nations, à fournir au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations un relevé des besoins totaux de leur consommation intérieure annuelle de l'opium et de ses dérivés, en indiquant séparément, si possible, les quantités employées respectivement pour des usages médicaux, scientifiques et autres. Ce relevé devra établir une distinction entre les sortes d'opium utilisées, et, dans le cas des dérivés de l'opium, les quantités seront indiquées d'après la teneur en morphine.

La Commission consultative estime en outre que ce relevé devra parvenir au Secrétaire général le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard, et qu'il est de la plus haute importance que les chiffres relatifs aux quantités d'opium nécessaires à la consommation des pays d'Extrême-Orient où les Chinois sont les principaux consommateurs, parviennent au Secrétariat à cette date au plus tard.

5. Le Conseil de la Société devrait, si la nécessité s'en présente, inviter le gouvernement des Etats Parties à la Convention, à faciliter sur leur territoire les enquêtes sur la production de l'opium et la fabrication de la morphine et de la cocaïne, auxquelles procéderont, pour toute question relevant de la Convention de l'opium, des commissions mixtes nommées en partie par le gouvernement intéressé, en partie par le Conseil de la Société.

6. a) La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium de la Société des Nations, ayant examiné les rapports communiqués par le représentant de la Chine à la Commission, sur la reprise de la culture de l'opium qui se serait produite dans diverses provinces; ayant tenu compte de l'époque, des circonstances et de la situation de certaines des personnes par qui ces enquêtes ont été effectuées; ainsi que du fait que des régions importantes ont échappé à cette enquête; ayant comparé ces rapports

avec les renseignements contenus dans le *Livre bleu* publié par le Gouvernement britannique, ainsi qu'avec d'autres renseignements communiqués à la Commission;

Se plaît à reconnaître les efforts qui ont été faits par les autorités dans certaines provinces en vue de la suppression de l'opium, mais regrette d'avoir à constater qu'il se produit en Chine une recrudescence considérable de la culture et de l'usage de l'opium.

En outre, la Commission constate que la responsabilité de cette recrudescence retombe principalement, sinon entièrement, sur les gouverneurs militaires des provinces intéressées, et que, dans la situation politique actuelle, la pression de l'opinion publique est probablement la seule force qu'il soit possible d'utiliser pour remédier à un état de choses qui constitue une violation des engagements pris par la Chine dans les traités conclus et qui est incompatible avec les obligations qu'elle a assumées en sa qualité de Membre de la Société des Nations.

b) Le Conseil de la Société des Nations prie le Gouvernement chinois de procéder à une enquête plus complète que celle de l'an passé, sur la culture du pavot en Chine, afin de pouvoir soumettre à la Société des Nations, cette année et les années suivantes, des rapports plus dignes de foi. La Commission chargée de faire une enquête dans les provinces devrait comprendre, outre les fonctionnaires nommés par les Gouvernements chinois, des représentants d'organisations telles que les chambres de commerce, les sociétés d'éducation et autres corps particulièrement intéressés à la suppression de l'opium, qui visiteraient toutes les provinces où l'on signale des cultures de pavot.

c) La Commission, considérant que la Chine, de concert avec tous les autres Etats membres de la Société, a chargé la Société des Nations de contrôler le trafic des drogues nuisibles, adresse au Gouvernement chinois la recommandation instante d'inviter des représentants de la Société à accompagner les commissaires dans leur enquête.

La Commission désire également faire observer qu'une enquête ne pourra avoir de résultats que si elle est faite au cours de la saison pendant laquelle le pavot est en fleurs, et elle prie le Gouvernement chinois de bien vouloir prendre ses dispositions en conséquence.

d) Le Conseil est prié de publier les conclusions auxquelles la Commission est arrivée.

7. La Commission prend acte de la promesse faite par le représentant du Japon, au nom de son Gouvernement, de procéder à une enquête, aussi rigoureuse que possible sur le trafic illicite de la morphine, qui se fait actuellement en Extrême-Orient, et qu'à cet effet une étroite coopération soit établie entre les autorités japonaises et les fonctionnaires des douanes maritimes chinoises afin de découvrir l'origine de la morphine de contrebande. Il importe en outre de tirer au clair les causes des divergences existant entre les statistiques d'importation japonaises et les statistiques d'exportation fournies par certains autres pays.

8. La Commission émet le vœu, afin de faciliter le contrôle général du trafic des drogues dangereuses:

a) que soient complétées aussitôt que possible les informations relatives à la fabrication de la cocaïne;

b) que le Conseil de la Société invite les gouvernements à envoyer au Secrétariat des estimations aussi exactes que possible des quantités de cocaïne qu'ils jugent nécessaires pour les besoins de leurs pays respectifs;

c) que les gouvernements prennent toutes mesures nécessaires pour échanger mutuellement des renseignements complets sur toutes les saisies effectuées par leurs autorités respectives de douane et de police;

d) que les gouvernements examinent l'opportunité d'éduquer la population au point de vue des dangers que présente l'usage des drogues nuisibles;

e) que, l'expérience montrant que par suite des énormes profits réalisés par le trafic clandestin des stupéfiants, les amendes ne sont plus une peine suffisante, les gouvernements étudient la question de punir également ce trafic de prison;

f) que la liste des drogues non comprises dans la Convention de 1912, transmise par le Gouvernement français, soit envoyée aux gouvernements intéressés pour toutes observations qu'ils jugeront utiles, et que, dans l'intervalle, la question de la convocation d'une nouvelle Conférence internationale soit ajournée.

9. La Commission est d'avis que soit acceptée l'offre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge, en vue d'inviter les Sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge s'intéressant à la question de l'opium, d'entreprendre une œuvre d'éducation populaire au point de vue des conséquences funestes de l'abus de l'opium.

10. La Commission émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements, lorsqu'ils établiront leur rapport annuel à la Société des Nations sur l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles, à adopter le projet élaboré par la Commission consultative, à transmettre ce rapport pour le 1^{er} juillet au plus tard (en ce qui concerne les pays d'Occident) et pour

le 1^{er} octobre (en ce qui concerne les pays d'Orient), que ce rapport soit rédigé dans l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles de la Société.

La Commission approuve les résolutions sous réserve de modifications de forme que pourront y apporter le président et le Secrétariat.

49. *Publication des documents.*

Le PRÉSIDENT propose que le résumé des réponses au questionnaire et tout autre document s'y rapportant soient publiés par le Secrétariat, mis au point et à jour.

La Commission approuve cette proposition.

50. *Date de la prochaine Session.*

Le PRÉSIDENT demande à la Commission si elle juge opportun de se réunir dans l'arrière automne, en octobre ou novembre. Il fait remarquer que la Commission n'a pas pu envisager la situation en général, en se basant sur les matériaux fournis par les réponses au questionnaire.

M. CAMPBELL (Inde) estime qu'une session par an n'est pas suffisante, mais propose de laisser au Secrétariat le soin de décider ultérieurement si la Commission doit se réunir cet automne.

La Commission approuve cette proposition.

51. *Télégramme du Gouvernement chinois.*

Le PRÉSIDENT communique le télégramme suivant reçu du Gouvernement chinois au sujet de la saisie d'opium de contrebande et de drogues nuisibles par la douane maritime chinoise:

« En réponse à votre demande de renseignements sur les saisies d'opium, de ses dérivés et d'autres drogues, au cours de la dernière année, l'Inspecteur général des douanes chinoises a télégraphié des détails complets au représentant de la Chine à Londres pour qu'ils soient transmis à Genève. La Chine est extrêmement désireuse d'agir énergiquement dans cette question. Comme cette question intéresse le monde entier, nous comptons sur la collaboration de la Société des Nations. »

(Signé) WAI-CHIAO-POU.

52. *Adresse de remerciements au Secrétariat.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT propose d'adresser des remerciements au Secrétariat pour son travail pendant la session de la Commission.

Cette proposition est adoptée à l'unanimité.

53. *Adresse de remerciements au Président.*

M. BOURGOIS (France) propose d'adresser des remerciements au président, ce qui est approuvé à l'unanimité.

(Signé) Rachel E. CROWDY (Secrétaire).

(Signé) Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Président).
G. BOURGOIS (Vice-Président).

ERRATA

Page 44 (français), 15^e ligne:

Transposer les mots "give references" et "reports. as".

Page 52 (français), 9^e alinéa:

Lire comme suit:

« Sur la proposition de M. Bourgois (France), les mots suivants: « les renseignements relatifs au Sse-Tchouen et au Yunnan » sont insérés avant les mots: « le représentant de la France à la Commission ».

ANNEXE 1

EXPOSÉ DE MRS. HAMILTON WRIGHT.

La meilleure méthode d'aborder ce problème est difficile à découvrir. L'autre jour à Washington s'est tenue une Conférence qui semble avoir indiqué une méthode pratique d'entrer immédiatement en matière. Il s'agissait de la réduction des forces navales et on décida que la façon la plus pratique de réduire les forces navales était de les réduire.

Ce serait là une méthode admirable pour résoudre la question de l'opium. Pour délivrer le monde de ce fléau, il faut restreindre la culture du pavot.

Ce n'est pas là une opinion nouvelle. Elle a été maintes fois soutenue par des personnalités éminentes. Sir John Jordan par exemple, nous a rappelé l'an dernier que partout où le pavot était cultivé, l'opium, en fin de compte, parvenait aux consommateurs. La seule méthode de résoudre le problème consistait à restreindre la production dans le monde entier.

Sir Francis Aglen, inspecteur général des douanes chinoises, déclare que la plus grande vigilance ne peut suffire à empêcher la contrebande de l'opium et de ses dérivés en Chine, et que seul un contrôle de la production peut réussir à combattre le mal avec efficacité.

Le gouverneur général des Philippines parle dans le même sens.

Le Gouvernement du Siam reconnaît que la suppression de la culture du pavot est l'objet qu'il avait visé.

Les Etats-Unis d'Amérique ont appliqué en 1915 la Convention de l'opium et ont promulgué des lois à cet effet, plus strictes qu'aucun autre pays. Néanmoins, tant que la culture intensive du pavot continuera, les Etats-Unis se trouveront dans l'impossibilité de remédier aux effets funestes de l'emploi de cette drogue.

A la réunion du Conseil de la Société des Nations, en juin dernier, le Docteur Wellington Koo avait proposé une résolution dans ce sens. Elle a été adoptée à l'unanimité et ce vote marque un grand progrès dans l'étude du problème de l'opium. Les mesures prises par le Conseil ont obtenu, m'a-t-on dit, le plus grand succès en Angleterre. En Amérique, elles ont provoqué le plus vif intérêt et la Société des Nations a été, de toutes parts, félicitée pour son attitude pratique et courageuse.

Aussi le prestige qu'elle avait acquis s'est-il vu soudainement diminué lorsqu'à la réunion de l'Assemblée l'œuvre du Conseil a été pour ainsi dire renversée de fond en comble. Le Dr Wellington Koo affirmait que l'objet que l'on se proposait, à savoir la restriction à des besoins « légitimes » du trafic de drogues nuisibles ne pourrait jamais être atteint tant que la production dépasserait de beaucoup les besoins de la médecine et de la science.

L'Assemblée proposa de remplacer le mot « légitime » par « médicaux et scientifiques ». Cette modification pourrait paraître minime; toutefois, le mot « légitime » est un terme très élastique. Les motifs qui ont conduit à modifier la décision du Conseil provenaient principalement de ce que le délégué de l'Inde avait affirmé que l'opium était réellement nécessaire à la population de l'Inde, à titre de prophylactique ou de médicament.

C'est là une question qui touche immédiatement au problème de la culture de l'opium dans son ensemble. Les témoignages innombrables des autorités médicales relativement aux effets désastreux de l'opium, soit qu'on le fume, soit qu'on le mange, semblent avoir fait très peu d'impression sur l'esprit populaire de l'Inde.

Néanmoins, il semble extraordinaire que l'Assemblée ait abouti à une décision précisément opposée à celle du Conseil et qu'au lieu de se fonder sur l'opinion du monde médical qui devrait faire autorité, elle se soit contentée de l'affirmation d'un seul individu ne représentant que l'opinion populaire et non scientifique qui prévaut depuis si longtemps dans l'Inde.

J'hésite à introduire dans cette discussion des questions de controverse de ce genre. Mais il serait évidemment imprudent de laisser sans commentaires la décision prise par l'Assemblée. Toute déclaration qui ne rencontre aucune contradiction se cristallise rapidement et devient bientôt un fait accompli.

Il y a longtemps que l'on aurait dû procéder à une enquête scientifique pour rassurer les esprits de ceux qui croient encore que l'opium a une valeur légitime, et pour mettre fin à une controverse qui dure toujours. C'est là une proposition qui a été faite à la Commission internationale sur l'opium qui s'est tenue à Shanghai. Toutefois, il y fut reconnu que bien qu'il n'existât aucun rapport international sur l'emploi de l'opium et des drogues analogues au point de vue scientifique, l'abus de ces drogues ne pouvait être défendu, ni moralement, ni économiquement.

Néanmoins, le rapport de la Commission royale de 1895, réfuté par les sommités médicales d'un grand nombre de pays, est encore cité comme s'il faisait autorité, et cela malgré la déclaration de Lord Morley:

« Je ne veux pas paraître dénigrer l'avis de la Commission, mais quoi qu'il en soit ses conclusions n'ont aucunement donné satisfaction à l'opinion publique de la Grande-Bretagne, ni rassuré la conscience de ceux qui avaient soulevé la question. De quelle utilité peut être l'avis des médecins sur la question de savoir si l'opium est en soi une chose bonne ou mauvaise lorsque nous possédons le témoignage des indigènes qui savent de première main ce que vaut l'opium ? »

En outre, nous savons que dans la pharmacopée britannique, l'opium est placé dans la catégorie des poisons et que la législation anglaise est conçue de façon à mettre cette drogue hors d'atteinte de la majorité des gens. En 1892, 5000 médecins de Grande-Bretagne ont déclaré publiquement que:

1. l'habitude de fumer l'opium ou d'en manger est dégradante au point de vue moral, comme au point de vue physique;
2. que l'opium devrait être classé et vendu comme un poison, dans l'Inde comme en Angleterre.

Nous savons aussi qu'en Europe et en Amérique, partout où il existe une législation pharmaceutique moderne, l'usage de l'opium pour tous autres objets que ceux de la médecine est sévèrement condamné. Dans ces conditions, comment peut-on impunément en permettre l'usage aux indigènes de l'Inde ?

Etant donné ces faits, il semble impossible de comprendre comment la Commission pourrait faire œuvre utile ou prendre des mesures désirables et pratiques si elle n'a pour point de départ que les conclusions de l'Assemblée.

Depuis notre dernière réunion, j'ai recueilli de nouvelles opinions sur l'efficacité de l'opium dans le traitement du paludisme et autres maladies bénignes de l'Inde; entre autres opinions, je citerai celles de Sir Patrick Manson et d'autres sommités médicales en Angleterre et en Amérique. Ce n'est pas mon intention de donner ici lecture de leurs conclusions, mais je serais heureuse de les voir figurer au procès-verbal.

J'essaierai d'être aussi brève que possible car l'ordre du jour contient un grand nombre d'autres questions dont l'étude nous permettra d'aboutir à une solution équitable du problème, telle qu'on peut en découvrir sans pour cela détruire l'équilibre économique de l'Orient. Il est évident qu'on ne peut s'attendre à ce que l'Inde seule détruise volontairement une de ses sources de recettes au profit d'autres nations. Il est donc absolument nécessaire d'examiner quels sont les meilleurs moyens à notre disposition pour induire les autres nations productrices d'opium en grande quantité à faire face à leurs obligations internationales et à se ranger à l'opinion bienséante du monde civilisé.

En premier lieu, il faut reconnaître qu'il ne s'agit pas d'une question exclusivement économique, mais d'une question morale qui affecte le bien-être de millions d'individus de toutes races et de toutes couleurs.

Je rappellerai brièvement les opinions suivantes qui devront figurer au procès-verbal. Il paraît superflu, au premier abord, de les citer; néanmoins, il est impossible de ne pas réfuter les paroles prononcées à l'Assemblée, car une opinion non réfutée peut facilement se cristalliser et être acceptée comme un fait indéniable.

L'efficacité de l'opium contre la malaria a été contestée à la Conférence de La Haye, par Sir William Collins et le Dr Wu Lien Ten.

Le Professeur Henry C. Barbour, de l'Ecole de pharmacie McGill, à l'Université de Montréal, a répondu à la lettre que je lui adressais:

« En ce qui concerne le besoin d'opium en Orient, je ne suis pas d'avis que l'opium ait une utilité essentielle en dehors de son emploi médical, et je suis persuadé que l'usage continu de cette drogue est nuisible à la santé.

« Le traitement de la malaria n'a aucun rapport avec l'usage de l'opium par les masses. Il est bien certain que l'opium n'a aucun effet spécifique contre cette maladie. »

Le Dr Richard Cabot, de l'Ecole de médecine de Harvard, dit:

« L'opium ne guérit ou n'aide nullement à guérir la malaria. On peut dire en toute certitude qu'il n'a jamais fait de bien à l'homme, sauf lorsqu'il est employé comme calmant. »

Le Dr Capps, de l'Université de Chicago, déclare:

« Je suis d'avis qu'aucune raison fondamentale ne justifie l'usage continu des opiacés en dehors de leur emploi comme calmants. Je ne partage nullement l'opinion de la personne qui prétend que l'usage de l'opium est justifié dans les cas de malaria chronique. L'usage continu de cette drogue ne détruit pas seulement la résistance de l'individu aux maladies infectieuses de toute espèce, mais, fait plus important encore, détruit peu à peu sa résistance morale. »

Le Dr C. W. Greene, de l'Ecole de physiologie de l'Université de Missouri, dit:

« Je suis chargé des cours sur les drogues, à l'Ecole de médecine de l'Université de Missouri, et je viens de commencer un cours pour les étudiants de seconde année de médecine sur l'action physiologique des drogues.

« Je ne peux souscrire à l'opinion suivante: « Il n'est aucune race sur la terre qui n'emploie un stimulant quelconque, et l'opium semble particulièrement convenir au tempérament oriental, lui causant moins de préjudice que d'autres drogues, certainement beaucoup moins que l'alcool... »

« Bref, je ne peux admettre que l'abus des drogues par les masses soit un argument en faveur de cette habitude. Je nie, de plus, que l'opium soit un remède contre la malaria; l'opium et ses alcaloïdes sont, à mon avis, les calmants les plus efficaces, mais il ne s'ensuit pas que l'emploi de ces alcaloïdes doive servir de préventif contre les douleurs de toute nature. »

Le Dr Greene poursuit:

« Il est regrettable que la pression intense du mercantilisme fasse, d'une drogue précieuse ou de toute une série de drogues, un usage absolument néfaste pour l'individu et la race. »

Le Dr C. C. Bass, du Laboratoire de médecine clinique de l'Université de La, déclare:

« Mes nombreuses études et recherches et mon expérience au sujet de la malaria me permettent de parler avec autorité de l'emploi de l'opium pour le traitement de cette maladie. L'opium n'a aucun effet satisfaisant sur la malaria, et n'est nécessaire en aucune circonstance. La quinine est un excellent remède contre cette maladie; il n'existe pas de cas qu'elle ne guérisse si l'on en fait convenablement usage. Au contraire, l'opium n'est pas un remède pour la malaria; il n'a aucune action spécifique contre cette maladie et ne peut servir d'agent curatif. »

ANNEXE 2

RAPPORTS RELATIFS A LA CULTURE DU PAVOT DANS LA PROVINCE DU FOOKIEN.

Rapport du Gouverneur de Fookien adressé par télégramme au Ministre de l'Intérieur, Pékin, 30 décembre 1921.

Une enquête approfondie a été effectuée dans toute la province par le Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung, accompagné de MM. Chen Pei-Kun, Taoyin d'Amoy, et Yu Shac-Ying, Directeur du Bureau pour la suppression de l'opium. Ils se sont assurés de l'abolition générale de la culture du pavot, bien que dans la partie inférieure de la province il ait été encore cultivé, mais il a été procédé à la destruction, par force, de ces cultures.

Rapport du Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung adressé par télégramme au Ministre de l'Intérieur, Pékin, 25 novembre 1921.

J'ai parcouru les régions de Chiin-Kiang, Nan-An, Yung, Chiun, An-Chi, Hua-An, Sen-Yiu et Pu-Tien. Nous n'avons trouvé dans ces régions aucune culture de pavot, sauf à Hua-An et Sen-Yiu, où cette plante était cultivée sous l'influence des bandits. Heureusement, le Gouverneur Lee a envoyé ses troupes sur les lieux et a détruit toutes les plantations de pavot. Quand je suis arrivé avec ma suite, il ne restait presque pas de pavot dans les champs.

« A notre arrivée à Pu-Tien, nous avons été informés par les notabilités qu'on n'avait jamais cultivé le pavot dans cette région, affirmation qui nous a été confirmée par les missionnaires américains et anglais qui s'étaient livrés à une enquête dans cette région et dans les alentours. Ce fait a été également confirmé par la Section de Foochow de l'Association internationale contre l'opium.

District de Tung-An. — Tung-An était bien connu pour ses cultures de pavot, mais elles ont été détruites par l'ordre du magistrat qui avait reçu du Gouverneur les instructions en vue de la destruction immédiate de toutes les cultures signalées. La Commission n'a rien aperçu au cours de son voyage entre la ville principale et les grands villages comme Ma-Shieng et Quan-Kow.

Districts de Sze-Ming et Chin-Mun. — Le pavot n'est pas cultivé dans ces deux districts en raison de leur caractère insulaire et montagneux qui ne convient pas à ce genre de plantation.

La Commission a parcouru douze districts du Comté (Tao) d'Anoy pendant six semaines et nous nous sommes assurés que la situation était satisfaisante à cet égard.

Rapport du Gouverneur de Fookien adressé par télégramme au Ministre de l'Intérieur, Pékin, 17 janvier 1922.

Le Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung, accompagné de MM. Wang Sou-Chun Taoyin de Chang-Chow et Ting-Chow, a fait une enquête personnelle dans les districts suivants:

Lung-Chi. — Les fermiers de ce district cultivent surtout la canne à sucre. Ils ont cessé de cultiver le pavot d'opium il y a quelques années. La Commission a été bien accueillie à son arrivée, particulièrement par les étudiants qui ont tous des sentiments très hostiles à l'égard de l'opium.

Nan-Ching. — A son arrivée dans ce district, la Commission a été reçue avec enthousiasme, particulièrement par les étudiants qui partagent les mêmes sentiments que leurs camarades de Lung-Chi. Au cours de notre voyage à travers le district, nous n'avons pas vu une seule tête de pavot.

Chang-Pu. — Le pavot somnifère ne pousse pas dans ce territoire montagneux, comme l'a attesté le missionnaire étranger qui réside dans ce district.

Chang-Tai et Ping-Hu. — Dans plusieurs endroits de ces deux districts, le pavot était cultivé, mais il a été détruit aussitôt que découvert. Le Commissaire, en arrivant dans ce district, n'a vu dans les champs que du riz.

De plus, suivant un rapport complémentaire du Taoyin de Chang-Chow, les plantations de pavot ont été supprimées partout sauf à Yuin-Shiao, où l'ordre n'est pas très strictement maintenu à l'heure actuelle. (Un rapport spécial sur ce district est donné séparément.)

Rapport du Commissaire spécial Wang-Tah-Chung, adressé au Ministre de l'Intérieur,
Pékin, 12 février 1922.

Yuin-Shiao. — La culture du pavot était considérable presque partout dans le district, car cette région échappait au contrôle des autorités, de sorte qu'elle ne pouvait faire respecter l'interdiction. Quand le Gouverneur a envoyé des troupes pour essayer de détruire le pavot, la foule est entrée en collision avec les soldats. Cependant, après de longs efforts, elle a laissé passer les soldats et le pavot a été détruit. Le Gouverneur avait l'intention de punir sévèrement ces fauteurs de troubles, mais on a montré pour eux une certaine indulgence, en raison des cautions fournies par la Chambre de Commerce, l'Association agricole et l'Association d'enseignement de Lung-Chi.

Rapport du Gouverneur Lee, adressé par télégramme au Ministre de l'Intérieur,
Pékin, 14 janvier 1922.

Ting-Chow. — Tous les districts de ce comté ont été soigneusement inspectés par le Commissaire spéciale, accompagné de MM. Wang-Sou-Chun et Taoyin. La culture du pavot a complètement cessé.

Extrait d'une dépêche du Gouverneur de Fookien, adressée au Ministre de l'Intérieur,
Pékin, 15 février 1922.

Foo-An, Sah-Pu, Foo-Ting, Ning-Teh et Sou-Ning. — Aucune culture de pavot n'a été trouvée dans ces districts; la Section de Foochow, de l'Association internationale contre l'opium, a procédé à une vérification. Une lettre adressée par ladite Association au Directeur du Bureau pour la suppression de l'opium, est ainsi conçue:

« Le vice-président de cette Association a reçu un rapport de son ami, le secrétaire de l'Association des missionnaires de Shanghai, disant qu'il avait fait un voyage à Amoy, Chin-Kiang, Hua-An, Sing-Hua et retour à Foochow. Il n'a pas trouvé de culture du pavot somnifère dans les endroits qu'il a traversés. Un autre rapport a été envoyé par un missionnaire américain qui a voyagé entre Yung-Chuen et Sing-Hua. Cette année, il a à peine trouvé quelques têtes de pavots. Il en a été très surpris, car l'année précédente il avait constaté que le pavot somnifère était cultivé en quatre-vingt-quatorze endroits différents dans le district. Il a fait ce voyage au commencement de l'hiver, alors que la saison de culture était passée, de sorte qu'il est certain qu'il n'y aura pas de culture de pavot cette année. C'est là le résultat de la stricte application des mesures destinées à la suppression, par les autorités provinciales, de la culture du pavot somnifère. »

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung au Ministère de l'Intérieur à
Pékin, le 11 novembre 1921.

Province de Fookien. — A mon arrivée dans la partie méridionale de la province de Fookien, j'ai reçu les salutations des représentants de la noblesse, de l'enseignement et du commerce. J'ai été escorté à la Chambre de Commerce où j'ai prononcé un discours sur la suppression de l'opium. Les auditeurs ont paru convaincus et ont promis de collaborer à notre œuvre.

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Péking, le 25 octobre 1921.

A mon arrivée à Fou-Tcheou, j'ai appris que le pavot était cultivé dans les parties sud de la province. En conséquence, j'ai secrètement chargé certaines personnes dignes de confiance de faire une enquête. J'ai divisé la province en quatre taos et envoyé un fonctionnaire procéder à une enquête dans chacun des taos. En même temps, j'ai demandé au gouverneur de faire savoir aux magistrats de tous les districts que le pavot devait être détruit partout. Au cas où il ne serait pas détruit avant l'arrivée des personnes chargées de l'enquête, le magistrat du district serait tenu pour responsable, et passible d'être congédié. M. Yu Shao-Ying, directeur du bureau principal pour la suppression de l'opium, a été également chargé de procéder à des enquêtes en différentes parties de la province. Il est donc certain qu'à la suite de ces mesures la culture du pavot disparaîtra de la province.

ANNEXE 2^a.

**RAPPORTS RELATIFS A LA CULTURE DU PAVOT
DANS D'AUTRES PROVINCES DE LA CHINE.**

Province de Kansu.

Dépêche du Commissaire spécial Pan Ling-Kou au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 5 décembre 1921.

Pour se faire aider dans son enquête sur la culture du pavot dans la province, la Commission a nommé comme conseiller honoraire, un missionnaire étranger: le Révérend Yensouchien (?). Grâce à sa collaboration, on peut être certain que l'enquête sera menée à bonne fin.

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Pan Ling-Kou au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 25 décembre 1921.

Ning-Sha, Shi-Ning, Kau-Liang et An-Su. — La culture du pavot est strictement interdite dans ces quatre taos. La Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation.

Wei-Chieun et Ching-Yuen. — Il existait des plantations de pavot dans la juridiction de ces deux taos. Elles avaient été signalées en été, mais la Commission n'a rien trouvé lorsqu'elle s'est rendue sur les lieux.

Loan-Shan. — Le pavot était cultivé dans quelques districts de ce tao. Cette culture avait été signalée, mais les propriétaires, en apprenant l'arrivée de la Commission, craignant d'être punis, ont détruit eux-mêmes les plantations.

Province de Shensi.

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Sung Len-Kwoi au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 20 décembre 1921.

Il avait été signalé que le pavot était cultivé en secret dans la partie nord de Chang-An. Le magistrat de ce district a reçu l'ordre de faire détruire les plantations, ce qui a été fait. L'enquête se continue dans les autres districts. Jusqu'ici, la Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation de pavot. Elle transmettra ultérieurement de nouveaux rapports.

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Sung Len-Kwoi au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 25 décembre 1921.

Han-Yang, Sing-Kou, Mei-Shien, Pao-Gi, Shian-Shien, Chou-Yi, Hua-Yin, Hua-Shien, Tuh-Li. — Des rapports sur lesquels on peut se fier ont été reçus des fonctionnaires chargés de l'enquête, qui ont voyagé à travers tous les districts énumérés ci-dessus et qui ont reconnu qu'il

n'existait aucune plantation de pavot. Ils ont recueilli des déclarations des autorités militaires locales leur donnant l'assurance qu'il n'existait dans le district aucune plantation.

Province de Shensi.

Rapport télégraphique du Commissaire spécial Sung Len-Kwoi au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 28 décembre 1921.

Wei-Nan, Tung-Kuan, Lok-Nan, Shian-Nan. — Une enquête détaillée a été faite dans ces districts, mais la Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation de pavot.

Yen-Len, Fun-Shien, Shan-Yang. — Il existait dans ces districts des plantations de pavot, mais les autorités locales les ont fait détruire.

Den-Wu. — On signale qu'il existe dans plusieurs endroits de ce district un certain nombre de plantations. La Commission a chargé les autorités civiles et militaires de procéder à leur destruction.

Province de Hupei.

Dépêche du Gouverneur civil de Hupei au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin, le 31 octobre 1921.

La province du Sud-Est vient d'être délivrée de l'invasion des troupes méridionales. Dès que l'ordre sera rétabli, l'interdiction de la culture du pavot sera strictement appliquée. Les plantations de pavot ont déjà été détruites en plusieurs endroits.

Province de Shansi.

Dépêche du Gouverneur de Shansi au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin.

La culture du pavot a été strictement interdite dans la province. Les autorités locales ont saisi et détruit de l'opium passé en contrebande et provenant de la province voisine.

Province d'Anhui.

Dépêche du Gouverneur d'Anhui au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin.

La partie nord de la province était reconnue avant l'application de la loi d'interdiction, comme l'un des districts où l'opium était cultivé. Toutefois, depuis l'établissement de la République, l'interdiction de cette culture a été strictement observée. On possède à cet effet les témoignages de la Commission mixte anglo-chinoise qui se livrait à une enquête détaillée dans la province en 1917.

Dans quelques districts éloignés on signalait quelques cas de culture de pavot, mais les plantes ont été détruites. Le fait est vérifié également dans une lettre d'un missionnaire américain qui déclare s'être assuré que le pavot a été détruit par les autorités locales.

Province de Kilin.

Dépêche du Gouverneur de Kilin au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin.

On signale dans la province un certain nombre de districts où le pavot est cultivé. Toutefois, la plupart des plantations ont été détruites à mesure qu'elles ont été découvertes. Une loi d'interdiction de la culture du pavot comprenant quinze articles a été promulguée et mise en vigueur.

Province de Heilung-Kiang.

Communication du Gouverneur de Heilung-Kiang au Ministère de l'Intérieur, Pékin.

Des mesures rigoureuses ont été prises en vue de l'interdiction de la culture du pavot dans la province, sauf dans certaines régions telles que le massif intérieur des montagnes de Sing-An, que ne peut atteindre le contrôle de l'administration à cause de leur éloignement et de la proximité de la frontière russe. Cependant, les autorités provinciales s'efforceront de leur mieux d'assurer l'exécution de la loi.

Suiyien.

Communication du Commissaire spécial Wu Pun-Chih au Ministère de l'Intérieur, Pékin,
14 janvier 1922.

La Commission a procédé à une enquête minutieuse dans tous les districts. Elle a découvert des cultures de pavots en certains endroits, mais a fait détruire les plants. Les autorités locales ont déployé tous leurs efforts pour assurer l'exécution de la loi d'interdiction; c'est pourquoi les membres de la Commission sont satisfaits du résultat obtenu, à savoir que toutes les plantations de pavots ont été supprimées dans les différents districts.

Province de Hsinchiang.

Communication du Gouverneur de Hsinchiang au Ministre de l'Intérieur, Pékin.

Des mesures rigoureuses ont été prises en vue de l'interdiction de la culture du pavot dans la province. Nous possédons à cet égard le témoignage du vice-consul britannique à Kasah; en avril dernier, il s'est rendu de Kasah dans les districts de Kan-Ke-Su, Bai-Chung, Fu-Ju et Yen-Chi et également de Kan-Ke-Su et Ping-Tah-Pan à Yi-Li. Il n'a découvert aucune culture de pavots sur une étendue de plusieurs milliers de li, au cours d'un voyage qui a duré une centaine de jours. Le mois d'avril est la saison des pavots, le moment où leurs fleurs sont facilement visibles. Certainement le vice-consul britannique n'aurait pas manqué de s'apercevoir de l'existence des plantations de pavots s'il y en avait eu.

On a découvert de l'opium en certains lieux; il a été confisqué par la police et brûlé publiquement.

Province de Sse-Tchonen.

Communication du Commissaire de la Défense de la frontière de Sse-Tchonen,
au Ministère de l'Intérieur, Pékin.

Le pavot n'a jamais été cultivé dans plus de vingt districts de cette partie de la province, occupés par des tribus indigènes, car ces tribus n'ont jamais contracté l'habitude de fumer l'opium. En d'autres endroits, des plants de pavot ont été découverts mais ils ont été détruits par les autorités militaires. On a découvert de nombreux cas de contrebande d'opium et l'opium a été confisqué et brûlé publiquement.

Jehol.

Dépêche du Commandant militaire de Jehol au Ministère de l'Intérieur à Pékin.

La culture du pavot est interdite en vertu d'une loi spécialement promulguée à cet effet. On peut affirmer que les autorités locales appliqueront cette loi dans toute sa rigueur.

Extrait d'une dépêche du Commissaire spécial Yao-Tchi-Yuen au Ministère de l'Intérieur
à Pékin, en date du 10 janvier 1922.

La culture du pavot est strictement interdite depuis 1915. Les enquêtes auxquelles on a procédé en 1916, 1917, 1918, n'ont fait découvrir aucune plantation de pavots.

On a signalé que certains districts éloignés, tels que le Ping-Cheun, le Wei-Chung, le Czé-Chung, le Lung-Hua, le Ling-Yun, le Kien-Pung, le Fung-Chi, le Ning-Liun, le Ping-Fu, le Heinching-Chia, contenaient des plantations de pavots, mais les autorités locales ont reçu l'ordre de les détruire. Tous les fonctionnaires nommés par les princes mongols ont donné l'assurance que la culture du pavot était et demeurerait strictement interdite.

ANNEXE 3

INDICATIONS GÉNÉRALES POUR L'ÉTABLISSEMENT DU RAPPORT ANNUEL DES GOUVERNEMENTS.

(Texte approuvé par la Commission consultative de l'opium, le 26 avril 1922.)

Le rapport doit être envoyé chaque année au Secrétariat, avant le 1^{er} juillet (pour les pays d'Occident) avant le 1^{er} octobre (pour les pays d'Orient).

Rapport du Gouvernement de..... sur le trafic de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles, pour l'année.....

A. — RENSEIGNEMENTS GÉNÉRAUX.

I.

Prière de signaler toutes les nouvelles lois, règlements importants, ordonnances, etc., ayant trait au trafic de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles, et édictés pendant l'année..... ainsi que toutes modifications importantes apportées aux mesures administratives en vigueur.

Prière de fournir des renseignements sur les documents officiels publiés, de nature à intéresser la Commission consultative.

2. Réglementation des importations et exportations.

Fournir un compte rendu détaillé du fonctionnement du système des « Certificats d'importation », en mentionnant les difficultés de toute nature auxquelles son application a pu donner lieu, tant en ce qui concerne :

- a) l'exportation, que
- b) l'importation des stupéfiants.

Quelle est la procédure suivie pour les pays qui n'ont pas encore adopté le système ?

3. Réglementation intérieure de la fabrication, de la vente, de la distribution, de l'usage, etc., des stupéfiants.

Prière de fournir des renseignements sur tout point nouveau présentant un intérêt ou une importance particulière, concernant l'application des lois en vigueur, et, spécialement, le degré de consommation habituelle des stupéfiants; les difficultés de l'application de ces lois à des cas particuliers; les difficultés rencontrées dans la mise en vigueur de ces lois et tous les renseignements qu'il sera possible d'obtenir sur le trafic illicite des stupéfiants, ainsi que sur les origines de ce trafic et les voies et moyens employés.

Fournir tous les renseignements possibles sur les poursuites engagées et les condamnations prononcées.

B. — STUPÉFIANTS PARTICULIERS.

4. Opium brut.

- a) Si le pays est un pays producteur d'opium, indiquer la superficie cultivée, la quantité récoltée et la proportion moyenne de morphine contenue dans l'opium.

b) Importations.

Indiquer le nom des ports autorisés pour l'année....., ainsi que le montant des importations pour chaque espèce d'opium (opium européen, turc, persan, indien et autre).

c) Indiquer la quantité d'opium de chaque espèce employée à la fabrication:

1. de la morphine,
2. de l'opium médicinal,
3. d'autres préparations médicinales.

d) Autres usages.

Fournir des renseignements sur la nature de ces usages, les quantités consommées, etc.

c) Exportations.

Indiquer les ports autorisés pour l'année....., le montant des exportations d'opium de chaque espèce, ainsi que le lieu de destination.

5. Opium préparé.

a) Pays dans lesquels l'importation, la fabrication et l'usage de l'opium préparé sont interdits.

Indiquer s'il a été possible de supprimer l'habitude de fumer de l'opium,

1. dans la population indigène.
2. dans la population étrangère.

A quelles nationalités appartiennent les fumeurs d'opium ?

Nature des difficultés rencontrées dans l'application des mesures de répression.

A quel degré l'opium est-il introduit en contrebande ?

Mesures législatives prises. Nombre des poursuites, etc.

La collaboration d'autres pays est-elle nécessaire pour arriver à une suppression absolue ?

Dans l'affirmative, indiquer les formes de cette collaboration.

b) Pays dans lesquels l'usage de l'opium préparé n'est pas complètement interdit.

Indiquer les modifications qui ont pu être apportées pendant l'année au système en vigueur et, le cas échéant, les mesures nouvelles prises en vue de la suppression absolue.

Indiquer, si possible, le chiffre total de la consommation d'opium préparé, le prix de vente au détail, et si on ne l'a déjà fait, tous renseignements utiles sur le fonctionnement d'un système de contrôle.

Dans les pays où les fumeurs doivent être munis d'une licence ou être enregistrés, indiquer le nombre de ces fumeurs.

Indiquer le nombre de Chinois domiciliés dans le pays et si l'habitude de fumer existe également chez des personnes appartenant à une autre nationalité; indiquer le nombre de personnes de cette nationalité domiciliées dans le pays. Indiquer également, le cas échéant, le revenu provenant de la vente d'opium préparé et le montant de ce revenu par rapport au revenu total du pays.

6. Morphine.

a) Importations.

Indiquer les quantités de:

1. morphine,
2. sels de morphine,
3. préparations, mélanges, etc., contenant de la morphine importée des divers pays fournisseurs; dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de morphine contenu dans ces préparations).

b) Fabrication.

Indiquer les noms des fabricants et l'emplacement des fabriques, les quantités de chaque espèce d'opium utilisées pour la fabrication; le pourcentage (si on le connaît) de morphine contenue dans cet opium; la quantité de morphine ou de sels de morphine fabriquée.

N. B. — Comprendre la morphine transformée en héroïne, codéine et autres substances, en indiquant les quantités ainsi transformées.

c) Exportations.

Indiquer les quantités de:

1. morphine,
2. sel de morphine,
3. préparations, mélanges, etc., contenant de la morphine, exportées dans les divers pays destinataires. (Dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de morphine contenu dans ces préparations.)

Signaler toute augmentation ou diminution des exportations à destination d'un pays quelconque par rapport à l'année précédente.

d) Fournir, si possible, une statistique de la consommation intérieure de morphine pour des usages:

- a)* médicaux,
- b)* scientifiques.

e) Indiquer les catégories de personnes auxquelles ont été délivrées des licences ou des autorisations en vue de l'usage ou de la possession de stupéfiants.

7. Héroïne.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine (sauf en ce qui concerne la quantité d'opium brut utilisée).

8. Opium médicinal.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine.

9. Cocaïne.

a) Si la coca est cultivée, fournir des renseignements sur la superficie cultivée, l'emplacement des plantations, le nom des propriétaires; les exportations de:

1. cocaïne brute,
2. cocaïne raffinée ou sels de cocaïne

dans les divers pays destinataires; le prix de la cocaïne brute et de la cocaïne raffinée, les quantités de cocaïne brute et de cocaïne raffinée, en stock, au début et à la fin de chaque année.

b) le montant des importations de:

1. cocaïne brute;
2. cocaïne raffinée ou sels de cocaïne;
3. préparations, etc., contenant de la cocaïne. (Dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de cocaïne contenu dans ces préparations).

c) Indiquer le nom des propriétaires et la situation des fabriques dans lesquelles on extrait la cocaïne des feuilles ou dans lesquelles on raffine la cocaïne brute; la production de chaque fabrique pour l'année.

d) Indiquer les catégories de personnes à qui ont été délivrées des licences ou des autorisations en vue de l'usage ou de la possession de stupéfiants.

10. Autres stupéfiants auxquels s'applique la Convention.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine.

C. — DIVERS.

II. Chine.

Fournir tous renseignements nouveaux sur l'application des dispositions du Traité.

12. *Mesures d'ordre international.*

Signaler les traités ou accords internationaux, relatifs à l'opium ou aux narcotiques, signés au cours de l'année.....

13. *Autres stupéfiants.*

Signaler tous les faits intéressants se rapportant à l'usage de stupéfiants non mentionné dans le questionnaire qui précède, ainsi que les mesures prises à ce sujet au cours de l'année....

14. *Renseignements complémentaires et suggestions.*

.....
.....
.....
.....

Présenter autant que possible sous forme de tableaux statistiques, les renseignements demandés aux paragraphes 4 à 10. Indiquer si les marchandises en transit sont comprises ou non dans les chiffres donnés pour les importations et les exportations.

N. B. — Les gouvernements sont priés de vouloir bien fournir les mêmes renseignements pour leurs colonies, possessions, protectorats, territoires à bail, territoires sous mandat, etc.

ANNEXE 4

LETTRE DE LA LIGUE DES SOCIÉTÉS DE LA CROIX-ROUGE

[Traduction.]

6 avril 1922.

Monsieur le Secrétaire général,

Dans votre lettre relative à l'abus de l'opium, vous m'avez demandé des renseignements sur le rôle que la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge pourrait jouer dans la campagne que la Société des Nations se propose d'entreprendre contre ce fléau. Comme vous le comprendrez facilement, la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge ne dispose pas de fonds qu'elle puisse directement employer pour une campagne de ce genre; de plus, nous ne possédons pas, à l'heure actuelle, dans notre personnel, d'experts spécialement qualifiés pour nous fournir des avis sur les conséquences fâcheuses qui résultent de l'abus de l'opium. Ces réserves faites, je suis heureux de vous soumettre les observations et les suggestions suivantes sur la part qu'à mon avis nous pourrions prendre à cette œuvre.

1. A l'occasion de la récente réunion du Conseil général de la Ligue, nous avons consulté le colonel H. Ross, de l'« Indian Medical Service », Secrétaire de la Croix-Rouge de l'Inde, sur les projets que vous m'aviez communiqués; c'est en conformité de ce que nous croyons être son opinion que les propositions suivantes vous sont soumises :

a) La Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge pourrait s'adresser à toutes les sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge qui sont spécialement intéressées soit à la production soit à l'usage ou à l'abus de l'opium; elle pourrait solliciter leur sympathie, leur appui et leurs conseils au sujet des mesures qu'il conviendrait de prendre pour organiser une campagne, avec la collaboration des autorités officielles, en vue de combattre l'abus de l'opium;

b) Il ressort des résolutions qui ont été adoptées à la dernière réunion du Conseil général, que la méthode qui a la confiance de la Société et dont elle proposerait l'emploi aux sociétés affiliées, est celle de l'éducation populaire sur les questions d'hygiène. Appliquée à la question de l'opium, cette campagne serait une campagne d'éducation du public ayant pour but de le renseigner clairement sur les résultats funestes qui résultent de l'abus de l'opium;

c) Dans la lettre qui serait adressée aux Sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge, on demanderait des renseignements complets sur la situation existant dans leurs pays respectifs au point de vue de la réglementation légale de la possession, de l'usage, de la vente, etc. de

l'opium ; on demanderait également les suggestions qu'elles auraient à présenter au point de vue des moyens à employer par la Croix-Rouge et par les autres organisations bénévoles pour aider les autorités officielles à restreindre l'abus de la drogue.

2. Comme l'indique la résolution N° 9, adoptée à la dernière réunion du Conseil général de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge, j'ai été invité à organiser une Conférence orientale de la Croix-Rouge qui se réunira à Bangkok en novembre 1922. Ce me paraît être là une occasion exceptionnelle de faire adopter des mesures prises de concert par les organisations bénévoles et les Gouvernements au point de vue de l'usage de l'opium et je propose que la Société des Nations profite de cette occasion pour obtenir auprès des Gouvernements les renseignements les plus complets, afin que la Conférence de Bangkok soit en possession des données qui lui seront nécessaires pour formuler des avis et des recommandations vraiment utiles.

3. Je me permets donc de soumettre la proposition suivante à l'examen de la Société des Nations: Avec l'approbation des gouvernements Membres de la Société, la Société des Nations pourrait, le plus tôt qu'il lui serait possible, envoyer dans les pays spécialement intéressés, par exemple en Chine, au Japon, dans les Etablissements du Détroit, dans l'Inde et peut-être en Perse, un délégué dûment qualifié qui examinerait la situation actuelle et aurait pour instructions, après avoir recueilli ces renseignements, de se rendre à Bangkok comme représentant de la Société des Nations pour soumettre ces renseignements à la Conférence orientale de la Croix-Rouge. Afin que la Société des Nations soit à même de juger de la valeur de cette suggestion, je vous soumettrai le plus tôt possible, à titre d'information, copie d'un mémoire, en cours de préparation, sur les sujets qui seront discutés à Bangkok. Ce mémoire sera prochainement adressé aux Sociétés de Croix-Rouge de l'Amérique, de l'Australie, de l'Angleterre, de la Chine, de la France, de l'Inde, du Japon, des Pays-Bas, de la Nouvelle-Zélande et du Siam. Je vous adresserai en même temps, copie de l'itinéraire de la délégation de la Ligue, ainsi que de l'ordre du jour de la Conférence. C'est en partie à la suite de votre lettre que j'ai donné à la question du trafic de l'opium une place très importante dans cet ordre du jour; si la Section d'hygiène de la Société des Nations peut agir dans le sens que j'ai indiqué, je suis certain que des propositions très utiles pourront sortir des délibérations de la Conférence et que celles-ci pourront amener un plan bien établi de collaboration effective de la part des gouvernements et des Sociétés de Croix-Rouge intéressés.

Je regrette de ne pouvoir faire parvenir avant deux ou trois jours le mémoire dont je vous ai parlé dans le paragraphe précédent. Dans l'intervalle, j'espère avoir l'occasion, avec votre approbation, de discuter personnellement la question avec le Docteur Rajchmann.

Veillez agréer, etc.

(Signé) CLAUDE H. HILL.

ANNEXE 5

LETTRE DU REPRÉSENTANT DE LA CHINE AU SECRÉTAIRE DE LA COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE.

24 avril 1922.

Madame,

A la suite du projet de résolution présenté par le Président à la séance du 24 avril au matin, pour compléter ma proposition que la Commission avait adoptée au cours de sa séance du samedi après-midi, puis-je vous prier de vouloir bien soumettre la présente lettre à l'examen des membres de la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium ?

Tout d'abord, je dois faire observer que cette résolution n'était aucunement justifiée, car elle constitue évidemment un amendement à la proposition que j'avais soumise et que la Commission avait définitivement adoptée.

Je me souviens que le Président, en mettant aux voix ma proposition, a déclaré qu'il ne supposait pas qu'elle serait adoptée; elle l'a cependant été, par quatre voix contre une. Elle ne saurait donc plus être modifiée. Moi-même qui l'ai proposée, ne pourrais plus la retirer. Le Président lui-même s'en est rendu compte samedi dernier, car il remarqua que si ma proposition était adoptée, toutes les propositions du même genre tomberaient. Lorsque ma proposition fut adoptée d'une manière imprévue, je ne pus que m'en féliciter et en même temps j'exprimai mes remerciements aux membres de la Commission pour avoir bien voulu se rallier à ma façon de voir, sur la politique du « laisser faire » en Chine. L'adoption de la résolution indiquait qu'elle répondait à l'opinion de la majorité des membres de la Commission, et le président n'avait aucunement le droit d'y proposer une modification quelconque.

Le projet d'amendement porte que le Gouvernement chinois devrait inviter des représentants de la Société à accompagner les membres des Commissions au cours de leurs enquêtes. Le Gouvernement chinois ne saurait accepter l'expression « devrait inviter ». J'ai, à maintes reprises, déclaré à la Commission que mon Gouvernement ne consentira jamais à donner son adhésion à une proposition de ce genre. Par conséquent, l'expression « devrait inviter » signifiera que le Gouvernement chinois « n'invitera pas ». Si quelqu'un ne désire pas inviter un ami à dîner, mais que celui-ci insiste en lui disant : « Vous devriez m'inviter », il lui sera nécessaire d'exprimer plus clairement ses intentions en répondant : « Je ne vous inviterai pas ». A quoi sert que l'ami répète : « Vous devriez m'inviter » ?

Je tiens à déclarer officiellement à la Commission, au nom du Gouvernement chinois, que la Chine n'acceptera jamais cette proposition et ne formulera aucune invitation. Il est donc inutile de proposer qu'une invitation soit envoyée.

Le deuxième paragraphe de la même résolution déclare que « les enquêtes ne sauraient être efficaces que si elles sont effectuées pendant la saison où le pavot est en fleur », et il recommande que le « Gouvernement chinois soit invité à prendre ses dispositions en conséquence. » Naturellement, les enquêtes seront effectuées pendant la saison du pavot ; je puis vous assurer que ceci était contenu implicitement dans ma proposition et qu'il n'est aucunement nécessaire d'insérer un nouveau paragraphe dans la recommandation déjà adoptée.

Pour illustrer d'une façon plus concrète ce que je viens de dire, je pourrai faire observer que voter la résolution présentée par le Président, après que ma proposition a été adoptée, équivaudrait à peu près à ajouter, dans un tableau, des pattes à un serpent.

Je m'élève donc énergiquement contre la résolution additionnelle, car elle implique une discrimination défavorable à la Chine et elle est incompatible avec la procédure ordinaire suivie dans les affaires publiques.

Veillez agréer, etc. :

(Signé) CHAO-HSIN CHU,

Représentant de la Chine.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF MEMBERS | 4 |
| AGENDA | 4 |
| FIRST MEETING (April 19th — 10-30 a.m.) | 5 |
| 1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman. | 5 |
| 2. Procedure and Composition of the Committee. | 5 |
| 3. The situation to date as regards the signature and ratification of the Opium Convention and the signature of the Protocol of 1914. | 5 |
| 4. Correspondence with the Netherlands Government | 6 |
| SECOND MEETING (April 20th — 10 a.m.) | 8 |
| 5. Order of work | 8 |
| 6. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 9 |
| 7. Import Certificates | 9 |
| 8. Draft Official Import Certificates | 10 |
| THIRD MEETING (April 20th — 3 p.m.) | 11 |
| 9. Approval of the Minutes. | 11 |
| 10. Interpretation of the word "legitimate" in the resolution on Importation Certificates taken by the Committee on May 4th, 1921. | 11 |
| 11. Signature of the Opium Convention | 11 |
| 12. Re-exportation of Imported Drugs | 11 |
| 13. Enquiry by the Health Committee on the approximate requirements of drugs specified in Chapter III of the Opium Convention. | 11 |
| FOURTH MEETING (April 21st — 10 a.m.) | 13 |
| 14. Minutes | 13 |
| 15. Minutes of the First Meeting | 13 |
| 16. The Far-Eastern problem | 13 |
| FIFTH MEETING (April 21st — 3 p.m.) | 16 |
| 17. Adhesion of Colombia to the International Opium Convention. | 16 |
| 18. The Far-Eastern problem (<i>continued</i>) | 16 |
| SIXTH MEETING (April 22nd — 10 a.m.) | 19 |
| 19. Minutes. | 19 |
| 20. The Far-Eastern problem (<i>continued</i>). | 19 |
| SEVENTH MEETING (April 22nd — 3 p.m.) | 22 |
| 21. The Far-Eastern problem (<i>continued</i>) | 22 |
| EIGHTH MEETING (April 24th — 10 a.m.) | 26 |
| 22. Minutes | 26 |
| 23. The Far-Eastern problem (<i>continued</i>) | 26 |
| 24. Illicit Trading in the Far East | 28 |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| NINTH MEETING (April 24th — 3 p.m.) | 30 |
| 25. Illicit Trading in the Far East (<i>continued</i>) | 30 |
| 26. Far-Eastern problems in general | 32 |
| TENTH MEETING (April 25th — 10 a.m.) | 00 |
| 27. Minutes | |
| 28. Enquiry into approximate requirements of raw opium specified in Chapter I of the Opium Convention. | 34 |
| 29. Extension of investigations to include all dangerous drugs producing similar effects to those mentioned in the Convention | 37 |
| ELEVENTH MEETING (April 25th — 3 p.m.) | 39 |
| 30. Enquiry into the approximate requirements of raw opium. | 39 |
| 31. The manufacture, distribution and use of morphine and cocaine. | 40 |
| 32. Telegram from the International Council of Missionaries | 41 |
| 33. Letter from the International Opium Association at Peking. | 41 |
| TWELFTH MEETING (April 26th — 10 a.m.) | 42 |
| 34. Departure of the Chinese Representative. | 42 |
| 35. Minutes of the Ninth Meeting. | 42 |
| 36. Form of Annual Report to be furnished by the Governments. | 42 |
| 37. Proposal by the Canadian Government for an Inventory of Stocks of Narcotics. | 45 |
| 38. Date of sending in the Report | 46 |
| THIRTEENTH MEETING (April 26th — 3 p.m.) | |
| 39. Public Meeting | 47 |
| 40. Budget for 1923 | 48 |
| 41. Letter from the League of Red Cross Societies | 49 |
| 42. Letter from the Director of the International Office of the Universal Postal Union. | 50 |
| 43. Letter of the Secretary of the Committee from the Chinese Representative. | 50 |
| 44. Publication of the Summary of the replies to the questionnaire. | 51 |
| 45. Resolution of Sir John Jordan | 51 |
| 46. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 52 |
| FOURTEENTH MEETING (April 29th — 10 a.m.) | 53 |
| 47. Approval of the Minutes | 53 |
| 48. Report of the Committee to the Council | 53 |
| 49. Publication of Documents. | 57 |
| 50. Date of the next Meeting. | 57 |
| 51. Telegram from the Chinese Government | 57 |
| 52. Vote of thanks to the Secretariat | 57 |
| 53. Vote of thanks to the Chairman. | 57 |
| ANNEXES: | |
| 1. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 58 |
| 2. Reports on poppy cultivation in the Fookien Province | 60 |
| 2a. Reports on poppy cultivation in other provinces of China | 62 |
| 3. Form of Annual Report by Governments. | 64 |
| 4. Letter from the League of Red Cross Societies | 67 |
| 5. Letter from the Chinese Representative to the Secretary of the Advisory Committee | 69 |

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

SECOND SESSION

Held at Geneva from April, 19th to 29th, 1922.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Government Representatives.

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

Assessors.

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

Secretary.

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

AGENDA.

1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

A. REPORTS ON QUESTIONS CONSIDERED AT THE FIRST SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE.

2. Signature and Ratification of the Opium Convention and Signature of the Protocol of 1914.
— The situation to date.
3. Correspondence with the Netherlands Government.
 - (a) System for exchange of information.
 - (b) Information exchanged under Article 21 of the Convention.
4. Replies to the Questionnaire.
5. Annual Report and additional information. Including Canadian proposal concerning annual statement of narcotics in stock.
6. Enquiry by Health Committee on approximate requirements of Drugs specified in Chapter III of the Opium Convention.
7. Importation Certificates.
8. Representations by Consular Representatives in China.
9. Article 15 of the Opium Convention.

B. NEW QUESTIONS.

10. Enquiry on approximate requirements of Raw Opium specified in Chapter I of the Opium Convention.
11. Extension of investigation to include all dangerous Drugs producing similar effects to those mentioned in the Convention.
12. Draft Budget for the Opium Section for 1923 and Reports on Budgets for 1921 and 1922.
13. Report to be presented to the Council by the Advisory Committee.
14. Other business.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

MINUTES OF THE SECOND SESSION

held at Geneva from April 19th to 29th, 1922.

FIRST MEETING

held on April 19th, 1922, at 10.30 a.m..

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

1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain), as Vice-Chairman of the Committee during its first session, took the chair in the absence of M. van Wettum, Chairman. He said the first business for the Committee was to appoint a new Chairman and Vice-Chairman according to the rules of procedure.

On the proposal of the Delegate of the Netherlands, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE was appointed Chairman.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, M. BOURGOIS (France) was appointed Vice-Chairman.

2. Procedure and Composition of the Committee.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided* to hold two meetings a day.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would remember that the Second Assembly had recommended that all States which were interested to any considerable extent in the traffic should be represented on the Committee. It was regrettable that the Government of the United States had, so far, not seen its way to co-operate, but they welcomed the representative of Germany, who was present for the first time.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thanked the Chairman for his welcome. The question with which they were concerned was humanitarian and not political, and his Government was happy to collaborate with the States which were engaged in this work.

3. The Situation to date as regards the Signature and Ratification of the Opium Convention and the Signature of the Protocol of 1914.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Finnish Minister at The Hague had been authorised to sign the Convention. Chile had announced her intention of ratifying.

M. BRENIER complimented the Secretariat on the preparatory work which it had done for this meeting. He drew attention to a slight error which appeared in certain documents; it was necessary to distinguish Kwantung, a Japanese "leased territory", from Kwangtung, which was a Chinese province.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the list of countries which had not ratified the Convention.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) observed that two important opium-producing countries, Persia and Turkey, had not yet ratified, and, though Persia had signed the Convention, she had made an important reservation in regard to Article 3a, which was an essential part of the Convention.

Replying to a question of Sir John JORDAN, he explained that the opium exported from Persia was transhipped principally in the ports of Bombay, Singapore and Hong-Kong, and that it was impossible for the Government of India to control these transshipments.

It was pointed out by the CHAIRMAN that the case of Persia stood on a different footing from that of Turkey. Persia was a Member of the League, and her representative at the Assembly last September had taken part in the work of the Committee which considered the opium question and had agreed to its recommendations.

In the present political situation with regard to Turkey, it was probably not possible to take any action at the moment; but, presumably, in any treaty that might be concluded between the Allies and Turkey, the same provisions regarding opium would be inserted as those contained in the Treaty of Sèvres.

The Committee agreed that the Council should be asked to bring pressure to bear on the Persian Government to adhere to the Convention in its entirety, and that the attention of the Council should be called to the position as regards Turkey.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that it was important that all the opium-producing lands of the old Turkish Empire should be covered, and it was agreed that — so far as they had not passed into the possession of countries which had already adhered to the Convention — this ought to be secured.

The position as regards Switzerland was then considered.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Swiss Government had explained that it was owing to constitutional difficulties that Switzerland had not yet ratified the Convention. The internal trade in opium fell within the competence of the Cantons, and the position was still being considered by the Government.

It was pointed out that the control of the import and export of the drugs was presumably a question for the Federal Government, and *the Committee decided* to ask the Council to invite Switzerland, pending the solution of the constitutional difficulty, to adopt the system of importation certificates recommended by the Committee during its last session.

Generally, *it was decided* to invite the Council to press the question of ratification on the States which had not yet adhered — directly in the case of the States Members of the League, and indirectly through the Netherlands Government in the case of the other States.

4. Correspondence with the Netherlands Government.

(a) System for exchange of information (C. 171. M. 88. 1922, XI, Annex 10).

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that all the States had agreed to send the information required by the Convention to the Secretariat of the League of Nations, except the United States, which continued to send this information to the Netherlands Government.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she would place at the disposal of the Committee the reply of her Government to the questionnaire and the texts of the laws relating to opium.

The CHAIRMAN, supported by M. BRENIER, asked whether this information was official, and pointed out that, apart from the questionnaire, under Article 21 of the Convention, the signatory States had assumed the obligation to communicate to the Netherlands Government information as to the traffic in the drugs.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT explained that, owing to a misunderstanding, her Government had not forwarded the information in question to the Netherlands Government. The documents which she would submit to the Committee had an official source.

The Committee decided to recommend that the Council should ask the Netherlands Government to draw the attention of the Government of the United States to the fact that the information required by Article 21 of the Convention had not yet been furnished.

(b) Information exchanged under Article 21 of the Convention (C. 71. M. 88. 1922, XI, Annex 6).

The CHAIRMAN observed that this list of documents did not include all the information supplied to the League. Most of the States had supplied the documents with their replies to the questionnaire. He enquired whether it was necessary for the Secretariat to communicate all the documents received to all the signatory States, which would entail a very large amount of work, or whether they could not find a more economical procedure.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) mentioned some German laws which were not included in the list. He undertook that in future all documents should be sent directly to the Secretariat.

On the proposal of M. BRENIER, *the Committee decided* to circulate periodically a list of documents received. Each Government might then ask the Secretariat to communicate such documents as were of particular interest to it.

Communications to the Press.

The Committee decided to draft each day a communication, the text of which would be approved by the Chairman.

SECOND MEETING

Held on April 20th, 1922, at 10 a. m.

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

5. Order of Work.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that various items of the Agenda were closely related, but suggested that, for purposes of discussion, a broad general division should be made; the Committee should first deal with the problem of opium in the Far East, and next with the general question of the control of traffic in morphine, cocaine and their derivatives throughout the world with special reference to European countries and the United States.

It was not possible, for instance, to discuss the fourth item of the Agenda (Replies to the questionnaire) without discussing the eighth and ninth (Representations by Consular representatives in China, Article 15 of the Opium Convention) at the same time.

He proposed that the Committee should begin by discussing the seventh item, Importation Certificates, and then pass on to the question of the world's requirements of morphine, etc., and the questions raised by France concerning the control of other drugs.

M. BRENIER agreed, but was of opinion that the Committee could not discuss the question of raw and prepared opium in the East without considering the question of its derivatives also.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that the Committee should first deal with the great opium-producing countries: China, India, Turkey and Persia. It could consider the amount of opium produced, consumed and exported by each of these countries. The question of the export of opium differed in accordance with the different countries to which it was exported. Some countries manufactured it and exported its derivatives, some simply imported sufficient for internal consumption. In the case of the former the Committee would have to consider the manufacture and control of the derivatives.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with the Chairman, but thought that the Far-Eastern question should be discussed before the question of importation certificates.

Mr. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the reports of the Commission of Enquiry sent by the Chinese Government into the various opium-producing provinces of China could not be laid before the Committee before the end of the week as they had not all been translated.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was astonished at this delay; he had been given to understand that these reports had been received two months ago.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the reports of the Chinese Government's Commission of Enquiry were made to the Chinese Government and not to the League of Nations. The Chinese delegate to the Second Assembly had promised that they should be laid before the League, and he understood that the Chinese representative on the Committee was ready to do so.

Sir John JORDAN said that, during the first session of the Committee, he had made a proposal to which the Committee had agreed, but which the Council of the League had subsequently rejected. He understood that the Council had done this because it had been assured that the Chinese Government was conducting an enquiry, the results of which would be placed before the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium. The postponement of this question was most unfortunate as he could not remain in Geneva beyond the beginning of the following week.

M. BRENIER also said he could not remain long in Geneva.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Chinese representative if it would be possible for him to give the Committee a summary of these reports immediately. The Committee could then wait for the full text.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he thought these reports were going to be discussed when the eighth item of the Agenda (Representations by Consular representatives in China) came

before the Committee. He had been unable to bring all the reports with him from London, but had been obliged to send some by post. These he had not yet received, doubtless through delay at the Customs. All the reports, however, would be ready by the end of the week.

M. BRENIER asked if the Chinese representative could not give a general survey of the question in the more-important provinces of China, from the Committee's point of view.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) replied that he had not been given sufficient time to prepare a summary. The opium question was an international one and, as such, concerned other countries besides China. The Committee could start on other aspects of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Eastern question should be postponed until the morning of the next day in order to give the Chinese representative time to prepare his summary.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) pointed out that the discussion of his summary would not exhaust the question and that the Committee would have to wait for the full reports.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) hoped that the Committee would be able to hear the Chinese representative's summary on the next day, as, after listening to it, the Committee would be able to deal at once with the questionnaires while Sir John Jordan and M. Brenier were still present and could then examine later at leisure the detailed reports when they were ready.

After further discussion between the CHAIRMAN, Sir John JORDAN and the CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE, the *Committee agreed* to postpone discussing the Far-Eastern question until its Meeting on the morning of April 21st.

6. *Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT made a statement on the general question of Traffic in Opium (Annex 1).

7. *Import Certificates.*

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the system of certificates which it had recommended had been adopted by the Council and by the Assembly. Unfortunately only a few Governments had accepted the Committee's recommendation and a partial system was very unsatisfactory. He considered that some Governments had misunderstood the proposals, and he asked the Representative of the Netherlands whether the Secretary-General's explanatory note had removed this misunderstanding as far as the Dutch Government was concerned.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that the explanation did not touch the difficulty. His Government's objection was that it could not guarantee that there would never be an abuse or an illegitimate use of the drugs imported.

The CHAIRMAN said that the government of the importing country would not have to undertake more than a reasonable responsibility. The wording of the certificate would be discussed later.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) thought that this explanation would satisfy his Government.

Sir John JORDAN said that the certificate could be of use in countries where stable conditions prevailed and where the government services were working regularly, but not in disturbed countries where the illicit traffic in these drugs was being carried on a large scale.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Germany's acceptance would be forthcoming immediately but that in free ports like Hamburg, and he understood the same was true of Copenhagen, the re-exportation of drugs could be carried on outside the Customs barrier without the knowledge of the authorities. The German Government was ready to extend the system of control to her ports. In order, however, that the control should be effective it should be exercised by all States.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that his Government, which employed the system of customs bonds (*acquit à caution*) had no objection in principle to the system proposed. The only reason why it had delayed giving its reply was that it had been studying the question and desired to put forward a concrete solution. In order to grant certificates with full knowledge of the facts it was necessary to undertake a detached preliminary examination of the actual needs of the country and to find out to whom they should be granted, whether to all sellers or only to some. The head of the Customs Service had suggested that imports of narcotics should be generally prohibited, and that exceptions should be authorised where justifiable by a competent Committee. In this way smuggling by postal packets could be dealt with. The Government of Indo-China had also prepared a draft scheme.

The French Government had the same scruples as the Netherlands Government. It should be clearly understood that in the official importation certificate the words: — "the consignment

proposed to be imported is required" meant that the government held itself responsible for the necessity of the import, but not for the use made of the imported products.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Portuguese representative if he had any observations to make on the subject of certificates.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he had nothing to add to the reply of his Government to the questionnaire. In answer to the wish expressed by the President in the name of the Committee, he stated that he was ready to draw his Government's attention to the importance of accepting the system of certificates.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) told the Committee that a telegram had just been received from the Government of India accepting the principle of certificates with certain possible reservations to be explained in a despatch following. He did not anticipate that the reservations, if any, would be of a serious nature.

8. Draft Official Import Certificates.

The CHAIRMAN asked if there were any objections to the draft (Document O. C. 21).

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thought that the certificate should mention "manufacturing purposes" in addition to "legitimate purposes" and "medical and scientific purposes."

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had decided that manufacturing purposes were included in the terms used.

The Committee decided to ask the Council to invite the Signatory Powers to adopt the certificate, it being understood that the words "is necessary" referred to the necessity of importation and not to the use of the products.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to fix a date on which the system should enter into force for all countries. He said that Great Britain was already applying it and this meant that she was at a disadvantage with regard to other countries.

After discussion concerning the necessity to inform the trade in time regarding the proposed measure, the Committee adopted Mr. Campbell's proposal to the effect that the system should come into force on September 1st, 1922, in Europe and America and on January 1st, 1923, for other countries.

M. BOURGOIS (France) stated that he would transmit this decision to his Government, but he thought the period of delay too short to enable a detailed study of the question to be undertaken and the necessary arrangements made.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) agreed with M. Bourgois.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked when the question of re-exportation would be discussed and if it could not be taken with the question of import certificates.

A discussion took place, during which Mr. Campbell suggested that under the system a country would not permit export unless a certificate was forthcoming from the country of ultimate destination if the ultimate destination were known.

This view was generally adopted.

THIRD MEETING

Held on April 20th, 1922, at 3 p.m.

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

9. Approval of the Minutes.

The Committee approved the Minutes of the First Meeting subject to a small change proposed by the Chairman.

On the request of Mr. CAMPBELL (India) note was made in the Minutes of the fact that the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, which had been invited by the Assembly to send a representative to the Committee, had not done so.

10. Interpretation of the Word "Legitimate" in the Resolution on Import Certificates on May 4th, 1921.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) asked if the Assembly had substituted another word for "legitimate" in the Committee's resolution on Importation Certificates as they had done in the case of the Committee's other resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the change had been only made in another resolution regarding the world's requirements of raw opium.

After a discussion, in which Mr. CAMPBELL (India) and Sir John JORDAN took part, it was agreed that the decision of the Assembly with regard to the application of the word "legitimate" did not affect the export trade in raw opium as to which it was still an open question.

11. Signature of the Opium Convention.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Lithuanian Government had signed the Opium Convention on April 7th.

12. Re-exportation of Imported Drugs.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) drew the Committee's attention to the case of imports which were only partially consumed in the country, the balance being re-exported. He asked if an international means of control could not be established over the re-exportation.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, if the Chinese Representative referred to legitimate traffic, the system of certificates provided sufficient means of control; but if he referred to smuggling, it was rather a matter for police measures.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT and Sir John JORDAN asked if the danger of re-exportation could not be guarded against by adding to the certificate a clause prohibiting re-exportation.

The CHAIRMAN thought that re-exportation could not be prohibited since there were centres of distribution outside the exporting countries.

13. Enquiry by the Health Committee on the approximate requirements of drugs specified in Chapter III of the Opium Convention.

Dr. Norman WHITE, Deputy-Director of the Health Section, asked by the Chairman to give any available information, stated that investigations had been carried out in Sweden, Denmark and

Switzerland. The comparison of the results obtained in these three countries exhibited both discrepancies and similarities of some interest, but the greatest caution was needed in any attempt to make these figures a base for the formation of an international standard applicable to all countries. The enquiry in Switzerland had been carried out by Dr. Carrière with the greatest care; the difficulties encountered in the enquiry and the amount of labour involved indicated how formidable a task it would be to obtain similar figures for larger countries. Even should it be possible to carry out enquiries in numerous countries, the results would be little likely to be consistent. It was doubtful even whether the term "legitimate requirements" was capable of an interpretation applicable to all countries. France had proposed that the Opium Advisory Committee should take count of numerous chemical substances allied to morphine, cocaine, and their derivatives. It would seem to be of doubtful wisdom to hamper in any way the use of drugs which were not "habit-forming", and which might be satisfactory substitutes for the more dangerous drugs under consideration. Should it be considered necessary to carry on the investigations that had been begun, it would be desirable to extend them over a number of years and to carry them out in a larger number of countries.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked Dr. Norman White to give him information on the three following points:—

1. To what extent would the conclusions obtained in Northern countries apply to other countries. Italy, for example.
2. To what extent would the conclusions apply to India and Eastern countries generally?
3. Ought an enquiry to be conducted in India to find out approximately her legitimate requirements?

Dr. Norman WHITE replied:—

1. It would be unjustifiable to utilise the results of the enquiry made in Northern countries, such as Sweden, in fixing a standard of legitimate consumption for a country such as Italy. The legitimate consumption would depend, amongst other things, on the morbidity of the country concerned. For this purpose in Europe it might be assumed that morbidity rates varied directly with mortality rates.

(2) That it would not be justifiable to apply results obtained in Europe to Oriental countries such as India, where conditions of life, the prevalence of disease, the number of doctors, the large number of unqualified medical practitioners and the requirements of the population dependent upon climatic and other conditions were so entirely different.

(3) The difficulties of conducting an *ad hoc* enquiry in India would appear to be almost insuperable.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the consumption per head per annum of all forms of opium in India was 26 grains (1.9 grammes). This figure, the accuracy of which was beyond dispute, was for British India only, with a population of 240,000,000. The population of India including the Native States was about 320,000,000.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the consumption of cocaine in Switzerland seemed large. In Germany it was not larger than in Denmark, and Germany consumed three or four times more morphine than cocaine. Dangerous drugs were being more and more replaced in Germany by non-injurious drugs, which had the same effect and which were cheaper.

Dr. Norman WHITE, in reply to a question from M. BRENIER, expressed the opinion that the substitution of non-injurious drugs, that is to say drugs which were not "habit-forming", for the dangerous drugs which they were considering would do much to solve a very difficult problem. It would be of great interest to have statistics from Germany showing what had already been accomplished in this direction. At present the dangerous "habit-forming" drugs were essential to the practice of medicine.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) hoped to be able to furnish statistics before the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN stated that it was difficult to reach a definite decision on legitimate requirements; and, on his proposal,

The Committee decided to recommend the Council to ask the Health Committee to pursue their enquiries.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was obviously extremely important to obtain statistical information from Governments as to imports, exports and manufacture.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that a knowledge of the legitimate requirements would only have a very indirect effect on the campaign against the illicit traffic in narcotics. To combat these abuses, the problems of production and smuggling must be attacked. He asked if the approximate ratio of legitimate to illegitimate use of the drugs could be, at the moment, in any way estimated.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that light would be thrown on this question when the replies to the Questionnaire were examined.

FOURTH MEETING

Held on 21st April, 1922, at 10 a.m.

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

14. Minutes.

The Minutes of the Second Meeting, subject to certain amendments, were adopted.

15. Minutes of the First Meeting.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT desired that the document which she had handed in with regard to the reply of the United States of America to the Questionnaire as recorded in the Minutes of the First Meeting should be withdrawn.

16. The Far-Eastern Problem.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the problem of opium in the Far East should be discussed under three heads:

1. The situation in China regarding the cultivation of the poppy.
2. Smuggling, especially with regard to the smuggling of morphia into China.
3. The situation in certain colonies and possessions in the East as, for instance, Hong-Kong, Singapore, and Indo-China.

He hoped the Committee would endeavour to keep these proposed divisions in mind when discussing this question.

He called upon the Chinese representative to read his summary of the reports of the Commissioners sent by the Chinese Government to investigate the cultivation of the poppy in the various provinces of China.

In answer to Mr. CAMPBELL, the Chairman stated that a *Blue Book* issued by the British Government on the poppy cultivation in China had been circulated to members of the Committee last January.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) explained that the Chinese Government had been faced with great difficulties in investigating poppy cultivation, owing to the large area which had to be dealt with and the unrest existing in certain provinces. As a result, however, of its investigations it had reached two conclusions:

1. In some districts there was no cultivation whatever.
2. In other districts there had been cultivation but the crops had been destroyed.

He then read a summary of the reports concerning the province of Fukien (Annex 2).

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to put four questions to the Chinese representative before the other reports were read:—

1. How many provinces had been inspected by the Commissioners?
2. How many Commissioners had been sent out?
3. At what season of the year had they made their tours?
4. How large an area had they traversed?

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) replied:—

1. The names of the provinces and regions visited were: Fukien, Kansu, Shensi, Shansi, Sin-yuan, Hupei, Anhui, Kilin, Heilung-Kiang, Jehol, Hsinchiang, Sze-chuan (Chuan Pien), Western Marches of Sze-Chuan).

2. That five Special Commissioners had been sent out and that the other investigations had been made by the Governors of the provinces.

3. That as regards the season of the year at which the Commissioners made their journeys, all, their reports were dated at the end of 1921 except a few which had been dated in October of that year. The Commissioners had left Peking in the middle of the year.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) asked if their reports had been dated at the conclusion of their tours.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) stated that he did not know the exact date of the departure of the Commissioners on their tour.

The CHAIRMAN said it was of the utmost importance for the Committee to be able to know at what season of the year these Commissioners had discharged their duties. If they had visited the provinces after the opium harvest, they would naturally have discovered nothing.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) stated that he was sure the Commissioners had arrived before the harvest, because in certain of their reports they referred to the finding of poppy which they had ordered to be destroyed. They could not have found this poppy unless they had been there before the harvest.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that the Chinese representative's opinion was too optimistic. There were cases cited in the British Government's *Blue Book* where fields had been investigated by the Chinese Government out of the poppy season. He concluded, therefore, that the Chinese representative was unable to state specifically the exact season of the year in which these Commissioners had made their investigations.

Sir John JORDAN said that it was not possible for any exact details of the areas under poppy cultivation to be given in reply to Mr. Campbell's fourth question.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) then read a summary of the reports on the other provinces (Annex 2a).

M. BRENIER, on the subject of the reports presented by the Chinese representative, desired to draw the attention of the Committee to a fact of importance, if some substantial result was to be reached. Account must be taken of the relative importance of the Chinese provinces from the point of view of their actual, or possible, production of opium. The province of Fukien, of which the Committee had heard a great deal, had never been an important producing province. An approximate classification was furnished by the official data presented by the Chinese Government itself, to the Commission at Shanghai in 1909, and at The Hague in 1911-12. An estimate of the production of opium in China would be found on page 57 of Vol. II of Documents of the International Hague Conference. This estimate showed that, at the beginning of the anti-opium campaign in 1907, the cultivation of the poppy was chiefly concentrated in the three provinces of Sze-Chuan, Kweichow and Yunnan, the last of which alone produced 364,000 piculs of opium out of an estimated total of 584,000 piculs (about 35,000 tons).

In answer to a remark of Sir John JORDAN, who disputed the accuracy of this estimate, M. Brenier said that the figures were collected by the Chinese Maritime Customs, whose composition and means of information were above suspicion. It was on this basis that very important resolutions had been passed both at Shanghai and The Hague. Almost two years' continual journeying in Yunnan, Kweichow and Sze-Chuan, entitled M. Brenier to avow their importance as past producers of opium and as possible producers in the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to make some general observations on the summary furnished by the Chinese representative.

In the first place, the Central Government of China had only sent out five special Commissioners and the remainder of the investigations had been conducted by the Governors of the provinces. The *Blue Book* issued by the British Government proved clearly that it was precisely these Governors who were chiefly responsible for encouraging the cultivation of opium. The charges made in that publication were definite and it would therefore seem that the Chinese Government was in the position of having employed a thief to report on the crime. He was obliged to declare that the Government of India would not accept the reports of the provincial Governors.

Mr. Campbell also drew attention to a statement appearing on page 116 of the *Blue Book*, made by the British Minister in Peking, to the effect that one at least of the Commissioners sent by the Central Government had been open to corruption.

The poppy was sown in October and its prevalence could only be detected when the crop was in flower, which was only during March and April. The dates of the special Commissioners' reports showed that they had not conducted their investigations during either of these months.

The Commissioners appointed had had to traverse an immense area. One province alone was larger than France. What reliance could be placed on the investigations of five men over a vast tract of country, when, to be effective, those investigations ought only to have been carried out in the space of some six weeks, and when, as a matter of fact, they had not been conducted during the season when the poppy was in flower?

The Chinese representative's summary bore a strong resemblance to some of the evidence contained in the *Blue Book*.

The reports, however, were in many cases undated and were of so vague a character that little reliance could be placed on them.

Sir John JORDAN said that the evidence in his possession proved that the reports of the special Commissioners and of the provincial Governors were with one exception entirely inaccurate.

He could only endorse the report of the Governor of Shansi. This province had been cleared of opium more than ten years ago and had remained clear ever since in spite of great difficulties. Its Governor had the double task of keeping out native-grown opium in the East and stemming the inflow of foreign morphia from the West.

With reference to the province of Anhui for example, which the Chinese representative had declared to be free of opium, the North China *Daily News*, a long-established and reliable paper, said: "Opium has been planted and is being grown over an area of unprecedented size". The provinces of Sze-Chuan and Shensi were in a better state except in certain districts. The Commissioners had failed to visit the two provinces where the cultivation was most prevalent. Yunnan and Kweichow.

In the absence of statistics, it was hard to form an estimate of the cultivation of opium in China, but, in Sir John Jordan's opinion, the present cultivation was about twenty-five per cent of what it had been in 1907 when the first efforts had been made to suppress it. In the 10 years, 1907-1917, the work of the British Government and the great efforts made by the Chinese Government and people themselves had resulted in its almost total suppression. After 1917 there had been a relapse. He wished the Chinese Government could frankly have acknowledged this instead of sending in reports upon which no reliance could be placed.

The causes of this collapse had been primarily due to the disturbed state of China, which had been and still was in a transition stage from monarchy to democracy. The military Governors of the provinces were the real rulers, and they were compelling and encouraging the growth of the poppy.

There were, however, three contributory causes: first, the immense quantity of morphine which was sent to the Far East from about 1917 onwards and of which a large quantity had found its way into China; next, the smuggling of foreign opium; and lastly, the Indian Government's policy of continuing to send opium to Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, etc. While the Indian Government continued to supply opium to Chinese settlers in its own possessions, in those of other Powers and in the East, the Chinese Government could and did argue that it was quite justifiable for them to supply their own people at home with opium: this was an acknowledged fact and was also the opinion of all the British communities in the East.

When he had first gone out to China about forty years ago, comparatively little opium had been grown. Indian exports to China, however, had increased until they had reached at one time as much as 100,000 chests a year. It was scarcely surprising, therefore, that China should have increased her own cultivation of opium. If the Advisory Committee did not take firm action, China, which had not hitherto produced any morphia, would soon begin similarly to manufacture morphia rather than allow it to be imported by other countries.

Letter of sympathy to M. Van Wettum.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN the Committee agreed to send a letter of sympathy to M. Van Wettum, who was prevented by illness from attending the session.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) thanked the Committee for their action.

FIFTH MEETING

Held on April 21st, 1922, at 3 p. m.

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

17. Adhesion of Colombia to the International Opium Convention.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Secretary-General had received a communication from Colombia stating that its adhesion to the International Opium Convention would be placed before the next Congress and that the Delegate to the Third Assembly would be given powers to sign.

18. The Far-Eastern Problem (continuation).

M. BRENIER said that he had been concerned since their beginning with the efforts to suppress the cultivation and abuse of opium. He wished to congratulate the Chinese Government on what it had achieved in the past and also Sir John Jordan for his work during the years 1907 to 1917. There could be no doubt that very important results had been obtained by 1917. Now, however, there had been an unfortunate relapse. He suggested that the Chinese Government should find means to substitute the cultivation of some product other than the poppy in order that the farmers might be provided with an alternative means of livelihood.

As he would be obliged to leave Geneva before the Committee would have finished its work, he wished to state now that it was his firm opinion that special measures should be taken to suppress the abuse of cocaine and morphia throughout the world by the control of their manufacture. This was even more important than the suppression of the cultivation of opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), in answer to Mr. Campbell's objection that the Commissioners had not started their work until after the poppy season was over, stated that they had not been appointed by the Chinese Government until August.

Sir John JORDAN said that some of the reports appearing in the British Government's *Blue Book* were dated July, and that it therefore appeared that the poppy season varied in different provinces and that a summer crop was grown in some districts.

M. BRENIER said that in the provinces in which he had personally resided, and which were the most important from the point of view of opium cultivation, the poppy was sown in winter and reaped in the spring.

The CHAIRMAN said that, according to a despatch from the British Minister in Peking dated August 5th, none of the special Commissioners had left at that date to begin their enquiries, while all the poppy harvest had been gathered except in Northern Manchuria, and in one or two other districts.

M. BOURGOIS (France) stated that the information collected by France concerning Yunnan and Sze-Chuan after the publication of the British *Blue Book* confirmed and even went beyond the conclusions contained in that document. He gave details concerning the cultivation of opium in those two provinces. The cultivation which, as a result of the efforts of the Government of Peking, had been reduced by 75 to 80 per cent. in certain districts, now extended over the same area as it had covered before the passing of the prohibitive measures. Those measures which had been taken against the cultivation of the poppy and the use of the drug had now become a dead letter. The production of the province of Yunnan would amount in 1922 to about 300 tons. The selling price had dropped to 80-cents an ounce. Communication between Canton and Kouang Si, whither the opium had been exported, having been interrupted, an intense outbreak of smuggling threatened the frontier of Tonkin.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that the Committee realised the great difficulty under which the Chinese Government was labouring, and any proposal made would be with a desire to help and not to criticise.

Last year the Committee had made a report stating that the poppy was being cultivated with the connivance of the provincial Governors and that the Central Government was too weak to prevent it.

Sir John Jordan had proposed that the Consular representatives of the Treaty Powers should be instructed, with the consent of the Chinese Government, to make strong representations to the provincial governors. The Committee, with the exception of the Chinese representative, had adopted this proposal; but the Council and the Assembly had decided to take no action upon it until the Chinese Government had carried out the investigations the result of which had just been communicated. The Committee would have to give an opinion on the results of these investigations, and also on the Chinese Government's reply to the questionnaire, which stated that there had been no recrudescence of opium cultivation except on a very small scale. The reports of its Commissioners said the same thing. Both the reply and the reports were irreconcilable with the British Government *Blue Book* and the French Government's report. Mr. Campbell and Sir John Jordan had given reasons which led to the conclusions that the Chinese Government Commissioners' reports and the reports of the Provincial Governors were of very little value. If the Committee accepted the *Blue Book*, which described the conditions prevalent in 1920, was it now prepared to say that there had been a sudden and drastic change? The Central Chinese Government had little control over the Provinces and there were at least two large armies engaged in civil war in China.

He thought the Committee would conclude, therefore, that there was at the present moment a large and widespread cultivation of the poppy in China. This was wholly inconsistent with China's obligations as a Member of the League of Nations. He suggested that the Committee should take the following decisions:

1. It should repeat its recommendation concerning the action to be taken by the Consular representatives of the Treaty Powers, who should inform the League of Nations of any steps they might take.
2. It should request the Council to instruct the Secretariat to watch the situation in China, and to get into touch with authoritative sources of information.
3. The Chinese Government should be asked to instruct the Chinese Maritime Customs service to supply the League with all details regarding the seizure of contraband opium, morphine, etc.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the Chinese Government would appreciate the efforts of the League to combat the opium problem. But in no circumstances whatever would the Chinese Government tolerate the intervention of the Consular representatives of other Powers in the internal affairs of China. The Chinese people would greatly resent foreign interference. Such interference would weaken the position of the Chinese Government, and would create a very dangerous precedent. The League of Nations could not treat China differently from the way it treated its other Members. To do so would be a violation of the Covenant. If this method was applied to China, why not apply it to all other countries which produced opium?

The opium question was an international one, and the only effective method by which the League could deal with it would be to establish an international control of the production and distribution of opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were two things for the Committee to decide: first, what view should be taken of the reports which had been presented by the Chinese representative, and, secondly, what recommendations or suggestions should be made to the Council. He would be happy to have the views of the Committee on the statement he had made summarising the discussion. He had no formal resolution to present, but he would suggest that, if the Committee approved his statement, it might be embodied in the report of the Committee to the Council.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he was quite prepared to accept the statement of the Chairman.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) enquired whether the Chinese representative had not misunderstood the character of the proposal which had been made in regard to consular representations. They ought not to embarrass the Chinese Government by interference with its internal affairs, and the consent of the Chinese Government should be obtained before any consular representations were made.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that consular representation would, in any case, be interpreted as foreign interference. He reminded the Committee that the year before, when the resolution regarding consular representations had been passed, the Committee had not known whether the Chinese Government would consent. On that occasion M. Tang Tsai-Fou, not knowing the attitude of the Chinese Government, had only made a reservation. Now, however, precise instructions had been given to the Chinese representative, who was in a position to state that consular representations would in no event be allowed.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether the Chinese Government denied the right of the British diplomatic representatives in China to make representations under the Treaty of 1911.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that this was a question which must be put officially to the Chinese Government.

Sir John JORDAN stated that every Consul in China was in the habit of making representations under the Treaty to the local Chinese authorities and that such representations had been continuous from 1917 to the present day.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) pointed out that the resolution passed by the Committee last year stipulated for the consent of the Chinese Government. This was an admission that the consent of the Chinese Government was necessary.

The CHAIRMAN said that the attitude of the Chinese representative was extremely disappointing. The Committee, in passing its resolution of the previous year, had had no idea of embarrassing the Chinese Government by foreign interference. It had realised that the revival of poppy cultivation was due to the action of the local military governors. The League merely desired to help the Chinese Government to carry out its obligations. The Chinese Government was not in a position to do so, and, at the same time, it refused the assistance of the Committee.

In these circumstances the Committee could do no more than suggest to the Council that the method of consular representation appeared to be the best means of preventing the local military governors in China from encouraging in their own interests the cultivation of the poppy. The Council would have to decide whether the matter should be brought to the notice of the Treaty Powers, and the Chinese Government would have to consider its attitude should the Treaty Powers decide to press it to carry out its duties under the Treaty of 1911 and as a Member of the League of Nations.

M. de Kat ANGLINO (Netherlands) said he could understand the objections of the Chinese Government to consular representations in view of the political difficulties involved. He proposed that the Committee should adopt the following resolution:—

"Having regard to the great achievements of the Chinese Government in the past in suppressing the cultivation of the poppy,

"Having heard the report of the Chinese Government on the results of the work of the special Commission,

"Sympathising with the difficulties of the Chinese Government particularly in view of the internal conflicts in the country at the present time,

"And after taking note of certain differences of opinion as to conditions there:

"The Advisory Committee begs to recommend that the Council, in addition to requesting that the Chinese Government consider such further action as may be taken ask the Governments having treaties with China, particularly in view of their obligations under Chapter IV of the Convention, to consider the situation and to forward to the Secretary-General such observations and suggestions as they may deem advisable.

"Organisations interested in the suppression of the opium traffic might also be asked for their views."

The CHAIRMAN said he personally could not accept this draft. He proposed that the Committee should take a decision at that sitting on the value of the reports presented by the Chinese representative and on the suggestion that the League of Nations should collect further information. The other questions might be reserved until a future sitting.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the question should be divided into two parts: first, the adoption of the Chairman's summary and its inclusion in the report of the Committee to the Council, and, secondly, the practical measures to be taken.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the question of the summary should be taken first.

Sir John JORDAN suggested that a resolution embodying the Chairman's summary should be drafted and that the Committee should vote upon it. This might be telegraphed to China and would have a great effect on Chinese public opinion.

The CHAIRMAN undertook to draft a text and to submit it to the Committee at its next meeting.

This was agreed to.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he must repeat that no resolution which included a recommendation for the making of consular representations could be accepted by the Chinese Government. There should be no room for misunderstanding on this point. Chinese public opinion was hostile to the cultivation of the poppy, but it would not tolerate foreign intervention.

Sir John JORDAN said that hitherto British and Chinese officials had co-operated most cordially in this matter and that Chinese public opinion had been strongly in favour of the action taken. There had never been an opposition in the past, although consular intervention had been continuous and much more active than it was at present.

SIXTH MEETING

Held on April 22nd, 1922, at 10 a.m.

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

19. *Minutes.*

The Committee approved the Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings with certain amendments and additions.

It was understood that Mr. Campbell (India) would reply at a future meeting to the statements made by Sir John Jordan.

20. *Far-Eastern Problem (Continuation).*

The CHAIRMAN laid before the Committee the following draft resolution:--

"The Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium of the League of Nations, having considered the reports, as communicated by the Chinese representative on the Committee of the enquiries instituted by the Chinese Government into the alleged revival of opium cultivation in various provinces, and having had regard to the time at which, the conditions under which, and the position of certain of the persons by whom the enquiries were made, and having compared the reports with the information contained in the *Blue Book* issued by the British Government and with other information before the Committee:

"Regrets that it is unable to accept the reports furnished by the Chinese Government, and while gladly acknowledging that in certain districts efforts have been made by the authorities to enforce the prohibition of opium, is forced to the conclusion that there is a large and widespread revival both of the cultivation and use of opium in China.

"Further, the Committee realises that the responsibility for the revival rests mainly, if not wholly, on the provincial governors in the districts concerned; and that at the present time, under the political conditions prevailing, the pressure of public opinion is probably the only force available to remedy a state of things which is both a violation of the treaty engagements of China and inconsistent with its obligations as a Member of the League of Nations."

"The Committee recommends, therefore:

"1. That the Council should publish the conclusions at which the Committee has arrived;

"2. That the Council should invite those Powers which have special treaty relations with China to take such steps as may be in their power, through their representatives in China and otherwise, to bring pressure to bear upon the responsible provincial authorities; and

"3. That, in execution of the duty which is placed upon the League by the Covenant of the League, the Council should, through the Secretariat, take steps to watch the position in China in regard to the cultivation of opium and should publish from time to time the information it obtains."

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), in the name of his Government, said that he could not accept the draft resolution. Last year the Committee had recognised that it was necessary to obtain the Chinese Government's consent. To-day, however, the Committee knew that the Chinese Government was unable to give its consent to the intervention of the Consular Representatives. All States Members of the League of Nations were equal, and the weak state of China was no reason to compel it to submit to foreign intervention from which it had suffered too much in the past. The Committee's intentions were no doubt excellent, but the resolution could only have the most disastrous consequences if it were adopted. The opium problem did not concern China only; it concerned other countries which everyone knew produced opium and morphine.

A leading article in *The Times* of London (1921) showed that in reality the manufacture of morphine was greatly in excess of legitimate requirements. One ton of morphine was the equivalent of seven tons of opium and was sufficient for 32,000,000 injections. This was more than was sufficient for the medical requirements of the two Americas for a whole year. In 1919, 250 tons of opium had been imported into the United States, and 372 tons into Great Britain. From these quantities of opium the United States could manufacture 36 tons of morphine and Great Britain 53 tons. If these two countries each kept 1 ton for their own requirements there remained 35 and 52 tons respectively for exportation. These figures were confirmed by Sir William J. Collins, British Delegate to the Hague Conference in 1912, who had said: "When I read figures like 140,000 ounces of morphine exported from Great Britain in the first nine months of 1911, I do not think that I am using exaggerated language when I say that the production is appallingly out of proportion to any conceivable legitimate or medical use".

China did not manufacture a single ounce of morphine and it was very difficult for her to prevent smuggling, because of the foreign concessions and the extra-territorial rights conceded to other Powers. She was the chief victim of the re-exportation scandal. Was it the Committee's task to deal with the opium question in China only? The Committee sat under the auspices of the League of Nations and ought to treat the problem as a whole. When there was one thief naturally common action was taken against him. When, however, there were several thieves, why attack the weakest, without attacking the rest, who were stronger?

China was ready to fulfil its obligations and to accept any resolution which would be applied to the whole world, and not to one country in particular. It would accept, for instance, a resolution in the following sense:

"An international investigating committee should be set up to conduct an investigation in all the countries where opium is produced and where morphia is manufactured."

If the Committee desired to deal separately with the Chinese problem, it would have to abandon the draft resolution which would only increase the smuggling of opium and morphine and would have to adopt resolutions on the following lines:—

"The League of Nations asks the Chinese Government itself to make a more thorough investigation than was the case last year into poppy cultivation in China in order to submit this year and in the years to come more reliable reports to the League of Nations.

"Besides the Chinese official chosen by the Chinese Government, the Committee of Enquiry should also contain representatives of certain organisations in the country, such as Chambers of Commerce, Educational Societies, and other bodies specially interested in the suppression of opium. That Committee would investigate the provinces reported as possessing poppy cultivation."

This was the only way to treat China on a basis of equality.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Chinese Representative if he could give details regarding the composition of the mixed Committee which he proposed.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) replied that, in order to give satisfaction to the Committee, which had declared itself unsatisfied with the reports of the Chinese Government, a mixed Committee should be set up which should comprise among its members, besides the officials appointed by the Government, representatives of Chinese public opinion chosen by the Chamber of Commerce, the Students' Societies and other organisations whose intentions and good-will were well known.

Sir John JORDAN said that, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, he would explain that the proposal which he had made in May 1921 had been suggested by the Chinese Representative through the intermediary of Dr. Hawking Yen, and he himself had never regarded it as more than a "pis aller".

The opium question should certainly be examined as one whole and he desired to support in principle the proposal of an International Committee. Public opinion, however, in China was no longer what it had been during the years 1907 and onward. To-day it was above all concerned with politics and seemed little interested in the opium question. Chinese public opinion should therefore be roused anew by active propaganda.

It could also be asked what practical effect could be given to the Chinese Representative's proposal. In point of actual fact, the Chinese Government was not in a position to enforce its authority in certain provinces. Certain persons who had given proof of the energy with which they had combated the scourge should be approached. The Committee must do something unless another year was to be lost and unless it was prepared to risk the danger of finding opium and morphine monopolies established in China.

Finally, the moment seemed favourable to establish an International Committee, but the Chinese Representative's proposal was not sufficient.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) made the following observations on the two proposals of the Chinese Representative:

1. He understood that an International Committee of Control was proposed. He considered that an entirely impracticable suggestion:

(a) Because international action of this kind was beyond the scope of the League of Nations mandate;

(b) Because international control would necessarily, on the points now apparent, have to be exercised more particularly in China where, according to the Chinese Representative, it would be strongly opposed by the Chinese Government and people;

(c) Because international control could only be exercised with the consent of the numerous States composing the League of Nations and events had shown that it was most improbable that these States would give their consent.

2. For the reasons given by Sir John Jordan, the Chinese Committee of Enquiry would have no satisfactory result. The Treaty between Great Britain and China contemplated that Mixed Committees of Enquiry should ensure the execution of this Treaty, and no objection had ever been raised by the Chinese Government or by public opinion in China to the solution, and he again pressed it on the attention of the Chinese representative.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), replying to Mr. Campbell, referred him to pp. 100 and 101 of the *Blue Book*. He repeated that his Government was opposed to any intervention by consuls and that China was ready to accept any general proposals concerning the exercise of control in all parts of the world. This showed the Chinese Government's sincerity. It was true that public opinion had lost interest, but this was explained by the part played by the military governors. Public opinion, however, was active and it would be strong enough if it were properly enlightened. Something yet remained of the magnificent results obtained by the Chinese Government with the valuable help of Sir John Jordan, whose efforts in this connection probably constituted the greatest work of his life. As Sir John Jordan had just then remarked, if the production of opium and morphia in general were not dealt with, these scourges could not be put a stop to in China.

If the Committee adopted the resolution which he proposed, he would telegraph the text of it to his Government and he was certain that a great effect on public opinion in China would be produced.

China would remember the criticisms brought against it and, strong by reason of the friendly help which she had been offered, asked for only a short time in which to reach a good result by her own efforts, without outside intervention.

SEVENTH MEETING

Held on April 22nd, 1922 at 3. p.m.

All the Members of the Committee and the Assessors were present

21. *The Far-Eastern Problem* (continuation).

Sir John JORDAN said that, in consequence of the statement made by the Chinese Representative at the morning meeting that he would accept nothing short of a general international investigation of the opium question as a whole, a deadlock appeared to have been reached. The Indian Representative had declared that he could not accept such a general investigation. He appealed to the Indian Representative to suggest some practical method of finding a solution of the problem which might be agreeable both to the Chinese and Indian Governments.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that, as a practical solution, British and Chinese representatives might be appointed to enquire into the execution of the treaty between the Chinese and British Governments. The Indian Government had carried out this treaty in all respects and had gone much further than the treaty required; it had also readily accepted the serious consequent financial losses. The Chinese Government considered that the treaty was no longer applicable because it had been fulfilled in 1917. This attitude was in his opinion wholly unjustifiable and was the more so in view of the facts now before the Committee proving that China had indubitably failed to carry out her undertakings under the treaty. He appreciated the feeling of the Chinese Government against any interference by the League of Nations in the internal affairs of China which might go beyond the competence of the League, but some form of investigation was necessary.

He suggested that, if this first solution failed, the Committee might adopt a resolution expressing the hope that the British Government would press the Chinese Government to carry out the Treaty of 1911, and that information on the lines of the *Blue Book* recently issued by the British Government would be published from time to time showing to what extent China had complied with the treaty. The resolution might conclude with a statement that it was not proposed by the Committee to make any other recommendations at the moment, though the Committee fully realised the difficulties arising out of the present large production of opium in China.

He pointed out that this resolution would leave the necessary action to be taken by the British Government under an existing treaty, and that the League of Nations would not be called upon to interfere in China.

The CHAIRMAN briefly reviewed the proposals which had been presented to the Committee. He suggested that the Committee should first discuss the draft resolution which the Committee had instructed him to frame as a result of the discussion on the previous day, and which had been presented to the Committee at the morning meeting. He pointed out that this resolution fell into two portions. The first contained a summary of the views which the Committee were invited to take on the value of the reports furnished by the Chinese representative. The second contained recommendations proposed for the adoption of the Committee. He proposed that the first part of the resolution should be taken and put to the vote.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked whether he might present his views on the paragraphs in question.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Chinese Representative had already expressed his views and that the paragraphs were a result of yesterday's discussion.

The Committee decided to proceed to a vote on these paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote first on the question whether it accepted the substance of the three paragraphs on the understanding that amendments might, if desirable, be introduced at a later stage.

The Committee adopted the three paragraphs in principle, five members voting in favour and one against.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether any member desired to propose amendments to paragraph 1.

Sir John JORDAN proposed that reference should be made to the fact that the provinces of Yunnan and Kweichow had not been visited by the Chinese Commission, and M. BRENIER suggested that a special reference should also be made to the South-West of Sze-Chuan, where the cultivation of the poppy has been revived in addition to the cultivation recorded as existing in the marches of that province.

After some discussion *it was agreed* that no reference should be made to any special province or region, but that words should be inserted to be drafted by the Chairman alluding to the fact that certain districts, important from the point of view of poppy cultivation, had not been examined by the Chinese Government.

M. BOURGOIS (France) proposed an amendment designed to avoid offending the susceptibilities of the Chinese Government. He proposed in effect that only the last sentence of the paragraph should be retained and that it should read as follows:—

“The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, having taken cognisance of the information contained in the *Blue Book* issued by the British Government and of other information before the Committee, etc.”

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he could not accept the amendment of M. Bourgois. He did not think the Committee would be justified in weakening the resolution in deference to the susceptibilities of the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government had deliberately concealed the facts and it was essential that these should be published. The resolution contained the facts and presented them with fairness and moderation.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had drafted the resolution upon the request of Sir John Jordan, who had thought that a clear statement of the position would have a good effect on Chinese public opinion. The value of the resolution from this point of view would be prejudiced if the resolution were weakened.

The amendment of M. Bourgois was put to the vote *and lost*, four members voting against and two in favour.

Paragraph 1 was then put to the vote *and adopted*.

The CHAIRMAN then asked whether any member desired to propose amendments to the second paragraph.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked that the following phrase at the beginning of the paragraph should be omitted:—

“regrets that it is unable to accept the reports furnished by the Chinese Government, and, etc.”

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) opposed the proposal of M. Bourgois to omit the opening phrase. He represented that it was essential for the resolution to contain an explicit reference to the reports furnished by the Chinese Government.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked whether it would be possible to add to the resolution a phrase concerning the use of morphia in China. He thought Chinese public opinion should be directed to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of morphia would be discussed later, and that a resolution might be adopted on the subject then.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) supported the amendment proposed by M. Bourgois.

The amendment of M. Bourgois was put to the vote *and adopted*, three members voting in favour and one against.

Paragraph 2 as amended was then put to the vote *and carried* without dissent.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the Committee should vote upon the third paragraph of the Resolution.

M. BOURGOIS (France) objected to the word “violation” as being inaccurate and too strong; the word “non-execution” would better describe the circumstances.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that the British Government considered that the treaty engagements of China had actually been broken, and he did not think that the phrase should be attenuated.

The proposal of M. Bourgois to amend the phrase in question was put to the vote *and lost* by three votes to three, the Chairman giving his casting vote against it.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) proposed that the provincial governors alluded to in the paragraph should be described as the military governors of the provinces concerned.

Paragraph 3, thus amended, *was adopted*.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the Committee the first of the recommendations contained in the draft resolution:

"1. That the Council should publish the conclusions at which the Committee has arrived."

The Committee unanimously *adopted* this recommendation, with the exception of the German Delegate, who abstained from voting on the grounds that it would be difficult for him to do so, as the question had a diplomatic aspect as well as a humanitarian, and Germany not being a Member of the League could not participate in the vote.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had been induced by the Chinese Representative's remarks during the preceding meeting to draft the following recommendation, which, if it met with the approval of the Committee, he was prepared to accept in place of recommendation No. 2:—

"That the Council should propose to the Chinese Government that joint investigations, similar to the joint investigations made by Chinese and British Commissioners in 1917 and the preceding years, should be made each year during the poppy season in all provinces in which poppy cultivation is alleged, by Commissioners appointed partly by the Chinese Government and partly by the League of Nations."

He hoped that the Chinese Representative would agree to this. The Committee would not, he thought, agree to the proposal that the mixed committee should consist only of Chinese officials and representatives of Chinese societies. It seemed to him reasonable to propose that, as the League of Nations had been entrusted with supervising the execution of the International Opium Convention of 1912, it should take part in the proposed investigation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he would not press the proposal which he had made at the preceding meeting if the Chairman's new draft recommendation were adopted.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he was strongly opposed to the second resolution originally presented. It was worse than the resolution proposed last year. The Chinese treaty obligations concerned only China and the British Government and not the League of Nations. The League should adopt a *laissez faire* policy towards China, so that China could suppress opium on her own initiative, without the assistance of foreign intervention.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Chinese representative if his remarks referred to the new draft or to the old one.

M. CHAI-HSIN CHU (China) said that he referred to both. Neither draft was acceptable to the Chinese Government. The second was expressed in different language but its sense was the same.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that he desired it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on the resolution before the Committee, as he did not consider it proper for Siam to identify herself with such a resolution concerning a particular State whilst there were other States which continued to cultivate the poppy.

On a motion for adjournment, Sir John JORDAN begged the Committee not to take too premature a decision. This was a most important question and he feared that it was being dealt with in an unstatesmanlike spirit. If the Committee hurried over its decision only a weak compromise would be reached.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) proposed the following amendment to the Chairman's new draft of recommendation No. 2:—

"That the Council should propose to all Governments parties to the convention that a joint investigation should be made, directed by the League of Nations, by commissioners appointed partly by the Governments concerned and partly by the League of Nations, regarding the production of opium and the manufacture of morphia."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that there was a fundamental misunderstanding in the view that China was being singled out for special and invidious treatment.

It was not a question of opium production, as such, which gave the right to interfere, but the fact that China had broken her obligations voluntarily assumed under the Opium Convention. She had announced that she would grow no poppy; she was growing it extensively. She had announced that she had framed laws regarding production; these laws were clearly not effective. It was for this reason that China was being attacked, because she had failed to fulfil her promises, not because she was cultivating the poppy. If any other opium-producing country, such as, for instance, India, which was a party to the International Opium Convention, acted similarly, the Committee would be fully justified in proceeding against it in a similar manner.

The CHAIRMAN said that the amendment proposed by the Dutch representative was in very general terms, but it might be possible to find a form of words on the lines of this proposal which the Chinese Government might be able to accept.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) desired to add to his amendment the words "*in its discretion*", so that the dealt should read:—

"That the Council of the League should in its discretion invite the Governments of States which are parties to the Opium Convention to facilitate the carrying out in their territories of joint investigations by commissions, appointed partly by the Government concerned and partly by the Council of the League, into the production of opium and the manufacture of morphia."

Sir John JORDAN considered that this amendment in substance at least was admirably adapted to meet the requirements of the case. It dealt with the question as a whole and discriminated in no way against China.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT agreed.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he saw no reason why China should not accept the Dutch representative's amendment. China was ready to open the door to investigation. The Chinese Government could not, however, suppress opium production while it continued elsewhere. The amendment applied to the world in general and there was therefore no reason why China should oppose it, provided that it was generally applied and equally applied,

In accordance with the instructions from his Government, the Chinese representative, although he accepted the new amendment, asked that a vote should be taken on the resolution which he had put forward at a previous meeting.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that, as the instructions from his Government did not cover the issue raised in Mr. de Kat Angelino's amendment, he was compelled to make a formal reservation. The amendment was in very general terms, and Governments would desire to know the scope and object of the proposed investigation. If facts concerning the cultivation of the poppy in India were needed he had them all at his disposal at that moment and could give as many as the Committee desired, and could guarantee their accuracy. So long, therefore, as the scope of the investigations was not defined, they seemed of doubtful utility as far as India was concerned. He felt bound to remind the Committee once more that the League of Nations could not go beyond the terms of its mandate.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a form of words might be found, but that it would be difficult for Governments to accept the draft of the Dutch representative as it stood. He asked what the words "*in its discretion*" meant. In his view, the Council would not act, in any particular case, except on a recommendation from the Advisory Committee, whose duty it was to give advice to the Council on all matters regarding traffic in opium.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that, if the Council received information from any source leading it to consider that an investigation should be made, it should ask the Governments to act forthwith.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, according to the usual procedure, if the Council received information regarding any particular country, it would first refer to the Government of that country. He considered that the proposal would be more acceptable if it contained words making it clear that investigations in any particular case would only be set on foot after the Advisory Committee had made a definite recommendation to the Council to that effect. He proposed to adjourn so that the Committee should have time to consider the exact terms of the resolution.

In compliance with the request of the Chinese representative, the Chairman then put the following proposal:

"The Commission recommend that the Council of the League of Nations should ask the Chinese Government to make better and more thorough investigations into poppy cultivation in China than it did last year, so as to be able to give more reliable reports to the League this year and in the years to come. In conducting such an investigation, besides officials appointed by the Chinese Government, organisations such as Chambers of Commerce, Educational Associations and other organisations particularly interested in the suppression of opium, should be included on the Committee of Investigation throughout the provinces reported as having poppy cultivation."

The CHAIRMAN said that, in his opinion, the adoption of this proposal would involve the rejection of that of the Netherlands representative.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) urged that the two resolutions were in no way inconsistent.

On a vote being taken, the Chinese Representative's proposal *was adopted* by 4 votes to 1.

EIGHTH MEETING

Held on April 24th, 1922, at 10 a.m.

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

22. Minutes.

The CHAIRMAN asked if any Member of the Committee had any amendment involving a change of sense in the Minutes of the 5th, 6th and 7th meetings, it being understood that, in order to save time, more formal corrections of the text should be sent straight to the Secretariat.

Various amendments proposed for the 7th meeting were adopted, and the Minutes of the three meetings were passed subject to formal amendments.

23. *The Far-Eastern Problem* (continuation).

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) wished to explain to the Committee that he had voted for the Chinese representative's proposal at the last meeting under the impression that that proposal was not incompatible with that presented by the Netherlands representative. As the point now seemed doubtful, he wished to know definitely how the matter stood.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee found itself in a difficult position. He had put the Chinese representative's proposal to the Committee out of its order before the discussion on the proposals of himself and the Dutch representative was finished because M. Chao-Hsin Chu had asked him to do so, and because the course of the debate had seemed to him to show that it had not met with the approval of the Committee and could be disposed of. He had considered the position very carefully with a view to finding a solution. The proposals of the Dutch Representative and his own were still before the Committee and he would submit a proposal which might perhaps reconcile the views of both parties. Before doing so he wished to remind the Committee of the part which it was the duty of the League to play, and also the nature of the Committee's mandate regarding the opium question.

The terms of Article 23 of the Covenant were quite clear. No political question was involved. The League of Nations was not called upon to discuss the relations existing between China and the British Government, or any other Government. China, in common with all other States Members of the League, had entrusted the League with the general supervision of the opium traffic, and the traffic in dangerous drugs and with the application of the International Opium Convention, which imposed certain definite obligations on all the States which had signed it. The League, therefore, should be in a position to exercise its supervision over all countries without distinction, and in order to achieve this it should be able to set on foot enquiries when complaints were made regarding the violation of the Convention. The Siamese representative had, he thought, overlooked this point when he had made his statement at the seventh meeting.

There was no discrimination against China. The Committee had begun by studying the Chinese question because it was first on the Agenda; it could have begun if it had liked with the situation of other countries. The League had to exercise its supervision in regard to all countries concerned which were Members of the League.

Information received showed that cultivation of the poppy had broken out again in China and that China was not fulfilling her obligations under the Opium Convention. Consequently the Committee must exercise the mandate conferred upon the League in conformity with the stipulations of the Covenant and of the Convention.

He did not think the Committee should cancel the resolution which it had adopted when it had voted on the Chinese Representative's proposal, insufficient though that proposal seemed. That resolution, however, was not easily reconcilable with the proposals presented by the Chairman and the further proposal of the Netherlands Representative. In these circumstances, since it was admitted that the cultivation of the poppy had begun again in China, and that the laws required by the Convention were not being applied, he would withdraw his own proposal, but suggested that the Committee should add to the Chinese Representative's resolution, which the Committee had adopted, the two following supplementary paragraphs:—

"The Committee further strongly recommends that, as China, in common with all other States Members of the League, has entrusted the League of Nations with the supervision of the traffic in dangerous drugs, the Chinese Government should invite representatives of the League to accompany the Commissioners in their investigations.

"The Committee also desires to point out that investigations can only be effective if made during the season of the year while the poppy is in flower and recommends that the Chinese Government should be asked to make arrangements accordingly."

This proposal made the Association of Representatives of the League, a voluntary act on the part of the Chinese Government, and it had the double advantage of giving public opinion in China an opportunity to express itself and of allowing the League of Nations to fulfil its mandate to the greatest possible advantage of China herself.

If China rejected this proposal, the League of Nations would find itself unable to fulfil the obligations incumbent upon it.

The Chairman's proposal was approved by the representatives of Japan, France (who thought that the Chinese Government could not oppose a mere suggestion), India and Portugal.

Sir John JORDAN said that he supported the proposal, provided that the Chinese Government accepted it.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that in principle he supported the Chairman's resolution, but in actual fact he could not. A resolution had been adopted by a majority of the Committee, and it appeared in the minutes. Parliamentary procedure must be observed. When he had asked for his proposal to be put to the vote at the preceding meeting, he had not thought that it would be accepted. To his surprise it had been adopted, and once adopted it could not be modified. The Committee could not go back upon a decision which it had once taken. He thanked the members of the Committee who had voted for the proposal for the sympathy which they had shown towards the Chinese Government's view that it should be left alone to work out its own solution of the opium problem.

He had no objection to the proposal of the Netherlands Representative, which was a general proposal having as its object an international investigation in all countries producing opium or manufacturing morphia.

Despite what the Chairman had said, he was not convinced that the Committee had shown no discrimination in regard to China. It had discussed China and China only for two days, and had made no reference to the problem of opium production in general. That procedure was inadmissible. He had confidence in his Government and in the Chinese people. China was an independent State and should be left to work out her own solution of the problem alone without foreign interference. The Chinese Government could only support a general resolution applying equally to all countries.

He had already telegraphed to his Government that his proposal had been adopted. It could be applied immediately, while the Chairman's supplementary proposals would have to be submitted to the Council and the Assembly. The procedure of the Advisory Committee would be given the fullest publicity in China, and public opinion would certainly exercise strong pressure on the military governors.

Speaking personally, he supported the expression of opinion in the second paragraph of the proposed addition, which urged that the investigation should be carried out during the poppy season.

Finally, he would urgently beg the Committee to settle the Chinese part of the problem and to pass to a study of the question as a whole. If the supplementary proposal of the Chairman were adopted, he would be obliged to make a formal reservation, and his Government would certainly oppose any foreign interference in a question of internal policy. If, on the other hand, the resolution were drafted in general terms, and if other Governments invited representatives of the League of Nations to help them in their investigations, China would also give her consent.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that he wished to explain why he abstained from voting at the previous meeting. He was not quite clear as to the meaning of the resolution. He did not agree with it for two reasons. First, in his opinion, the Committee was not called upon to deal with the breach of a Treaty concluded between Great Britain and China. Secondly, if he remembered rightly, the Delegate for India had said at the last session of the Committee that cultivation was outside the Convention. China, therefore, was only one of the producing countries, and discrimination should not be made against her.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India), in reply to Prince Charoon, declared that he did not say at the last session of the Committee that cultivation was outside the Convention. What he had said was that the position as regards cultivation was settled by the Convention, which required each State to enact effective laws for its control.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that the Committee, in adopting the resolution of the Representative of China, had recognised the force of the arguments presented by M. Chao-Hsin Chu; but it was evident from the declarations of M. Chao-Hsin Chu that the Chinese Government was also prepared to accept some form of international control if of general application. The Committee might, therefore, now adopt the resolution submitted by him, which in his opinion was not incompatible with the resolution already adopted.

Sir John JORDAN thought that it would be regrettable if the proposal of the Chairman were rejected. If, however, the Chinese Government would not accept it, it would be useless for the Committee to adopt it. He therefore suggested that the question should be left open for the moment, and that the problem of the Far East as a whole be first considered.

M. BRENIER supported this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to put to the vote the three following proposals which were before the Committee:—

(1). *Proposal of Sir John Jordan to postpone the discussion.*

Four members voted for this proposal and four against. The Chairman gave his casting vote against the proposal.

(2). *The Resolution of the Representative of the Netherlands.*

The CHAIRMAN then observed that if this resolution were adopted, it would be inserted separately in a general chapter of the report, and not in the chapter devoted to the Far-Eastern question.

M BRENIER approved the draft resolution, but asked that the words "in its discretion" should be replaced by the words "when the necessity should arise" and that cocaine should be explicitly mentioned in the text.

The resolution, with these amendments, was adopted by five votes to three.

(3). *Supplementary proposal of the Chairman.*

The CHAIRMAN said that his proposal was only a particular case of the general principle contained in the resolution which the Committee had already adopted.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) strongly protested against taking a vote on this resolution. He said that China would never accept it. In those circumstances, what was the use of voting it? If the Committee adopted this resolution it would show clearly that it was discriminating against China, and was proposing to treat her in a manner which could not be tolerated.

The CHAIRMAN represented that the Committee would merely be applying a general resolution for which the Chinese Representative himself had voted. He pointed out that the Chinese Representative had approved the principle of the second paragraph of the resolution in question.

By five votes to three the Committee decided to vote upon the resolution of the Chairman, and by five votes to two the Committee adopted the resolution:

M CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked that there should be recorded in the minutes his formal reservation, and the indignation with which he regarded the procedure that the Committee had followed, especially in view of the fact that the Chinese Government had intimated its refusal in advance.

Illicit Trading in the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Japan whether he had any information to add to the memorandum which he had presented on the traffic in opium and its derivatives.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said he had nothing to add to the replies to the questionnaire sent by his Government, but that he was ready to furnish any explanations in his power.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that the schedule of imports and exports of morphia to Japan showed an immense increase of imports between 1910 and 1920. He inquired the reason for this increase.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that before the application of the Convention the imports were in excess of requirements, but that the imports which had taken place in 1920 were not intended to be consumed in a single year, and that the surplus might be still in stock. He added, in reply to a question by M. BRENIER, that requests for exports were granted when they were received from authorised persons, and that these exports figured in the statistics of official exports.

M. BRENIER drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, according to figures given previously as to the number of injections which could be obtained from one ton of morphia, twenty-four tons of morphia imported into Japan sufficed for 768 million injections.

Sir John JORDAN asked the Japanese representative for a more complete statement. The increase in the imports was shown for several consecutive years. The foreign manufacturers were as much to be blamed as the merchants and intermediaries. It was quite clear that there was a vast contraband trade, and that Northern China had received large quantities of morphia.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Japanese representative to deal with certain points at the next meeting. In addition to the imports into Japan, there was the amount manufactured in Japan which had been increasing. Japan had pointed out in her reply that it was necessary to manufacture in order to provide for her needs during the war. Further, there was the amount produced in Formosa, which had also been increasing. Should this production, which was not registered by the Japanese Customs, be added to that for which Japan had furnished statistics?

M. BRENIER asked what were the sources of the imports of morphia to Japan now that Great Britain had decreased her exports.

NINTH MEETING

held on April 24th, 1922, at 3 p.m.

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

25. Illicit Trading in the Far East (continuation).

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan), in reply to various questions put to him at the preceding meeting, said that the Japanese Government had given full statistics of the imports and production of morphine in Japan. There were no figures for the quantity needed for the consumption of the people, nor for the stock remaining.

The present regulations of the Japanese Government concerning morphine and other drugs had been in force since January 1st, 1921. Previous to that date there had been no regulations concerning import, export or production.

The reason for the increase of the import and production of morphine in Japan lay in the fact that, before the controlling regulations had come into effect, the trade had been conducted on an international basis, and import and production had been carried on in accordance with the fluctuations in price. During the war the heavy demand for morphine had resulted in higher profits to traders and consequent greater production.

The Japanese Government admitted that smuggling had been carried on between Japan and Northern China, but to what extent, in the absence of exact figures, could not be stated.

It had recently initiated an investigation to ascertain the amount of morphine in stock.

The Government had realised the very serious situation and had issued new regulations. It would always welcome any further enquiries which the League might desire to make regarding the morphia traffic in Japan.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he was in a position to check the accuracy of some of the Japanese statistics by comparison with the corresponding Indian statistics. In the five years ending 1920, India had exported to Japan 962,360 lbs of raw opium, while the Japanese import figures showed that she had received 909,201 lbs. An exact agreement of statistics of this kind was never possible for various reasons, such as cargoes at sea at the beginning or end of the period under consideration. The returns as a whole fully supported Sir John Jordan's criticisms. Large quantities of morphia had undoubtedly been smuggled into China from Japan. The evidence of this fact was to be found mainly in the statistics produced by the Japanese Government itself. He would like to pay a sincere tribute to that Government for the honest and open manner in which it had made known its figures. If every nation did the same, the question would soon be solved.

He would like to point out that the figures related to the period before the Hague Convention came into effective operation. The Japanese Government had now declared its intention of putting the Convention strictly in force, and this would go far to solve the problem in China. He regarded this as the first fruits of the Advisory Committee's work. It marked a great step in advance, more especially as the Japanese Government could easily have quoted the figures of export to Japan furnished by other Governments, which would have for various reasons rendered the position very much more difficult to elucidate. It had chosen, however, to put the situation in its true light, damaging as that was to Japan.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT stated that a large quantity of morphine reached Japan from the United States. In five months of 1920 enough had been exported to Japan to give ten doses to each unit of the whole population. America had now passed very strict regulations which had resulted in a great drop in the export trade, and a further bill was now being considered.

She quoted statistics from statements of December 8th and 11th 1920 made before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which disclosed the fact that there was a very large export of harmful drugs from America.

Sir John JORDAN desired to associate himself with Mr. Campbell's tribute to the frankness of the Japanese reply. He emphasised the fact that the importation of morphia had always had the closest possible connection with the whole opium question in China. He could have wished that the investigations to be carried out in China could have been extended to cover morphia also.

Importation of morphine into Japan was still continuing though not on such a large scale. In the first ten months of 1921, 198,308 oz. of morphia had been imported by Japan. This was still a very large figure, having regard to the fact that during the ten years before 1917 her import had never exceeded 32,000 oz., per annum. These figures were quoted from a despatch from the British Ambassador in Tokio and had presumably been obtained from statistics published by the Japanese Government.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that the Japanese Government was doing its utmost to suppress smuggling; but the large quantity imported during 1921 was due to the amount which Japanese traders had previously contracted to purchase, and had reached Japan after the end of 1920. Even this amount compared with that of the previous year, 1920, was a considerable reduction and amounted roughly to one-third of that of the previous year.

The CHAIRMAN, in summing up the position regarding Japan, said that the Japanese Government had obtained a very strict control over the opium traffic. Opium was only imported on Government account; the Government distributed it to licensed manufacturers, who would, therefore, only manufacture the quantity the Government desired. Import could only be effected by means of a licence, the amounts being regulated in accordance with the demand.

The Japanese Government had accepted the system of import certificates.

There seemed to him to be certain discrepancies in the figures contained in the table of imports and exports appearing in the Japanese Government's reply to the questionnaire, especially regarding Great Britain. According to the figures, Japan had received 11,333 lbs. of morphia in 1921 from Great Britain. According to British figures, however, a licence had only been given for the export of a quantity under 1 lb. He suggested that the Secretariat should get into touch with both Governments, so that this and other discrepancies might be set right.

Further, a letter from the British Minister in Peking, dated December 16th, 1921, reported the seizure at Tsentsin of 300 lbs. of heroin concealed among a consignment of sulphate of soda on a Japanese ship loaded at Osaka. This heroin had been manufactured by a Japanese firm, and he desired to know how such a large quantity made in a licensed factory could have reached the hands of smugglers.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that this was the first he had heard of this, but there were stocks of morphia in traders' hands still concealed. The Japanese Government were, however, enforcing the new laws with the greatest severity.

The CHAIRMAN said that, under the new postal arrangements in China resulting from the Washington Conference, foreign post offices were to be abolished after January 1st, 1923. China would thus soon be able to prevent more easily the smuggling of opium by means of postal parcels.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to raise one point concerning the figures given in the Japanese returns regarding the export of morphia and cocaine from Switzerland to Japan. In 1920 Switzerland was shown as having exported 4,963 lbs. of morphia and 1,640 lbs. of cocaine to Japan, which made her second only to the United States in her exports of these drugs to Japan. Switzerland had not signed the International Opium Convention, and these statistics showed that there was apparently a very strong case that she should do so.

Sir John JORDAN asked if all countries mentioned in the table of Japanese imports had established regulations for the control of the production of morphine.

The CHAIRMAN referred him to the individual replies of the Governments concerned.

This part of the discussion of the Far-Eastern problem having resulted in no formal resolution, he proposed that the results of the debate should be summarised in the Committee's report to the Council and the latter could then instruct the Secretariat to take such action as it thought fit either by communicating with the Japanese Government or by some other means.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China was very interested in the morphia question, as she was the chief victim of the illicit trade. The figures showed that the quantity of morphia manufactured and exported was enormous, and that in every country the supply largely exceeded the demand. The Indian delegate, in criticising China, had said that for her to carry out investigations was equivalent to setting a thief to report on his own crime. If China was a thief, there were other larger thieves which the League should catch. It should not allow certain Governments to protect the producers of morphia and thus to poison the rest of the world.

He noted that resolutions had been proposed during the past three days with the object of interfering in China's internal affairs, but that no resolution had been proposed with the object of interfering in the affairs of any other country. Why was China thus singled out? China was willing to do her best, provided the rest of the world left her alone. Confucius had said: "No man is perfect in this world; but he who recognises his error is the perfect man".

26. *Far-Eastern problems in general.*

The situation in Hong-Kong, Macao, Siam, Indo-China, Straits Settlements, North Borneo, etc.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he would supply any statistics the Committee desired regarding India. As he had said in a previous meeting, the consumption of opium per head per annum in India was 26 grains. This figure had remained stationary for 30 years.

Regarding the export trade, the Indian Government's reply to the questionnaire had been misunderstood. India exported no morphia except from the Government factory at Ghazipore. It was exported only to London under the same conditions as morphia was exported from any other country to Great Britain. None had in fact been exported for two years. India had accepted the system of import certificates.

No cocaine or medicinal opium had been manufactured.

Mr. Campbell further explained that a large quantity of raw opium sent to Great Britain during the war for medical purposes had been classified in error in the returns as "medicinal opium".

Sir John JORDAN suggested that the Committee should take up the proposal which had been presented by Prince Charoon. This proposal involved a rationing of the possessions of European Powers with a view to the gradual suppression of the traffic. It was in accordance with the original arrangement approved at Shanghai in 1909, and the principle had been endorsed by the Opium Convention itself. It was particularly fitting that the proposal should have been made by the Siamese representative. Siam was the only independent Power concerned, the other territories affected being dependencies.

He realised that it was impossible to abolish the traffic immediately, owing to the economic and financial considerations involved; there might, however, be a gradual suppression of the manufacture of prepared opium. The Committee would do well, before going into details, to look at the question as a whole. The members of the Committee should be urged to move their Governments to fix a minimum for their requirements which might be progressively reduced year by year.

M. BRENIER approved in principle the proposal of Sir John Jordan. He pointed out, however, that emphasis must also be laid on the fact that it was necessary for China to suppress progressively the cultivation of the poppy. Indo-China was as much interested in the suppression of the production of opium in China as China was in the suppression of the traffic in prepared opium in Indo-China. The contraband traffic in raw opium from Yunnan must be checked.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had already arranged to take the proposal of Prince Charoon when discussing item 10 of the agenda. He proposed, therefore, that the Committee should pass to item 10.

M. BOURGOIS (France) laid before the Committee certain information regarding the situation in Indo-China arising out of various questions raised in the Summary of the replies to the Questionnaire. The Summary stated that there was no information concerning Kwang Chow Wan. The statistics for 1920 and 1921 were not in M. Bourgois' possession. He could, however, inform the Committee that the system of State control had been extended to cover this territory in 1914, and that the Decree of July 1919 for the gradual suppression of opium traffic in Indo-China had also been applied to it. These measures had had an immediate effect. The imports had fallen from several thousand chests in 1914 to 600 chests and then to 300 in 1919.

In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, M. BRENIER said that the number of inhabitants of this territory, which was about 200,000 in 1914, was now in the neighbourhood of 300,000.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the total suppression of opium dens had been carried out not only in certain districts but throughout the whole of Annam and Tonkin, *i.e.* in more than two-thirds of Indo-China. There were no dens in Cochin-China except in a few big cities, such as Siagon and Cholon, where they were gradually becoming extinct.

A new Decree of July 1919 had strengthened the restrictive measures. There were only 70,000 smokers of opium in a population of about 20,000,000, which represented about 3 per 1000 of the total population. The Annamite population was not addicted to the use of opium. Among the countries of the Far East, Indo-China was the smallest consumer and the least threatened by the scourge.

The Summary mentioned the increase in consumption during the years 1916 and 1918. Statistics, however, showed that for this period there had been a general parallel increase in opium traffic in all neighbouring countries. In Indo-China this was explained by the special conditions arising out of the war, by the unprecedented prosperity due to two exceptional harvests of rice, by the enormous increase in exports and by the passage through the country of about 50,000 Chinese labourers. The sale of opium had immediately fallen from 114,700 kilogrammes in 1918 to 57,000 in 1919.

The period from 1916 to 1918, having been an abnormal one owing to the war, should be disregarded when considering the figures relating to the period 1910 to 1920, which were favourable as a whole. Thus the average for 1920 and 1921 (60,000 kilogrammes) was less by 14% than the

average from 1910 to 1916 (60,794 kilogrammes). Further, in order to obtain an accurate idea of the progress achieved, a comparison should be made with the statistics for the year 1907. The Government of Indo-China had done this, as that year had marked the turning-point in the struggle carried on by the Government against opium, and from this it could be seen that the figure was less by 45 %. Thus the true efficacy of the measures taken and of the results obtained could be gauged.

In whatever way, therefore, the statistics might be considered, they proved that the measures taken for the gradual suppression of the opium traffic in Indo-China had been effective, and that that gradual suppression, which had been carried on without interruption, though progressing perhaps more slowly during the war, had been energetically renewed by the Decree of 1919, and was actually in a fair way to be realised.

Mention had also been made of the lack of information regarding narcotics. In 1920 imports of these substances into Indo-China had risen to 63 kilogrammes for a population of 18,000,000 inhabitants. This represented 4 milligrams per head, or less than one twelfth of the quantity per head imported into Switzerland.

Sir John JORDAN said that these explanations were satisfactory. If, however, the Committee desired to go into details of this character, he would be obliged to draw its attention to many other cases. The supply of opium per head of population in a certain British possession, for example, amounted to about one pound. He was convinced that, if a computation were made of the amount per head consumed by the inhabitants of China and by the Chinese populations living elsewhere, the percentage would be considerably less for the Chinese living at home.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, the discussion on item 10 of the agenda was adjourned to the next meeting.

TENTH MEETING

held on April 25th, 1922, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee and the assessors, with the exception of M. BRENIER, were present.

27. Minutes.

Minutes of the Eighth Meeting were adopted subject to some amendments.

28. Enquiry into approximate requirements of raw opium specified in Chapter I of the Opium Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee had so far only dealt with the Far-Eastern problem and that it would now have to consider the control of the manufacture, distribution and use of opium, morphine and cocaine in the world in general, and particularly in certain countries in Europe and America.

It had, therefore, not yet completely disposed of the replies to the Questionnaire.

In accordance with Sir John Jordan's request expressed at the last meeting, he would open the question raised by Prince Charoon's letter to Dame Rachel Crowley, which would be considered in connection with item 10 of the Agenda.

The Council's resolution referred to in item 10 of the agenda was as follows:—

"That in view of the worldwide interest in the attitude of the League towards the opium question and of the general desire to reduce and restrict the cultivation and production of opium to legitimate purposes, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium be requested to consider and report at its next meeting on the possibility of instituting an enquiry concerning approximately the average requirements of raw opium specified in Chapter I of the Convention for legitimate purposes in different countries."

Prince Charoon in his letter proposed that each country should be asked to give the approximate quantity of raw opium it would require for its own use each year for the purpose of consumption by smokers or eaters, or for medicinal or scientific purposes.

Prince CHAROON (Siam), in submitting his proposal, said that it was a starting-point for the attainment of the object which the Committee had in view. The figures which would be obtained would not be scientific or definite, but they would be accurate enough for the Committee to gauge the requirements of each State. Dr. Norman White had told the Committee that the investigations carried out by the Health Committee of the League had demonstrated that it was almost impossible to collect data for the entirely accurate estimation of each country's legitimate requirements.

It might be objected that the amount could be obtained from the answers to the Questionnaire. It needed, however, an expert familiar with the science of reading statistics and with plenty of time at his disposal to obtain the information. He himself did not pretend to be such an expert, and he did not think that members of the Committee in general could afford the time for so close an examination of the replies.

It was, therefore, in order to arrive at an estimate sufficiently accurate for the Committee's purposes of the world requirements of raw opium that he desired to propose the following resolution:

"With a view to securing the necessary information upon which to base a general policy with regard to the control and suppression of the illegitimate traffic in dangerous drugs, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium requests the Council of the League of Nations to invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912 and other States Members of the League to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption per annum of opium and its derivatives. The Advisory Committee are of the opinion that in this statement each Government should set forth the requirements of its country for all purposes, and should indicate, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal,

scientific and other uses. They are further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than April 1st, 1923."

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he was entirely in sympathy with Prince Charoon's proposal, but he did not understand what practical use it would be to the Committee. What Prince Charoon and Sir John Jordan regarded as an ideal to be attained in the future was, he thought, an actuality which the Committee had reached at present. The Hague Convention, and the system of Import Certificates, did in fact control exports of raw opium from producing countries signatory to the Convention, and they limited this export to the amount certified as required for legitimate purposes. The responsibility for limiting these imports of opium was clearly, publicly and directly placed upon the importing countries. He did not think that Prince Charoon's resolution went so far as this.

To take, for example, the opium trade between Siam and India:— India sent no opium to Siam which Siam did not require for legitimate purposes, and that applied also to every other country which imported opium from India. The Committee should remember that the real difficulty lay in the *uncontrolled* countries, for example, Turkey and Persia, which were outside the Convention. He would not refer to China which had not at the moment proved to be of much importance as an exporting country. No form of wording or procedure could obviate this fundamental difficulty.

Prince Charoon's resolution would, he suggested, require certain alterations in form in order to meet the views of the United States. The stress laid upon "internal consumption" seemed to conflict in some degree with the substance of the resolution. If countries were required to state their total requirements for internal consumption only, it seemed inconsistent that they should also be asked to state their requirements for manufacturing purposes, because manufacturing countries did, in general, export the bulk of the drugs produced. The manufacturing demand would also, naturally, be a widely varying one.

Finally, the resolution should, he thought, allow Governments more latitude in stating their requirements. These would undoubtedly vary from year to year. It was quite possible for instance that there might be a revival of the rubber industry in the Straits Settlements, and a consequent influx of Chinese labour into that territory, involving the import of a larger quantity of opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) desired to support Prince Charoon's resolution because he considered it was the only solution of the opium problem especially in regard to the Far East. As he had said at a previous meeting, one ton of morphia was sufficient for 32,000,000 injections *i.e.*, more than was required by both North and South America. Last year America had manufactured about 34 tons of morphia while England had manufactured 53 tons. He considered that one ton was sufficient for the whole of America, two tons for Europe and six for Asia. Allowing for all possibilities, that would give a total world requirement of not more than 10 tons. Therefore, when the Committee had received the figures of their requirements of opium, morphia and similar drugs from all States, they would next year be able to ask those countries producing opium and manufacturing morphia why their production was in excess of the world's requirements. Prince Charoon's proposal was a very practical one, and if it were adopted the Committee would soon be in a position to be able to take the necessary steps to limit production.

The CHAIRMAN said that he did not wish to interfere with the main course of the debate, but that he could not allow the figures given by the Chinese Representative to pass unchallenged. M. Chao-Hsin Chu had said that Great Britain produced 53 tons of morphia per annum. He calculated that that represented 1,899,520 ounces. The actual figures to be found in Great Britain's answer to the Questionnaire showed that in 1919 the production was 547,000 ounces and in 1920 643,000 ounces. Excluding the period of the war, when Great Britain had been supplying all her Allies with morphia, the average amount had varied between 486,000 ounces and the 1920 figure of 643,000 ounces.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had obtained these figures from *The Times*, and that he would endeavour to give the exact reference.

The CHAIRMAN said that one ton was equivalent to 35,840 ounces of morphia. He could not state definitely what the legitimate requirement was in England, but the authorities had estimated very roughly that it might be between 30,000 and 50,000 ounces per annum. If that figure were correct, a population of under 50,000,000 consumed at least one ton per annum, which was the Chinese representative's estimate for both Americas. North America alone, with a population of about 130,000,000, could not require less than 3 tons.

He did not wish his figures to be considered as more than approximate. He had merely produced them in order to refute those supplied by the Chinese Representative, which he considered to be entirely wide of the facts.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT quoted statistics taken from Senate document 377, 61st Congress, Second Session. She suggested that these statistics should be submitted to the countries which they concerned with a request that their accuracy should be verified. In that way the Committee would have a basis on which to form an estimate of legitimate requirements.

The CHAIRMAN requested Mrs. Hamilton Wright to circulate these statistics in a formal memorandum.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was entirely in sympathy with Prince Charoon's proposal. He wished to say nothing controversial but he could not agree with Mr. Campbell that the resolution did not go beyond the point which the Committee had already reached. It was an excellent starting-point for the future. He did not desire to criticise India, but everyone knew that a large amount of opium got into the countries of the world, especially into Eastern countries, in excess of their requirements. The Hague Convention of 1912 had contemplated the gradual suppression of the traffic in opium, but very little had been done in the last few years in that direction. He would like the resolution to contain words explicitly referring to the gradual suppression of the traffic.

The proposal also had the advantage of allowing the Committee to examine figures of requirements in advance instead of figures a year old, such as the replies to the Questionnaire at present supplied.

The resolution should be amended so as to specify more exactly, as the Chairman had done, the different uses of opium for internal consumption. He would also like to add the following sentence to the end of the resolution:—

“And that it is of special importance that statements showing the quantities required in Far-Eastern countries where Chinese are the principal consumers should be available at that date.”

Everyone desired China to restrict her cultivation of the opium poppy. These words would give her an incentive to do so as they would show that foreign Powers were reducing their consumption and that production would accordingly have to be reduced in proportion.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed with Prince Charoon's proposal. The requirements of Germany were, like those of England, for purely medical purposes. Abuses existed but were not common. The distribution of morphia and other dangerous drugs was controlled by doctors' certificates. Druggists were rationed and had to possess a certificate which was renewed at the end of every three months. That certificate stated the amount of the drug which they were allowed to possess and any excess quantity required a special authorisation. Thus, each separate amount of these drugs was registered, and the legitimate requirements of Germany could therefore be very easily obtained.

Regarding the amounts required for manufacture, the position was more difficult, because they depended on the amounts required by other countries. When the system of import certificates was universally adopted, it would be easier to obtain a figure.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) desired to support Prince Charoon's resolution together with Sir John Jordan's amendments.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) also agreed with Prince Charoon.

The CHAIRMAN supported the resolution and considered, with Sir John Jordan, that the wording should be made more precise.

The amount of morphine contained in opium differed in accordance with its quality. European opium was richest in morphine, next came Turkish, then Persian, then Indian and lastly Far-Eastern. It was necessary, therefore, that countries, when stating their requirements of raw opium, should state the quality of opium which they desired to import.

It was necessary also to state precisely how the figures of the requirements of derivatives of opium were to be given. Countries which did not manufacture imported all kinds of morphine preparations. The figures should state therefore not the weight of those preparations but the weight of morphine contained in the preparations.

He agreed with Sir John Jordan that the amount required for internal medical purposes for manufacturing purposes and for commercial purposes by each country should be shown separately.

He was both optimistic and pessimistic regarding the results of this proposal. Certain countries, for example, Japan and Italy, would, as appeared from their replies to the Questionnaire, be in a position to give fairly accurate figures, but with other countries the position was much more difficult. The reply of Australia, for instance, to the Health Committee, in connection with the latter's investigations, had stated that there were no records available on which to base an estimate of Australia's legitimate requirements and that the only way in which one could be obtained would be to send a circular to all druggists. Such information would take time to collect and would be far from complete.

In his opinion, therefore, the Committee, if they adopted this proposal, must not expect to obtain more than approximate figures.

He supported it, however, and suggested that Prince Charoon and himself, with the assistance of the Secretariat, should redraft the resolution in accordance with the various amendments which had been suggested.

The Committee agreed to this procedure.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as there was no further proposal concerning item 10 of the agenda, he proposed that Prince Charoon's resolution which the Committee had just adopted should be forwarded to the Council with the statement that the Committee considered it to be the first step towards carrying out the instructions which it had received regarding the enquiries to be made into the requirements of raw opium.

29. *Extension of investigations to include all dangerous drugs producing similar effects to those mentioned in the Convention (Item II).*

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the Committee had two points to consider. First the extension of their investigations into synthetic drugs not contemplated in the International Opium Convention of 1912, and, secondly, the advisability of calling a new international conference to deal with this question.

The French Government had forwarded to the Committee a list of drugs, some of which were not covered by the terms of the Opium Convention. There was a large amount of clandestine traffic in these drugs, to deal with which France possessed the necessary legislation. The Committee had first to consider whether the traffic in these drugs, especially in synthetic cocaine, was controlled in the different countries, and he asked the members of the Committee if they could furnish any details of the legislation in force in their respective countries.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that in Japan there had been no abuse of synthetic drugs up to the present, but that when it was necessary to control those drugs, regulations would be immediately applied, in order to control morphine, cocaine and other drugs; he quoted Section III, Article 12, of the regulations:—

“Any medicine which is recognised by the Minister of Home Affairs as having the same effect as those mentioned in the preceding two sections, are regulated in a similar manner to morphine, cocaine and their respective salts.”

Dr ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, according to the French Government, the list which it had supplied (with the exception of apomorphine which was only an emetic) only contained products whose effects were similar to those of morphine, that was to say products which were either narcotics; or products whose effects were like those of cocaine, that was to say anaesthetics. In Germany all these preparations were controlled by regulations applying to dangerous drugs sold by druggists.

He did not think that all drugs were as harmful as morphine or cocaine. Scientific research had shown that the drugs in the list were not abused to the same extent as were morphia and cocaine.

Dinoine and peronine had the same qualities as codeine, which was not injurious. They were alike in chemical composition.

There was no “codeine habit” comparable to the morphia or cocaine habit, nor were there dionine, etymorphine, peronine, or benzylmorphine habits.

Artificial cocaine was probably as harmful as cocaine, but this question had still to be examined, and the use of these products was not widespread. He knew of no abuse of holocaine like the abuse of cocaine. This had also to be examined. Novococaine, and in certain cases eucaine B and euphthalmine were excellent substitutes and were non-injurious. Anesthesine was a preparation for external use and was not soluble in water. The soluble form of it, subcutine, was not like cocaine.

Alypine was a synthetic preparation, which had not given rise to abuses. Stovaine was an excellent narcotic much used by physicians. It had been invented by Professor Fourneau of Paris.

Tropacocaine was not widely known.

As Dr. Norman White had said at a previous meeting, the use of synthetic preparations which could replace dangerous drugs should be encouraged, and chemists and doctors should try to produce harmless substances in order to eliminate morphine and cocaine.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that all the information regarding the legislation in Holland concerning these drugs was to be found in her reply to the questionnaire.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that if some of these synthetic products were already covered by the legislation of some countries, the Committee could immediately insert them in the lists of products about which it desired to enquire or about which it proposed to take steps.

The CHAIRMAN asked Dr. Norman White to give his opinion concerning the list of drugs submitted by the French Government. He himself was unable to furnish any information regarding the position in Great Britain, as he had only received the list of drugs sent in by the French Government immediately before the beginning of the Committee's session.

Dr. Norman WHITE (Assistant Director of the Health Section of the Secretariat) said that after what the German representative had said he hesitated to express his opinion. He thought, however, that some of the drugs had been put in the list by mistake. The third, for instance, apomorphine, was only used as an emetic, and was not likely to be abused. He suggested that the Committee should approach the various Governments with the object of obtaining information from each of them, stating whether any of these drugs were abused, and whether any legislation was necessary. Regulations could be of a sufficiently elastic nature to allow of the addition to the list of any drugs which might be shown to be abused.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that some drugs, such as peronine and dionine had a much more lasting effect than morphine. Until, however, there was evidence that these drugs were abused, he did not consider it necessary for them to be added to the list.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that the French Government had desired in this matter to secure control over certain drugs, synthetic and of mineral origin, not covered by the Hague Convention. The list which it had supplied admittedly included some drugs so covered, and he thought that Dr. Norman White should be asked to remove from the list, if possible, the drugs covered by the Convention, so that the list could be reduced to manageable proportions.

The CHAIRMAN read Article 14 of the International Opium Convention of 1912, which states that in addition to certain preparations containing morphine, cocaine or heroin, all new derivatives of morphine, cocaine, or their respective salts and every other alkaloid of opium which may be shown by scientific research generally recognised to be liable to similar abuse, and productive of like effects, are covered by the Convention. This meant that only new derivatives were subject to the Convention when they were shown by scientific research to be liable to abuse. Before the Committee could, therefore recommend the inclusion of them, there would have to be a consensus of medical and scientific opinion.

Dr. Norman WHITE said that many of these drugs started with an alkaloid basis, and were then transformed into some other form. The Convention covered nothing made from substances not alkaloidal, and alkaloids could be made from much simpler products than opium.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that morphine was harmful on account of an open phenylic group. If the phenylic group was closed by an alcoholic group, the morphine was deprived of its effects as a habit-forming drug. Codeine was formed from morphine by the inclusion of the methylic group. Dionine was still less injurious as a habit-forming drug than codeine because the ethylic group was more difficult to remove than the methylic.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Dr. Anselmino should, with Dr. Norman White, Dr. Miyajima and Mr. Campbell, prepare a memorandum which could embody the observations which he had made.

The Committee had to ascertain whether the derivatives of morphine or other alkaloids of opium were recognised as giving rise to abuses. If they were, they were automatically included in the terms of the Hague Convention.

After consultation with the French Representative, they had both agreed that the list submitted by the French Government should be referred to Governments for the observations of their Health Departments. When the necessary scientific information had been collected, the Committee would be in a position to make a definite recommendation. While waiting for this information, the Committee could postpone considering the question of summoning a further international conference.

The Committee agreed to this suggestion.

ELEVENTH MEETING

held on April 25th, 1922, at 3 p.m.

All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. BRENIER, were present.

30. *Enquiry into the approximate requirements of Raw Opium.*

The CHAIRMAN read the following resolution:

"The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium recommends that the Council should invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912, and other States Members of the League, to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption per annum of opium and its derivatives indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required and in the case of opium derivatives the amounts should be given in terms of morphine content.

"The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far-Eastern countries where the Chinese are the principal consumers, should be available by that date."

The resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN read to the Committee an extract from a letter from Smyrna, dated March 31st, 1922, with regard to the opium market. It was stated in this letter that owing to the vigorous campaign against the traffic in opium in the United States and Great Britain, the export of opium, from Smyrna, Constantinople and Salonica had been largely checked. A great deal of opium, however, was being sold to dealers and transported by land across Siberia and other Asiatic countries to the Far East; it was expected that this traffic would develop considerably after peace had been restored in Asia Minor. The Chairman pointed out that these statements confirmed the reports already noted of the traffic in opium from Afghanistan and Turkestan to China.

Sir John JORDAN hoped that the Committee would look into this question. There was a great deal of smuggling into Northern China by way of Manchuria. There was cultivation of the poppy in Turkestan and opium was carried by Afghans and perhaps by British Indians to the Far East through Russian territory. There had been reports in the newspapers of an opium monopoly which had been established at Vladivostock.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) thanked Sir John Jordan for drawing attention to these facts. He had been instructed by his Government to inform the Committee of this overland traffic in opium. It was believed that British subjects were engaged in the traffic in Kashgar. Cultivation was allowed upon Russian territory, and at Vladivostock a company had been authorised by the authorities to trade in opium. The Chinese Consul-General at Vladivostock had been instructed to protest.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that the monopoly to which reference had been made had been granted by the Russian authorities at Vladivostock to Koreans who were not under the control of the Japanese Government. He was trying to get further information on the subject from Japan.

Sir John JORDAN said that, according to the reports in the newspapers this opium was being transported from Vladivostock to Chinanpoo and was being distributed by a company of Japanese and Chinese.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he had seen figures showing that opium had been leaving Afghanistan and was being transported overland to Chinese Turkestan and to China. This opium was, he believed, partly grown in Afghanistan, but came chiefly from Persia. He understood that the traffic had ceased owing to the fall in the price of the drug in China. The transport of the drug over the mountains was very costly and the trade was not profitable when the price was normal. He could assure the Committee that none of the opium in question came from India. It was here

confronted with the difficulty of controlling exports from countries which were not parties to the Opium Convention. Afghanistan was neither a signatory of the Convention nor a Member of the League. He had noted that the company at Vladivostok had applied for the export from India of a minimum amount of 180,000 pounds of opium. He could assure the Committee that no opium would be exported from India in answer to this demand.

He could not positively state that British Indian subjects were not concerned in the cultivation and transport of opium in Kashgar and Chinese Turkestan. His memory on the point was very vague, but he thought that there had been reports from Kashgar about two years ago stating that the Consul there had enquired into complaints and punished the persons concerned. Owing to the nature of the country, it would be very difficult to exercise effective control.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN it was agreed that the Secretariat should request the Government of India to furnish it with any information not of a confidential character received from the British representatives in Chinese Turkestan.

31. *The manufacture, distribution and use of morphine and cocaine.*

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should discuss the control of the manufacture, distribution and use of morphine and cocaine in general, with special reference to the countries where the drug habit was prevalent. The Committee was aware from statements made by the French representative at the last Assembly and from other sources that there was a large illicit traffic in these drugs in the countries of Western Europe and on the continent of America. There were considerable illicit imports of cocaine into Great Britain: seizures were frequently made by the police, and cocaine hawkers prosecuted. So far, it had proved impossible to discover the source of these imports, or the persons who were really responsible for the traffic. France was suffering to an even worse degree, and was greatly interested in tracking down and controlling the traffic. The only effective method was to control production. Cocaine was not easily manufactured and could only be prepared by expert chemists. They had to discover which were the centres of production, by whom the product was handled, and to whom it was sold. The Dutch Government had been unable to supply the figures of the production of the factory in Amsterdam, and no statistics had been obtained from the Swiss and German Governments. The first step was to get from each country the names of the factories concerned, the amount which they produced, and particulars as to the channels of distribution. Agreement might then be reached as to the amount which should be produced to meet the total requirements of the world, and as to the methods of distribution.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) regretted that he could not at present give exact figures regarding the manufacture and consumption of cocaine in the Netherlands. The figures would, however, be given for 1922, and if the Committee should so desire, for 1921. The facts already known sufficiently proved that the Netherlands was not at all foremost in the manufacture of cocaine, as had been stated¹. He had been asked by the Netherlands Government to make this affirmation, which would be corroborated by exact figures later on. There was only one firm in the Netherlands manufacturing cocaine and it was controlled by the Government. He might add, in conclusion, that the system of import certificates was already applied to exports of cocaine to countries where imports were restricted or prohibited.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that after the war there had arisen in Germany a certain amount of illicit trade in cocaine and substitutes for cocaine. Legislation had, however, been passed by the Government, and the evil had been diminished. The big German firms which manufactured cocaine were particularly anxious to restrict unlawful commerce and were above suspicion. The stocks of the manufactured and raw material must be declared to the Government every three and six months. The stocks were carefully compared at the Ministry of Health, and enquiries at once made if any discrepancies were noted.

The German Government would supply the Secretariat with the statistics of production.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said that the statistics of production in Japan for 1920 were to be found in Table 4 of the summary of information drafted by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would doubtless obtain information from the other countries concerned in the manufacture.

Replying to a question of the CHAIRMAN, Dr. ANSELMINO said that all cocaine manufactured in Germany was made from coca leaves imported from Peru and Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN raised the point whether coca leaves and ecgonine were covered by the Convention, and whether information should not be obtained in regard to the production and trade in coca leaves.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that he did not think the Convention applied.

¹ Minutes of the Provisional Health Committee, page 34.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the United States Government assumed that it did apply.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government considered that coca leaves were covered by the Convention.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that the wording of the Convention justified their inclusion.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), on the invitation of the Chairman, explained that it was impossible to estimate how much cocaine could be extracted from a given quantity of coca leaves. The quantity varied in different consignments and diminished with storage. In the manufacturing process ecgonine was obtained from the leaves, and from it cocaine and related drugs were synthesised.

The CHAIRMAN, in view of this information, withdrew his suggestion that statistics should be obtained in regard to coca leaves and ecgonine.

He suggested that the Governments concerned should be asked to state their maximum requirements of cocaine.

This proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN further suggested that the Secretariat should obtain from the Governments concerned particulars as to the manufacture and method of distribution of morphine and cocaine, and that it should present a summary of the information obtained at the next session.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that it might be advisable, before asking for further information in regard to morphine, for the materials already obtained to be studied at leisure by the Secretariat. From the figures already supplied a fairly accurate idea might perhaps be formed of the amount of morphine which was being manufactured by the various countries. The position of Japan, for example, had already been explained to the Committee. A further study of the materials already obtained would enable the Committee, he thought, to form a fairly correct idea of the position in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that an application for further information in regard to morphine might well be postponed. The Secretariat had not yet had the time to obtain from the statistics at their disposal all the results and inferences which were possible.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government was convinced that the only way to deal with the question was to control production. Illicit trade was extremely easy. The French Government was much concerned by the increase of this trade. A bill already adopted by the Senate was before the Chamber, which had increased the penalties from 10,000 to 30,000 francs and from two years to five years' imprisonment. In addition a penalty of from five to ten years' expulsion was provided.

32. *Telegram from the International Council of Missionaries.*

The CHAIRMAN announced that a telegram had been received from the International Council of Missionaries offering to assist the Advisory Committee with the collection of information in regard to opium and other dangerous drugs. He thought this offer should be carefully considered. Missionaries had been of great assistance to the British officials in compiling the information contained in the British *Blue Book* on the cultivation of opium in China.

Sir John JORDAN said that the British Government depended almost entirely for its information on missionaries in China and Persia. He urged that the offer should be accepted.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) enquired whether this offer had any bearing upon the investigation which was to be conducted in China.

The CHAIRMAN said that the two matters were unrelated.

The proposal to accept the offer of the International Council of Missionaries was adopted.

33. *Letter from the International Opium Association at Peking.*

The CHAIRMAN referred to a letter which had been received by the Committee last year from the International Opium Association at Peking.

The Committee decided that the request for the intervention of the League contained in this letter was already covered by the action taken during the present session.

TWELFTH MEETING

held on April 26th, 1922, at 10 a.m.

All the members of the Committee, except M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), and all the Assessors except M. BRENIER were present.

34. Departure of the Chinese Representative.

The CHAIRMAN said he had received a communication from M. Chao-Hsin Chu stating that on receipt of an urgent telegram he had had to leave for London and would therefore be unable to attend the further meetings of the Committee.

35. Minutes of the Ninth Meeting.

The Minutes of the Ninth Meeting were examined and passed by the Committee.

36. Form of the annual Report to be furnished by the Governments. (Annex 3).

Sir John JORDAN, referring to paragraph 5 of the report, suggested that particular be asked regarding the nationality and number of the consumers of opium, and the amount of revenue derived from the sale of opium. He proposed, in particular, that the Governments should be asked to state the number of Chinese consumers in countries such as Siam and Singapore, and that the total number of Chinese residents should also be given. This would enable the Committee to compare the consumption per head of opium in China with the consumption per head of the Chinese population in countries outside.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the point raised by Sir John Jordan was partly covered by the last sub-paragraph of paragraph 5*b*. He proposed that the following words might be substituted for the last sentence:

"State the number of Chinese residents in the territory, and if smoking is prevalent among persons of other nationalities, give the number of such nationals."

Sir John JORDAN proposed that the following clause should also be inserted:

"Please state the revenue, if any, derived from the sale of prepared opium and the proportion it bears to the total revenue of the territory in question."

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said it might be dangerous to compare consumption among the Chinese populations at home and abroad. The Chinese population outside China mostly consisted of unmarried Chinese labourers and comparisons would be misleading unless the particular circumstances of each country were taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that such circumstances would naturally affect the inferences to be drawn by the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the report should be taken paragraph by paragraph. This proposal was adopted.

Paragraph 1.

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India) the word "important" was inserted before the word "regulations" in paragraph 1 and the words "likely to be of interest to the Advisory Committee"

at the end of the paragraph. The object of these amendments was to avoid the forwarding to the Secretariat of information of no real value.

Paragraph 1 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 2.

Adopted.

Paragraph 3.

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India) the words "Regarding any new points of interest or importance relating to" were inserted in place of the word "of" in the first sentence of the paragraph; and, in the second sub-paragraph the words "such information as is possible regarding" were inserted in place of the words "table of". Mr. Campbell said that it would be very difficult, for example, to give particulars or even a summary of all the prosecutions and penalties in the various districts of India.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply to Mr. Campbell, said that the last sentence of paragraph 3 referred to drugs coming under Chapter III of the Opium Convention.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said it would be impossible for the Government of Siam to give the information referred to in this last sentence, because it had no control or jurisdiction over foreign subjects living in Siam. The native licensing laws did not apply to foreign residents.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Siamese Government might draw attention to this fact in its report to the Committee.

Paragraph 3 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 4.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) represented, in reference to paragraph 4e, that governments often could not say by what routes raw opium was transported, and that it would be difficult to state even the destinations. He moved that the words "and by what routes" should be omitted.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed that it would be difficult to indicate the routes.

The Committee decided to omit the phrase in question.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India), referring to paragraph 4f, said that it would be virtually impossible for the Indian Government to state the amount of stocks held by the small retailers.

He noted that the question of stocks had yet to be considered by the Committee with reference to the Canadian proposal that a general inventory should be made.

It was agreed that the question should be reserved and discussed later when the Canadian proposal came up.

Paragraph 5.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed that paragraph 5a should be amended. He thought it desirable that governments should be invited to indicate the nature of the difficulties with which they were confronted in suppressing illicit traffic in opium, and that the various governments should be warned of these difficulties in order that they might more effectually co-operate.

After some discussion, the following clauses were added:—

"If not, what nationalities are addicted; what is the nature of the difficulties which have been experienced in suppressing the practice; and to what extent is opium illicitly introduced?"

"What action has been taken to enforce the law?"

"Please state number of prosecutions, etc."

"Is the co-operation of any country necessary to effect the complete suppression, and, if so, on what lines and in what directions?"

On the proposal of Mr. CAMPBELL (India) the words "if possible" were inserted after the word "state" in the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 5b, and the words "or alternatively amount of raw opium consumed for smoking" were suppressed.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) referred to the amendment moved by Sir John Jordan at the beginning of the discussion, under which governments would be asked to furnish particulars as to the revenue derived from opium. He reminded the Committee that last year it had been decided that no such information should be asked for because questions of revenue lay outside the province of the League of Nations, and the request would undoubtedly irritate some governments. The necessary figures could, moreover, be obtained in most cases from published statistics.

Sir John JORDAN urged that his amendment should be retained. The present situation in China was serious and without precedent. The Committee had to show that it was grappling with the question as a whole. The consumption of opium was officially prohibited in China, but the prohibition was not effective. At present there was what amounted to free trade in opium. In other countries, however, there were opium monopolies and if the present position continued, China would almost certainly follow their example and establish a government monopoly. The temptation to do so was very strong, owing to the enormous revenue which might be derived from a tax on opium, and the present desperate condition of China's finances. The situation in other countries must be frankly stated, and the position fairly considered as a whole.

The last Assembly had decided that the consumption of opium as practised in India was legitimate, though the representative of China had moved that the use of the term should be limited to strictly medical purposes.

He quoted in conclusion figures from a report which had been received from the Governor of Hong-Kong, from which it appeared that the Chinese were taking effective action in some localities at any rate. 8,000 lbs of opium from Amoy had been seized in Hong-Kong in 1920, but in 1921 there had been practically none from Amoy. China had been in earnest in trying to suppress the traffic, but unless something were done it would follow the example of the other Powers and would establish a monopoly.

The CHAIRMAN gave the complete figures of seizures at Hong-Kong, which showed that, although Amoy opium had ceased, there had been a great increase in the seizures of other Chinese opium.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India), M. BOURGOIS (France), and the CHAIRMAN said that, as far as their governments were concerned, they had no objection to offer to the amendment proposed by Sir John Jordan.

The amendment was accordingly adopted.

Paragraph 5 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 6.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), referring to paragraph 6c, said it would only be possible to give particulars as to the ultimate destination of exported drugs if the countries concerned agreed to accept the system of import certificates.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee must assume that the system of import certificates would be generally adopted. Otherwise the work of the League would be seriously hampered.

On the suggestion of M. BOURGOIS (France), it was agreed to ask in paragraph 6b for particulars as to the owners and the situation of factories and the output of the various firms engaged in the manufacture of morphine.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that paragraph 6d partly covered the points dealt with in the resolution of Prince Charoon. He thought, however, that this resolution should be dealt with quite separately from the report.

Paragraph 6 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 7.

It was agreed that a footnote should be appended to paragraph 7 indicating that the particulars required were "to include morphine subsequently converted into heroin, codeine or other substances, stating amount so converted."

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked that information might be requested in regard to all drugs coming under the Convention.

It was agreed that a general paragraph should be added on this point.

Paragraph 7 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 8.

Adopted.

Paragraph 9.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) suggested that, in view of the previous day's discussion, the references in paragraph 9 to coca leaves should be struck out.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed that such information would not be of much value.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned that in Great Britain coca leaves were used in the preparation of coca wines.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that this practice was of no importance.

It was agreed that the references to coca leaves in paragraph 9a and paragraph 9b should be deleted.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it would be difficult for the German Government to give information in regard to the production of particular factories. Many of the factories belonged to one large syndicate, and it would be impossible to differentiate between the output of each of the works.

It was further agreed that the reference to preparations containing cocaine in paragraph 9a should be deleted.

Paragraph 9 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 10.

Adopted.

Paragraph 11.

Adopted.

Paragraph 12.

It was agreed that in paragraph 12 the words "give references" should be substituted for the words "report as".

Paragraph 12 as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 13.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) suggested that, if possible, reports should be obtained from the Governments for identical periods as the statistical year varied in different countries.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the Governments should be requested, if possible, to give statistics for the calendar year.

Paragraph 13 as amended was adopted.

The footnotes in the draft form of annual report were approved.

37. Proposal by the Canadian Government for an Inventory of Stocks of Narcotics.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Canadian Government had suggested that the Governments concerned should be asked to supply information as to the amount of narcotics and other dangerous drugs in stock on a certain date, as this information would be useful as a check upon the exports trade.

He pointed out that it would be difficult to make such an inventory in countries where there was a vast number of retailers and where the drugs were sold in numerous forms.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed with the Chairman. He had found by experience that it was very difficult to obtain any satisfactory return of stocks. People tended to place more reliance on such figures than they could reasonably bear. It was, moreover, difficult to compare the figures of one country with those of another where the regulations were different. For example, the placing in a bonded warehouse would in some countries be regarded as import and in others not. The Indian Government could do no more than supply figures as to the Government stocks.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that every effort should be made to obtain this information. The inventory could certainly be taken in the United States, where every chemist had to receive an authorisation before he could receive specific quantities of drugs, and where every manufacturer was required to return particulars of his distribution.

M. ARIYOSHI (Japan) said it would be very difficult in Japan to take an inventory at a given date of stocks in the possession of small retailers. It would only be possible to give the large stocks in the wholesale houses.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that in Germany the stocks belonging to manufacturers were taken every three months, and those of the wholesale dealers every six months. It would be very difficult to take the stocks of the retailers.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the question might be postponed until the Secretariat had made a further examination of the statistics with which they were already provided.

This proposal was adopted.

38. Date of sending in the report.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a request should be made for the report to be furnished by the Governments by June 1st in each year.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) and Mr. CAMPBELL (India) doubted whether it would be possible for the Governments to forward a report as early as June.

After some discussion, it was decided that the following dates should be suggested to the Governments:

For the European Governments: July 1st.

For the Governments outside Europe: October 1st.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

held on April 26th, 1922 at 3 p.m

All the members of the Committee, with the exception of M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), and the Assessors, with the exception of M. BRENIER, were present.

39. *Public Meeting.*

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider whether a public meeting should be held when the report which it would present to the Council would be discussed. His own opinion was that, as the terms of no resolution adopted by the Committee had yet been given to the Press, and as the Committee was a purely advisory one whose decisions had to be endorsed by the Council, it would not be desirable to hold a public meeting.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) and M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with the Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) was also in agreement. It was essential for the Committee to be able to discuss its agenda with the utmost frankness. This would be impossible in public.

Sir John JORDAN said that at the first session of the Committee he had stated that publicity was the principal weapon to be used in dealing with the opium question. That was why he had advocated public meetings. Public opinion in China was the only real driving force in the campaign. He had attended the Washington Conference, and nothing had struck him more during the proceedings than the way in which public opinion had been informed of everything which had been going on. Each sub-Committee dealing with any particular question had published its decisions daily, and the important facts in those decisions had been summarised by the Press. When the subject had come before the full Committee, public opinion had been fully prepared, and the Committee had had to face a well-informed public. It could easily be seen that at Washington the statesmen had felt that the public was the master. He thought that the whole question of publicity was a very important one, and he was sorry that the Committee did not think it desirable to hold a public meeting.

The one great drawback to the League's machinery was the delay in the execution of decisions. The Committee decided something in April, the Council considered it some weeks later, and perhaps referred it to the Assembly, which was not to meet for three months. Public interest was bound to die out.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it was impossible for a frank discussion to take place in public.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out to Sir John Jordan that in this case the delay would not be great. The Council was meeting within fourteen days, and if it approved the Committee's report, the Secretariat would carry out all the decisions immediately. The report would then be published.

Discussion then took place between Sir John JORDAN, the CHAIRMAN and Mr. CAMPBELL (India) concerning the change which had been made by the Second Assembly in Mr. Wellington Koo's resolution which the Council had adopted on June 28th, 1921. The Assembly had substituted the word "legitimate" for the words "medicinal and scientific", and had omitted the word "strictly".

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the Assembly had changed a resolution of the Council which the latter had taken contrary to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. The Assembly had reversed the Council's decision, and had endorsed the Committee's opinion.

Sir John JORDAN said that he would like to move a motion before the Committee rose to the effect that the Assembly, having decided that the use of opium in India was legitimate, should be asked if it would enquire whether the smoking of opium outside India was legitimate or illegitimate. Having decided this question in one case, he thought that they should also do so in the other. He desired a definite pronouncement made on the question of opium smoking. If the Assembly decided that it was legitimate, then China was justified in her attitude. If it did not,

steps would have to be taken for the gradual suppression of opium smoking generally, in accordance with the Convention of 1912.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in order to avoid misunderstanding, he would draw attention to what were the duties of the Advisory Committee.

It was a Committee appointed to assist in advising the Council in dealing with any questions on the supervision of the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. It acted under the general direction of the Council. Its duty was also to prepare an annual report on the whole subject for the information of the Assembly. He asked Sir John Jordan to submit his proposal in writing.

The Committee decided not to hold a public meeting.

40. Budget for 1923.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the report prepared by the Financial Section of the Secretariat on its budget for 1922, and on the estimates for 1923. There was very little information regarding the actual expenditure during the present financial year. The 4,262 gold francs expenditure for the first three months did not include a session of the Committee, nor any salaries of the higher staff of the Opium Section. Dr. Hawking Yen, Secretary to the Advisory Committee last year, had been absent for several months and no expenditure in respect of his salary had been incurred. It was therefore difficult for the Committee to know whether the 1922 expenditure would justify the budget for 1923.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that in the budget for 1922 the provisions had been estimated in gold francs. This year the same figure had been repeated, but it now referred to Swiss francs.

The CHAIRMAN asked Sir Herbert Ames, Director of the Financial Department, to explain the difference between the gold and Swiss franc.

Sir Herbert AMES said that at the beginning of the Secretariat's residence in Geneva the budget for the League had been computed in gold francs. The gold franc was the pre-war franc of the monetary union, and was stabilised on the American dollar. The American dollar was worth 5,1826 gold francs. This had been done in order that a stable unit could be obtained for the calculation of national contributions. At the present moment the Swiss franc had increased in value and had become practically equivalent to the gold franc. The difference varied within a one per cent. limit. In consequence of this, the Second Assembly had decided that the provisions for the 1923 budget should be computed in Swiss francs. The 96,250 Swiss francs, therefore, which had been allocated to the Advisory Committee this year was practically equivalent to the 96,250 gold francs allocated to it last year.

The Committee then considered each item of the budget.

Item 1 (Meetings of the Committee).

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the estimate of 13,000 Swiss francs for sessions of the Committee should be increased to 15,000 in order to cover the cost of a second session in September.

The Committee agreed.

Item 2 (Salaries of the Secretariat).

The CHAIRMAN said that this was the most important item in the budget. It was essential to have a permanent staff working continuously on the opium question. A great deal of preparatory work had to be done before the sessions of the Committee, and he thought that something should be inserted in the Committee's report to the Council to the effect that adequate staff should be provided. He suggested that, in addition to the head of the Section, there should be one person of the administrative class to deal with administrative work.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed with the Chairman. The Committee felt the utmost sympathy with the staff of the Secretariat in connection with the extreme pressure of work put upon it. At the present moment documents came in at irregular intervals and in great quantities at a time. Some of these documents were important, but unless they were distributed more uniformly, it was impossible to give them proper attention.

The CHAIRMAN, in congratulating the Secretariat on the preparatory work accomplished, asked Dame Rachel Crowdy to express her views on the question of staff.

Dame Rachel CROWDY (Acting Secretary to the Advisory Committee) said that one reason for the great and sudden rush of work lay in the fact that many Governments had not sent in their answers to the questionnaire by the dates asked for, and some had delayed until the last moment. Further, many Governments had sent replies in other languages than French or English. The Secretariat had had to deal with forty answers to the questionnaire, in the last month, eleven of which had been in neither French nor English. For example, the reply from China had been in Chinese. The Translating Department of the Secretariat had translated sixty answers to the

questionnaire in seven or eight weeks, some of which, as, for instance, the Japanese, had been about eighty pages long. The Translating and Printing Departments of the Secretariat had had, in fact, to do in less than one month work which would normally have occupied five months, and she hoped that the Committee would agree that the attention of Governments should be drawn to the importance of sending their replies by the dates specified, and in one of the official languages of the League.

The official of the Secretariat who had prepared the summary had only had a fortnight in which to summarise about 70 replies to the questionnaire.

The CHAIRMAN said that not less than 50,000 Swiss francs should be allocated to the salaries of the Secretariat.

The Committee agreed.

Item 3 (Temporary assistance).

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to reduce this item from 8,000 to 7,000 Swiss francs, and to add the 1,000 francs so obtained to item 1.

The Committee agreed.

Item 4 (Travelling expenses of the Secretariat).

The CHAIRMAN noted that this item was considerably smaller than last year. It was necessary for the Secretariat to visit Governments occasionally.

The Committee adopted item 4.

Item 5 (Printing).

The Committee adopted item 5.

Items 6 and 7 (Cables, Telegrams, etc., Miscellaneous expenses).

The Committee adopted items 6 and 7.

Item 8 (Unforeseen expenses).

The CHAIRMAN proposed to reduce this item by 1,000 Swiss francs, and to add that sum to item 1.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

The Committee adopted the budget.

41. Letter from the League of Red Cross Societies. (Annex 4).

The CHAIRMAN said that a proposal had been made to the Second Assembly by the Persian delegate to the effect that the League of Nations should carry out propaganda in Eastern countries against the use of opium and other dangerous drugs. The League of Red Cross Societies had been consulted, and in reply had suggested that it should address to all national Red Cross Societies in countries specially interested, an invitation to give their aid in organising, in co-operation with Governments, measures to combat the abuse of opium and other drugs.

The League of Red Cross Societies had also proposed that a representative of the League should attend a conference of Oriental Red Cross Societies at Bangkok in November, and further that that representative should make a tour through China, Japan, the Straits Settlements, India and perhaps Persia, in order to acquaint himself with the condition of the opium traffic in those countries with the object of presenting the views of the League at the conference at Bangkok.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he did not think this proposal could be put into practice as there was no provision in the budget for such a purpose. The procedure of sending a representative into the proposed countries was fraught with serious difficulties and embarrassments, and he did not think that, in any case, it would be of the smallest use.

The CHAIRMAN said that he thought that the Committee could adopt the first proposal of the League of Red Cross Societies that it should get into touch with national Red Cross Societies and undertake propaganda in connection with the opium question. This would not commit the League to any expense.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said he saw no objection to the first proposal.

The Committee adopted the first proposal contained in the letter.

The CHAIRMAN said that the difficulties of appointing a representative to attend the conference at Bangkok were very great. Perhaps it might be possible to make an arrangement with someone on the spot in Siam who was interested in the subject, and who could be furnished with all information available. He did not think that more could be done. If this were not possible, perhaps the Committee could invite the Red Cross Societies to make such arrangements as would secure that the health side of the Opium question should be fully discussed at the Bangkok Conference.

Sir John JORDAN considered that that was all the Committee could do with regard to this proposal.

The Committee agreed to the Chairman's suggestion.

42. Letter from the Director of the International Office of the Universal Postal Union.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the new regulations which the last conference of the Universal Postal Union had adopted regarding the transmission of opium and other dangerous drugs through the post.

The transmission of these drugs was absolutely prohibited through letter post, and was only allowed through parcels and registered post to those countries which admitted opium by that method.

43. Letter to the Secretary of the Committee from the Chinese representative (Annex 5).

The Committee took note of the Chinese Representative's letter to the Secretary of the Committee concerning various resolutions passed by the Committee, together with the Chairman's remarks.

The abstract of a telegram received by the Chinese representative from his Government and circulated for the information of the Committee was also noted.

44. Publication of the Summary of the replies to the Questionnaire.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) asked if the Summary of the replies to the questionnaire (documents C. 171. M. 88 and O.C. 22) would be published.

The CHAIRMAN said that document C. 171. M. 88 contained the agenda of the meeting, and the summaries of the replies to the questionnaire, and would certainly be published subsequently. It would be a great pity if the information contained in it were not made available for general information.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that several statements in these documents had placed his country at a disadvantage. They concerned excessive consumption, smuggling, defects in the monopoly system and the possibility of limiting imports.

Sir John JORDAN desired to know whether these remarks were not correct. They seemed to him to be a very moderate statement of the actual situation.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) thought that the problem of the campaign against opium traffic should not be regarded only from the point of view of the present situation. To form a correct opinion it was necessary to pass in review a certain period of time. Portugal had, it was true, imported in 1908, before the Opium Convention of 1912, 3,249 chests of opium. After the Hague Convention of 1912, the imports had dropped to 2,043 chests, and after the signature of the Treaty of June 14th, 1913, the import figure had fallen to 531 chests. Article 90 of the Treaty provided for the reduction of import during the five years after the signing of the Treaty, and by 1918 the import was 400 chests, a decrease which became more marked in the next year, when the figure had been reduced to 374 chests. This decrease in the import figures showed the very remarkable manner in which Portugal had fulfilled its obligations.

Sir John JORDAN said that he was quite willing to consider the question over a large number of years. The figures for 1910 and 1911 proved what he had always maintained, that a large amount of opium had been going to Far-Eastern colonies which they were not consuming, but which they were exporting elsewhere, principally to China. In 1913 the treaty which Portugal had made with Great Britain had empowered the Government of India to supply 500 chests of opium a year to Macao. Of these 500 chests, he thought 260 were for export and 240 for local consumption. He did not know why any export was necessary, but he contended that 240 chests for a population of about 85,000 was altogether in excess of legitimate requirements. On this basis what would be the consumption of the 400 million people of China? He was sorry that the Portuguese delegate had raised this question, as he had not intended to denounce the things which had been done in the past, whether they had been done by the British Government or by any other Government. Macao

had not been the only place where opium had been received in excess of requirements. There were British colonies which were at that moment receiving more opium than was necessary and, until that question was settled, the opium problem in the Far East would never be solved.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) said that he possessed very detailed knowledge of the particular question at issue, and that the delegate of Portugal would be well advised to leave the Summary as it stood. The Secretariat could, if it were challenged, produce a really complete and exhaustive statement on the opium question far more damaging to Portugal than that which appeared in the Summary. Taking the local consumption of Macao at 240 chests, and allowing for a population of 100,000, and taking as a basis for estimating the present consumption in China 25 per cent. of the figures quoted in the Chinese delegate's statement at the Shanghai Conference of 1907, the amounts consumed per head in Macao, China and India would be as follows:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Macao | 2,352 grains per head. |
| China | 367 grains per head. |
| India | 26 grains per head. |

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) desired to reply to Sir John Jordan. The import figure of raw opium to Macao was not an arbitrary one. It was based on the terms of the Treaty signed at London on June 14th, 1913, which, in turn, had been based on the total number of the population in the Province of Macao. The Treaty, however, had taken as a basis of calculation the census of 1910, and this census, which had been carried out three years before the signing of the Treaty, did not give the actual number of the population. In reality the census of 1920 showed an increase of population of at least 20 per cent, without taking into account the influx of Chinese arriving for the feasts celebrated on the occasion of the Chinese New Year.

The documents to which he had alluded stated that the monopoly system was defective, because that system had been abandoned in other countries as the result of abuses, the outbreak of which it was impossible to avoid. He could not agree with such a criticism because the person holding the concession was unable to act freely. The system of concessions possessed a certain number of guarantees instituted by the Portuguese Government, which prevented abuses. It should not be forgotten that in its reply to the questionnaire the Portuguese Government had enumerated the penalties applying to abuses in connection with the opium trade.

The CHAIRMAN said that he thought the Summary placed before the Committee was a critical and an analytical one. It was not merely a précis of each of the replies. Its object was to facilitate the work of the Committee, and the Secretariat in preparing it had called attention to points which seemed to require the Committee's consideration. In doing so, they had been acting entirely in accordance with their duties. If there had been any inaccuracy it must be corrected, but, so far as Macao was concerned, it was a statement of fact which could not be disputed.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Summary would have been entirely useless if it had not contained these criticisms and whoever had prepared it deserved great credit. Portugal was not alone mentioned. Japan, for instance, had also been mentioned, and had made no protest against the statements regarding morphine. She had admitted them quite frankly, and the Committee had heard the explanation.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Portuguese representative's point of view could be met if a few words were inserted to point out that the import had diminished since 1913.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) thanked the Chairman for his proposal and stated that the activity shown by the Portuguese Government in the struggle against opium was the result of its desire to carry on that struggle in the future progressively and efficiently.

45. *Resolution of Sir John Jordan.*

Sir John JORDAN desired to move the following resolution in connection with the suppression of prepared opium:—

“That the Committee, taking note of the decision by which the Assembly at its meeting in September, 1921, pronounced the use of opium under certain conditions in India as legitimate, suggests to the Assembly that it would greatly facilitate the work of this Committee in dealing with the gradual and effective suppression of prepared opium in accordance with Article 6 of the 1912 Opium Convention, if the Assembly would undertake a similar investigation into the use of opium for smoking purposes, and gave an authoritative opinion for the guidance of the Committee, whether it considers such use of opium as legitimate or illegitimate.”

The CHAIRMAN said that the Second Assembly had deleted from Dr. Wellington Koo's resolution the reference to prepared opium precisely on the grounds that prepared opium had been declared illegitimate by the Opium Convention, and that that Convention had made provision

for its gradual suppression. If Sir John Jordan's resolution were adopted, the Assembly would be asked to decide a matter already decided.

Sir John JORDAN agreed to withdraw his proposal.

46. Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT desired to make a general statement on the opium question. Morally and physically, opium had been a curse to humanity. Economically no permanent trade could be established in a commodity which destroyed its own market. China had made a desperate attempt to suppress opium, and it could not be denied that great progress had been made; but now a more insidious drug had taken its place. China had made another effort last year to have the use of opium reduced to its medical and scientific requirements.

The Assembly had, however, substituted the words "legitimate" for "medicinal and scientific". Mrs. Hamilton Wright asked on what scientific authority did the Assembly base its opinion that eating opium was a legitimate practice. A final and precise definition must be given to the word "legitimate" before any real progress could be made. China would not continue to follow indefinitely the difficult path which she was now treading, and once she began to produce opium and morphine herself, she would easily outdistance all competition and control the markets of the world. If she did that, the responsibility would lie with the Advisory Committee, and, unless a programme could be adopted adequately dealing with the fundamental principles involved, the good work of many years would be rendered useless.

FOURTEENTH MEETING

held on April 29th, 1922. at 10 a.m.

All the members of the Committee were present except M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) and M. ARIYOSHI (Japan), whose place was taken by Dr. MIYAJIMA. Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT, Assessor, was also present.

47. Approval of the Minutes.

The Committee approved the Minutes of the Thirteenth Meeting subject to verbal amendments to be sent in by the members of the Committee later.

48. Report of the Committee to the Council.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had to perform the double task of formulating opinions and recommendations for the guidance of the Council, and of presenting an annual report on the general situation. The report now before the Committee was intended to meet both these objects, but in the future he thought that an annual report on the general situation should be prepared in advance by the Secretariat for adoption by the Committee, with such modifications as might be considered desirable. A second report covering the recommendations of the Committee might be drafted at the end of the session.

The Committee then proceeded to examine the draft report, which was adopted with the following amendments:

It was decided that the various Governments should be asked to send 15 copies of their annual report.

An addition was made to the effect that Switzerland should be invited to adopt the system of import certificates pending her ratification of the Convention.

A paragraph was added to the effect that States wishing to make the regulations regarding exports more strict, might introduce a clause to this effect in the certificate.

In connection with the resolution proposed by the Netherlands Representative, it was decided to suppress reference to any particular country. It was also decided that the enquiries should cover "any questions arising under the Opium Convention" and the wording was altered accordingly.

On the suggestion of M. BOURGOIS (France) the words "information on Sze-Chuan and Yunnan" were inserted before "... by the French Representative on the Committee".

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the paragraph referring to the inaccuracy of the reports of the Chinese Commissioners and the provincial governors might be omitted.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) and Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT were in favour of this suggestion.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) thought that there were many people who did not desire to be convinced that China was growing opium. His personal opinion was that the paragraph should stand, but he would not press the point.

The French, Japanese, Siamese and Portuguese representatives agreed that the paragraph should be omitted and it was decided accordingly.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired to know if some mention should not be made of the Committee's effort to obtain the Chinese Representative's agreement to an enquiry being carried on on the lines of the 1911 Treaty between China and Great Britain. He thought a reference to this should be put into the report in order that it should be shown that all means of conciliation had been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the words "or any suggestion of enquiries on the lines of the joint British and Chinese enquiries of 1917" should be added to the words "on the lines of the Committee's recommendation of last year."

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) said that he thought reference should not be made to that enquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) desired that all proposals made by the Committee should be stated in the report in order to show that the Committee had done its best to find a solution.

A vote was taken and the Chairman's suggestion was adopted by a majority.

M. de Kat ANGELINO (Netherlands) proposed to omit the sentence containing the opinion that the new enquiry by the Chinese Government would not be any more effective than the former. The sentence might have the opposite effect to that which the Committee had intended.

The Committee agreed to the omission.

On the suggestion of the Japanese Representative, the following words were added after the words "stop the illicit traffic": — "he stated that the Japanese Government would earnestly desire to have the close co-operation of the exporting countries in the matter of the control of the traffic in dangerous drugs".

Dr. MIYAJIMA (Japan) desired to substitute for the table of imports and manufactures of morphine that comparing the imports to Japan from Great Britain with the exports from Great Britain to Japan in the supplement to Annex II of Doc. 171. M. 188.

The CHAIRMAN said that the proposed change would substitute a table which merely showed the imports of morphia from Great Britain into Japan.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) proposed instead the following amendment:—

"The Committee desire to call attention to the fact that the Japanese figures of imports from certain countries are much larger than the quantities shown as exported from those countries to Japan."

Dr. MIYAJIMA (Japan) said that if the Committee adopted this he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Campbell's amendment was adopted.

Dr. MIYAJIMA (Japan) desired that the sentence after the table should read as follows:—

"After making allowance for the increase in the medical requirements during and after the war."

The Committee adopted this amendment.

He further desired that the rest of the sentence should read: "The Committee can feel little doubt that some of this morphine might have found its way into China."

The CHAIRMAN said that this would materially alter the substance of the sentence; he hoped the Japanese Representative would not press his point.

After some discussion the amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN to meet another amendment of the Japanese Representative, proposed that the sentence beginning, "They would recommend the Council" should read as follows:—

"They note the promise of the Japanese Government conveyed through its representative to make the strictest possible investigation into the present illicit traffic."

This amendment was adopted.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that insufficient attention had been drawn to the importance of providing very severe penalties for illicit traffickers in dangerous drugs. He thought words should be added drawing the Council's attention to this point.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) agreed, and also suggested that the words "only effective method" should be altered to "most effective method"

The CHAIRMAN proposed the following addition:

"The experience of different countries shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in cocaine, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent and the Committee suggests that the question of providing a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty should be considered by the Governments."

On the proposal of the Netherlands Representative, the addition was slightly altered in order to cover dangerous drugs in general.

The Committee adopted this and approved Mr. Campbell's further suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN proposed a new paragraph as follows:—

"Offer of assistance from the International Missionary Council.

"The International Missionary Council, which represents missionary associations in all parts of the world and includes the Churches of India, China, Africa and other countries, has offered its assistance to the Committee by suggesting sources of information and itself securing information with regard to the problems with which the Committee has to deal. The Committee very gladly accepted this offer."

The Committee agreed to this addition.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the following additional paragraph:

"Exchange of Laws and Regulations.

"Article 21 of the Convention requires the Signatory Powers to communicate to one another the texts of their laws and administrative regulations. In the case of Members of the League this exchange is now effected through the Secretariat. The number of these laws has become very large and the Committee think it would be sufficient and an economy both of time and money if, instead of circulating all the documents received, the Secretariat issued periodically to the Governments a list of all the laws and regulations received, leaving it to each Government to ask for any laws and regulations it desires to receive. The Committee considers that no objection would be taken if the Netherlands Government thought fit to adopt the same procedure."

The report was adopted.

Resolutions embodied in the Report.

The CHAIRMAN then asked the Committee to consider the resolutions attached to the Report, which were intended as a summary of the recommendations contained in the Report.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

The Advisory Committee have agreed to the following resolutions:

(1) That the Council of the League should be requested to urge on all States which have not yet done so, and in particular on Switzerland, Persia and Turkey, the desirability of bringing the Opium Convention of 1911 into force in its entirety without delay.

(2) That it is most desirable that the system of Import Certificates unanimously adopted by the Council and the Assembly of the League should be brought into force by countries in Europe, America, Africa and Australia not later than September 1st, 1922, and by other countries not later than January 1st, 1923; and that the Governments should be asked to adopt the form of Import Certificate proposed by the Advisory Committee.

(3) That the Health Committee of the League of Nations should be asked by the Council to continue their enquiries into the requirements of the various countries of morphine and other dangerous drugs for medicinal and scientific purposes.

(4) That the Council should invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912, and other States Members of the League, to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries, total requirements for internal consumption *per annum* of opium and its derivatives, indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required and in the case of opium derivatives the amounts should be given in terms of morphine content.

The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far-Eastern countries, where the Chinese are the principal consumers, should be available by that date.

(5) That the Council of the League should, if the necessity arises, invite the Governments of States which are Parties to the Convention to facilitate the carrying out in their territories of joint investigations by commissions, appointed partly by the Government concerned and partly by the League, into any questions arising under the Opium Convention.

(6) (a) That the Committee, having considered the reports, as communicated by the Chinese representative on the Committee, of the enquiries instituted by the Chinese Government into alleged revival of opium cultivation in various

provinces, and having had regard to the time at which, the condition under which, and the position of certain of the persons by whom the enquiries were made, and to the fact that certain important districts had not been covered, and having compared the reports with the information contained in the *Blue Book* issued by the British Government and with other information before the Committee:

Regrets that, while gladly acknowledging that in certain provinces efforts have been made by the authorities to enforce the prohibition of opium, it is forced to the conclusion that there is a large and widespread revival both of the cultivation and the use of opium in China.

Further, the Committee realises that the responsibility for the revival rests mainly, if not wholly, on the military governors of the provinces concerned; and that at the present time, under the political conditions prevailing, the pressure of public opinion is probably the only force available to remedy a state of things which is both a violation of the treaty engagements of China and inconsistent with its obligations as a Member of the League of Nations.

(b) That the Council of the League should ask the Chinese Government to make better and more thorough investigations into poppy cultivation in China than it did last year, so as to be able to give more reliable reports to the League this year and in the years to come. In conducting such an investigation, besides officials appointed by the Chinese Government, organisations such as Chambers of Commerce, Educational Associations and other organisations particularly interested in the suppression of opium, should be included on the Committee of investigation throughout the provinces reported as having poppy cultivation.

(c) That, as China in common with all other States Members of the League has entrusted the League of Nations with the supervision of the traffic in dangerous drugs, the Chinese Government should invite representatives of the League to accompany the Commissioners in their investigations; the Committee also desires to point out that investigations can only be effective if made during the season of the year while the poppy is in flower and recommends that the Chinese Government should be asked to make arrangements accordingly.

(d) That the Council should publish the conclusions at which the Committee has arrived.

(7) That the Committee notes the promise of the Japanese Government, conveyed through its representative, to make the strictest possible investigation into the illicit traffic in morphine at present being carried on in the Far East; and it recommends that co-operation should be established between the Japanese authorities and the Chinese Maritime Customs, with a view to tracing the sources of contraband morphine. It is further desirable that the discrepancies between the Japanese import statistics and the export statistics of certain other countries should be cleared up.

(8) That, in order to facilitate the general control of the traffic in dangerous drugs, the Committee recommends:

(a) that the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible;

(b) that the Council of the League should invite the Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries;

(c) that the Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police authorities;

(d) that the Governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs;

(e) that, as experience shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent, the Governments should consider the question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty;

(f) that the list of drugs not covered by the Convention of 1912, communicated by the French Government, should be referred to the interested Governments for their observations; and that pending the receipt of such information, the question of holding a further International Conference should be postponed.

(9) That the offer of the League of Red Cross Societies to invite the National Red Cross Societies which are interested in the Opium question to undertake educational work as to the evil results of the abuse of opium should be accepted.

(10) That the Council should invite the governments, in making their annual report to the League on opium and other dangerous drugs, to adopt the form prepared by the Advisory Committee; to furnish the report not later than July 1st (in the case of Western countries); and October 1st (in the case of Eastern countries); and to make the report in one or other of the official languages of the League.

The Committee adopted the resolutions subject to final drafting by the Chairman and the Secretariat.

49. *Publication of Documents.*

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Summary of the replies to the Questionnaire and any other relevant documents should be published by the Secretariat when they had been corrected and brought up to date.

The Committee agreed.

50. *Date of the next Meeting.*

The CHAIRMAN consulted the Committee as to whether it would be desirable to meet in the late autumn, either in October or November. He pointed out that they had been unable at the present meeting to attempt a general review of the situation based on the materials supplied in answer to the Questionnaire.

Mr. CAMPBELL (India) considered that one session a year was not sufficient, but proposed that it should be left to the Secretariat to decide at a later date whether a session should be convened this autumn.

The Committee agreed.

51. *Telegram from the Chinese Government.*

The CHAIRMAN communicated the following telegram received from the Chinese Government concerning the seizure of contraband opium and dangerous drugs by the Chinese Maritime Customs:—

“In reply your enquiry for information concerning last year's seizures of opium its derivatives and other drugs inspector general Chinese Customs has telegraphed complete details to London representative for transmission Geneva. China most willing exert utmost in this matter. Since question affects world we hope League of Nations will continually cooperate.

WAI-CHIAO-PU.”

52. *Vote of thanks to the Secretariat.*

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT proposed a vote of thanks to the Secretariat for the work they had done during the session of the Committee.

This proposal was carried unanimously.

53. *Vote of thanks to the Chairman.*

M. BOURGOIS (France) proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was carried unanimously.

(Signed) Rachel E. CROWDY (Secretary).

*(Signed) Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Chairman),
G. BOURGOIS (Vice-Chairman).*

ANNEX 1

STATEMENT BY Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT.

It is difficult to know the most direct way of opening this question. There was a conference held the other day in Washington, which suggested a most effective way of getting at once to the point. The question under discussion was the reduction of navies. And it was decided that the most effective way of reducing navies — was to reduce them.

The same solution could be admirably applied to the opium question. The way to rid the world of the curse of opium — is to reduce its cultivation.

This is not a new opinion. It has been propounded many times — by men eminently fitted to speak. Sir John Jordan, for instance, told us last year that opium wherever grown would always reach the consumers — and that the only way to solve the problem was to restrict production throughout the world.

Sir Francis Aglen, Inspector-General of Customs in China, says that the greatest vigilance cannot prevent the smuggling of opium and its derivatives into China and that only control of production can adequately deal with the evil.

The Governor-General of the Philippines makes the same assertion

The Government of Siam recognises that "the suppression of cultivation is the ultimate ideal."

The United States put the Opium Convention into effect in 1915 and has passed more restrictive drug laws than any other country. But while the poppy continues to be over-cultivated she is powerless to cope with the drug evil.

A resolution to this effect was made by Dr. Wellington Koo at the meeting of the Council of the League last June. It was accepted unanimously, and marked a great advance in the study of the opium question. The action of the Council met with an admirable response, I understand, in England. In America it evoked the greatest interest and the League of Nations was widely commended for its practical and courageous stand.

Its prestige suffered accordingly when at the meeting of the Assembly the position of the Council was practically reversed. It was Dr. Koo's contention that the desired object of restricting the traffic in dangerous drugs to legitimate purposes could never be attained so long as their production was very greatly in excess of medical and scientific requirements.

The Assembly proposed that the word "legitimate" be substituted for "medicinal and scientific". This would seem but a minor alteration. Legitimate, however, is a very elastic term. The grounds for altering the decision of the Council were based primarily on assertions made by the Indian delegate as to the actual need of the Indian population for opium — as a prophylactic or an effective remedy.

This point has a very direct bearing upon the whole question of opium cultivation. Although countless authorities have testified as to the injurious effects of opium whether smoked or eaten, it seems to have made little impression upon the lay mind of India.

Nevertheless, it is extraordinary that the Assembly should have reversed the opinion of the Council — not on the authoritative verdict of the medical world — but on the statement of an individual who but voiced the popular and unscientific opinion so long current in India. I am very reluctant to introduce matter of a controversial nature into this discussion — but it is obviously unwise to let the decision of the Assembly pass without comment; for a statement which remains uncontradicted soon crystallises into an established fact.

A scientific enquiry should long ago have been made to satisfy the minds of those still in doubt as to the legitimate value of opium — and to put an end to the controversy which is still being waged. Such a suggestion was propounded at the International Opium Commission held in Shanghai. But it was there recognised that in spite of the fact that there was no international report on the scientific aspects of the uses of opium and like drugs, that the excess use of these drugs is morally, economically and otherwise unsound.

Nevertheless, the report of the Royal Commission of 1895, which was widely repudiated by the highest medical opinion, is still quoted as an authority, in face as well of Lord Morley's statement that he did not wish to speak in disparagement of the Commission; but somehow or other its findings had failed to satisfy public opinion in Great Britain and to ease the conscience of those who had taken up the matter. What was the value of medical views as to whether opium was a good thing or not when we had the evidence of natives who knew opium at close quarters?

Further, we know that in the British pharmacopœia opium is classed as a poison, and that the laws of England are regulated in such a way as to place it out of reach of the majority of the people. In 1892 there was a public declaration of opinion by 5,000 medical men in Great Britain that:—

1. The habit of opium smoking or of opium eating is morally and physically debasing.
2. That opium ought in India, as in England, to be classed and sold as a poison.

Also we know that in Europe and America, wherever modern Pharmacy Laws are in existence, the employment of opium for other than medicinal uses has been strictly condemned. How therefore can it be left with impunity in the hands of the natives of India?

In view of these facts it is impossible to see how this Committee can proceed intelligently or do any lasting or constructive work on the premises laid down by the Assembly.

Since our last meeting I have procured further opinions as to the efficacy of opium in the treatment of malaria and the minor ills of India. Beginning with Sir Patrick Manson, I have obtained the views of many of the best-known medical authorities both in England and America. I will not take time to read these views — but I should be glad to have them inserted in the Minutes.

I am trying to be as brief as possible for there are many other points on the Agenda to be considered — the study of which will undoubtedly help us in arriving at some just solution of this question, which can be reached without unnecessarily upsetting the economic equilibrium of the Far East. It is obvious that India alone cannot be expected to cripple her revenue — while others fatten on her renunciation. Therefore it is essential for us to consider what means can best be used to induce the other great opium-producing countries to conform to their international obligations and to the decent opinion of the civilised world.

But primarily we cannot get away from the fact that we are not dealing alone with an economic question — but with a moral question which affects the welfare of millions of human beings of every race and colour.

I will quote very rapidly the following opinions, which should be inserted in the Minutes.

It seems superfluous to quote these opinions — but again it is unfair to allow the opinion expressed in the Assembly to remain unchallenged — for a statement which is allowed to remain unrefuted is very likely eventually to become crystallised and accepted as a fact.

Its use for malaria was refuted on the floor in the Conference at The Hague by Sir William Collins and Dr. Wu Lien Ten.

Professor Henry G. Barbour, of the Department of Pharmacology McGill University, Montreal, stated, to my letter as to the statement that opium is a necessity in the East: "I cannot agree that opium is a necessity to life in any case outside its proper medical use and I am quite certain that its continued use is harmful to the body." The question of the treatment of malaria has nothing to do with the use of opium by the laity. Of course opium has no specific effect in this disease."

Dr. Richard Cabot, Harvard Medical School, says: "Of course opium does not cure or tend to cure malaria. It is safe to say that it never did any human-being good, save in its pain-crushing effects."

Dr. Capps, of the University of Chicago, states:—

"I believe that there are no constitutional conditions aside from excruciating pain which justify the continued use of opiates. I absolutely disagree with the person who claims that the use of opium is justified in cases of chronic malaria. The continued use of the drug not only undermines the resistance of the individual to infections of all kinds, but, more important still, undermines the moral tone of the individual."

Dr. C. W. Greene, Department of Physiology, University of Missouri:—

"I am responsible for the courses on drugs given in the School of Medicine of the University of Missouri and have just inaugurated a course on the physiological action of drugs before our second year medical students.

"I do not subscribe to the quotation 'that there is no race on earth which does not use some stimulant, and it seems that opium is particularly adapted to the Eastern temperament and does less harm than any other, certainly less than alcohol.' In short, I cannot see that the abuse of drugs by peoples is any argument in favour of the process. Following up your quotation, I should deny the statement that implies that opium is a specific for malaria. Opium and its alkaloids I regard as the greatest alleviators we have, — but it does not follow that the use of these alkaloids should be made the basis of anticipating pain"

Dr. Greene continued:—

"It seems too bad that the intense pressure of commercialism should be used to force a valuable drug or group of drugs into a line of use that is absolutely ruinous to the best interests of the individual and of the race."

Dr. C. C. Bass, Laboratory of Clinical Medicine, University of La:—

"With regard to the use of opium in the treatment of malaria, I feel that my extensive studies and researches and wide experience with malaria enable me to speak with authority on this parti-

cular subject. Opium has no beneficial effect in malaria and is not required under any circumstances. Quinine is a perfect specific for malaria. There are no cases which it will not cure when properly employed. Opium on the other hand is not a remedy for malaria. It has no specific action in the disease and would not act as a curative agent."

ANNEX 2

REPORTS ON POPPY CULTIVATION IN THE FUKIEN PROVINCE.

Telegraphic Report of the Governor of Fukien to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 30th, 1921.

Investigation has been thoroughly made throughout the Province by the Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung, accompanied by Mr. Chen Pei-Kun, the Taoyin of Amoy, and Mr. Yu Shao-Ying, the Director of the Bureau for Suppression of Opium. They are satisfied with the general abolition of poppy plantation, although in the lower part of the Province some had been cultivated, but it was already destroyed by force.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung to the Ministry of the Interior
Peking, November 25th, 1921.

I have travelled throughout the districts of Chin-Kiang, Nan-An, Yung, Chiun, An-Chi, Hua-An, Sen-Yiu and Pu-Tien. We did not find any cultivation of the poppy in these districts except in Hua-An and Sen-Yiu, where the poppy plantation was carried on under the influence of the bandits. Happily Governor Lee sent his troops to the spot and destroyed all the poppy there. When my party arrived there we hardly found any poppy left in the fields.

On arrival at Pu-Tien, we were informed by the gentry that no poppy had ever been cultivated in the district, and we were convinced by the confirmation which was given to us by the American and British missionaries, who had privately investigated throughout the district and its neighbourhood. This message was also confirmed by the Foochow Branch of the International Anti-Opium Association.

Tung-An District. — Tung-An was well known as a place of poppy plantation, but the poppy was destroyed by the order of the magistrate, who was instructed by the Governor to destroy as soon as cultivation was discovered, and the Commission found nothing when we travelled from the chief town to the large villages such as Ma-Shieng and Quan-Kow.

Sze-Ming and Chin-Mun Districts. — There has been no cultivation of poppy in these two districts on account of their insular and hilly character, which is unsuitable for such plantation.

The Commission has gone through twelve districts within the County (or Tao) of Amoy for over six weeks and we are so far satisfied with the conditions on the spot.

Telegraphic Report of the Governor of Fukien to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
January 17th, 1922.

Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung, accompanied by Mr. Wang Sou-Chun, the Taoyin of Chang-Chow and Ting-Chow, made personal investigation into the following districts:—

Lung-Chi. — The farmers in this district are largely growers of sugar cane. They ceased to grow opium poppy some years ago. The Commission was welcomed upon arriving there, particularly by the students, who are all anti-opium elements.

Nan-Ching. — Upon arrival at this district the Commission was enthusiastically welcomed, particularly by the students, who are all anti-opium elements. Travelling throughout the district, not a single poppy plant could be seen.

Chang-Pu. — Opium poppy does not grow in this mountainous territory, and this has been testified to by the foreign missionary located in the district.

Chang-Tai and Ping-Hu. — In several places in these two districts the poppy was cultivated, but it was destroyed immediately upon discovery. The Commissioner when he arrived there found nothing in the fields but rice.

Moreover, according to an additional report by the Taoyin of Chang-Chow, poppy plantation has been cleared out throughout the country with the exception of Yuin-Shiao, where order is not well maintained at present. (Special report on this district is to be furnished separately.)

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, February 12th, 1922.

Yuin-Shiao. — The poppy cultivation was very extensive nearly everywhere in the district, because it was out of the control of the authorities, so that the prohibition was not enforced. When the Governor sent troops to endeavour to destroy the poppy the mobs came out against them. It took time to conquer them, but they were finally convinced and gave way to the troops and the poppy was destroyed. The Governor intended to punish these stubborn natives, but they were leniently disposed of on the guarantee provided by the Chamber of Commerce, the Agricultural Association and the Educational Association of Lung-Chi.

Telegraphic Report of Governor Lee to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, January 14th, 1922.

Ting-Chow. — All districts under this county have been investigated throughout by the Special Commissioner, accompanied by Mr. Wang Sou-Chun the Taoyin. The cultivation of the poppy has been completely done away with.

Extract from a Despatch of the Governor of Fukien to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, February 15th, 1922.

Foo-An, Sah-Pu, Foo-Ting, Ning-Teh and Sou-Ning. — No poppy cultivation was found in these districts, which was verified by the Foochow branch of the International Anti-Opium Association. A letter from the said Association addressed to the Director of the Suppression of Opium Bureau, read as follows:—

"The Vice-President of this Association received a report from his friend who was the Secretary of the Missionary Association in Shanghai, saying that he made a trip to Amoy, Chin-Kiang, Hua-An, Sing-Hua and back to Foochow. He found no opium poppy cultivated in the places where he travelled. Another report was sent in by an American missionary, saying that he was travelling from Yung-Chuen to Sing-Hua. He could hardly find a single plant of poppy this year. He was surprised, because he found 94 places in the district in the previous year where opium poppy was cultivated. He made this journey at the beginning of the winter, when the season was over, so that he was sure that there would be no cultivation in that year. This was the result of the strict enforcement of the suppression of opium-growing by the provincial authorities."

Telegraphic Report of the Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, November 11th, 1922.

Upon my arrival in the southern part of the Fukien Province, I was welcomed by the representatives of the gentry and the educational and commercial bodies. I was escorted to the Chamber of Commerce, where I made a speech on opium suppression, and the audience was cheerfully convinced and promised their co-operation to the end.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, October 25th, 1921.

Upon my arrival in Foochow, I was informed that in the lower part of the Province there was some poppy cultivation. I therefore secretly detailed reliable parties to make investigation. I divided the Province into four "Taos" and to each Tao I detailed two officials to investigate. Simultaneously I have asked the Governor to notify the magistrates of all the districts to destroy all poppy where found. If it were not destroyed before the arrival of the investigators, the magistrate of that district would be held responsible and be subject to dismissal. Mr. Yu Shao-Ying, the Director of the Chief Bureau of Opium Suppression, was also instructed to make investigations personally in different parts of the Province. In this way it could be assured that the poppy cultivation in the Province would be cleared out.

ANNEX 2 a

REPORTS ON POPPY CULTIVATION IN OTHER PROVINCES OF CHINA.

Kansu Province.

Despatch of Special Commissioner Pan Ling-Kou to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 5th, 1921.

In order to obtain assistance in investigating the poppy cultivation in the Province, the Commission has appointed a foreign missionary, the Rev. Yensouchien (?) as honorary adviser, and with his co-operation it can be assured that the investigation will be carried out satisfactorily.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Pan Ling-Kou to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 25th, 1921.

Ning-Sha, Shi-Ning, Kau-Liang and An-Su. — The prohibition of the cultivation of poppy in these four Taos was strict; therefore the Commission has found no plantations.

Wei-Chieun and Ching-Yuen. — There was poppy cultivation within the jurisdiction of these two Taos which was reported in the summer, but the Commission found nothing upon its arrival.

Loan-Shan. — A few districts in this Tao were reported as containing poppy plantations, but the owners, upon hearing of the coming of the Commission, were afraid of punishment and destroyed the plants themselves.

Shensi Province.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Sung Len-Kwoi to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 20th, 1921.

It was reported that in the northern part of Chang-An the people secretly cultivated poppy, but the magistrate of this district was instructed to destroy the plants, which was well done.

Investigation is going on in other districts. The Commission so far has not discovered any poppy cultivation. It will make further reports later on.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Sung Len-Kwoi to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 25th, 1921.

Han-Yang, Sing-Kou, Mei-Shien, Pao-Gi, Shian-Shien, Chou-Yi, Hua-Yin, Huo-Shien, Tah-Li. — Reliable reports have been received from the investigators, who have travelled throughout the above districts, verifying that no poppy plantations have been discovered, statements being furnished by the local military authorities as a guarantee of non-cultivation of the poppy in the districts.

Telegraphic Report of Special Commissioner Sung Len-Kwoi to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
December 28th, 1921.

Wei-Nan, Tung-Kuan, Lok-Nan, Shian-Nan. — Investigations have been made carefully in these districts and the Commission has found no poppy plantation there.

Yen-Len, Fun-Shien, Shan-Yang. — There was poppy cultivation in these districts, but the plants have been destroyed by the local authorities.

Den-Wu. — Report has been received that there are poppy plantations in several places in this district. The Commission has requested the local military and civil authorities to order destruction.

Hupei Province.

Despatch of the Civil Governor of Hupei to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking, October 31st, 1921.

The south-west of the Province has just been recovered from the invasion of the Southern troops. As soon as order has been restored in these localities prohibition of poppy cultivation will be enforced. Poppy plants have been destroyed in many places.

Shansi Province.

Despatch of the Governor of Shansi to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

Poppy cultivation has been strictly prohibited in the Province. Some smuggled opium from the neighbouring Province has been seized by the local authorities and destroyed.

Anhui Province.

Despatch of the Governor of Anhui to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

The northern part of the Province was known as an opium-poppy-growing district before the prohibition law was enforced. But since the Republic was established prohibition of cultivation has been observed. This was testified to by the Joint Anglo-Chinese Commission which made a thorough investigation of the Province in 1917.

In some distant districts it was reported that poppy cultivation was discovered, but the plants were destroyed. This was testified to by an American missionary in his letter saying that he was satisfied with the destruction of the poppy plants by the local authorities.

Kilin Province.

Despatch of the Governor of Kilin to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

Some districts in the Province are reported as containing poppy cultivation, but most of it was destroyed upon discovery. A law of prohibition of poppy cultivation containing fifteen articles has been proclaimed and enforced.

Heilung-Kiang Province.

Despatch of the Governor of Heilung-Kiang to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

Prohibition of poppy cultivation has been strictly enforced in the Province, except in some places, such as the inner mountains of Sing-An, which is out of civil control on account of its remote situation and its proximity to the Russian frontier. However, the provincial authorities will use their best efforts to enforce the prohibition law.

Suiyien.

Despatch of Special Commissioner Wu Pun-Chih to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking,
January 14th, 1922.

Investigation has been made thoroughly by the Commission throughout all the districts. Poppy cultivation was discovered in some places, but the plants were destroyed. The local authorities have made a great effort to enforce the prohibition law; therefore the investigators are satisfied with the result, that the whole of the poppy plantation has been cleared out of the different districts.

Hsinchiang Province.

Despatch of the Governor of Hsinchiang to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

Prohibition of poppy cultivation has been strictly enforced in the Province. This has been testified to by the British Vice-Consul at Kasah; last April he made a trip from Kasah through the districts of Kan-Ke-Su, Bai-Chung, Fu-Ju and Yen-Chi, and also from Kau-Ke-Su and Ping-Tah-Pan as far as Yi-Li. He did not find any poppy cultivation on the journey of several thousand li, which took him over a hundred days. April is the poppy season when the flowers can easily be seen. Certainly the eyes of the British Vice-Consul could not have been deceived if any poppy plantation had been in existence.

In some places opium was discovered, confiscated by the police authorities and burnt publicly.

Sze-Chaun Province.

Despatch from the Defence Commissioner of the Frontier of Sze-Chaun
to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

More than twenty districts in this part of the Province, which are occupied by the native tribes, never cultivated poppy because the tribes have never had the habit of opium smoking. In some other places poppy plants were discovered but destroyed by the military authorities. Many cases of opium smuggling were discovered and the opium was confiscated and publicly burnt.

Jehol.

Despatch of the Military Commander of Jehol to the Ministry of the Interior, Peking.

A special law has been made to prohibit the cultivation of the poppy. It can be assured that this law will be enforced to the fullest extent by the local authorities.

Extract from Despatch of the Special Commissioner, Yao Chi-Yuen, to the Ministry of the Interior,
Peking, January 10th, 1922.

The cultivation of opium poppy here has been strictly prohibited since 1915. Investigation was made in 1916, 1917, 1918, and no poppy plants were discovered.

Some remote districts, such as Ping-Cheun, Wei-Chung, Cze-Fung, Lung-Hua, Ling-Yuen, Kien-Ping, Fung-Chi, Ning-Liun, Ping-Fu, Heinching-Chia, were reported as having poppy plantations, but the local authorities have been instructed to destroy them. Guarantees have been furnished by all the magistrates of the Mongolian Princes that cultivation of the poppy is strictly prohibited for the present year and for ever.

ANNEX 3

FORM OF ANNUAL REPORT BY GOVERNMENTS

As approved by the Advisory Committee on Opium (April 26th, 1922.)

To be forwarded to the Secretariat each year not later than July 1st (in the case of Western States) and October 1st (in the case of Far-Eastern States).

*Report by the Government of for the Calendar Year on the Traffic in Opium
and Dangerous Drugs.*

A. — GENERAL.

(I)

Please mention any new legislation and important regulations and orders affecting the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs that have been issued during the year and any important changes in the administrative arrangements.

Please state particulars of any publication issued likely to be of interest to the Opium Advisory Committee.

(2) *Regulations of Imports and Exports.*

Please give a full account of the working of the "Import Certificates" system, mentioning any difficulties which have arisen in carrying it out in regard both to:

- (a) export of the drugs from the country;
- (b) import of the drugs into the country.

What is the practice with regard to countries which have not yet adopted the system?

(3) *Internal Regulation of the Manufacture, Sale, Distribution, Use, etc., of the Drugs.*

Please give particulars regarding any new points of interest or importance relating to the administration of the laws in force, and especially as to the prevalence of the drug habit; difficulties in the application of the laws to particular cases; difficulties in the enforcement of the laws, and particulars available of the illicit traffic carried on and the channels by, and the sources from which, this traffic is fed.

Please give such information as is possible regarding prosecutions and penalties imposed.

B. — PARTICULAR DRUGS.

(4) *Raw Opium.*

(a) If country is a producing country, please state acreage under cultivation, amount produced and average morphine content.

(b) *Imports.*

Please state names of ports approved during the year and amount of each kind of opium (*i.e.* European, Turkish, Persian, Indian, other) imported.

(c) Please state amount of each kind used in manufacture of:

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Medicinal opium,
- (3) Other medicinal preparations.

(d) *Other uses.*

Please state particulars of nature of use, amount used, etc.

(e) *Exports.*

Please state names of ports approved during the year and amount of each kind exported and to what destinations.

(5) *Prepared Opium.*

(a) *Countries where import, manufacture and use of prepared opium is prohibited.*

Please state whether it has been found possible to suppress opium smoking:

- (1) among national population;
- (2) among alien population.

If not, what nationalities are addicted, what is the nature of the difficulties which have been experienced in suppressing the practice; and to what extent is opium illicitly introduced? What action has been taken to enforce the law?

Please state number of prosecutions, etc.

Is the co-operation of any country necessary to effect the complete suppression, and if so, on what lines, and in what directions?

(b) *Countries where use of prepared opium is not entirely prohibited.*

Please state whether any change has been made in the system during the year, and what further steps, if any, have been taken towards suppression.

Please state, if possible, total amount of prepared opium consumed, price at which retailed, and particulars, if not already given, of the working of the system of control.

Where smokers are required to be licensed or registered, please state number of licensed or registered smokers.

State number of Chinese resident in the country, and, if smoking is prevalent among persons of any other nationality, the number of residents of that nationality as well. State also revenue if any, derived from the sale of prepared opium and what proportion it bears to the total revenue of the country.

(6) *Morphine.*

(a) *Imports.*

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Salts of morphine,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing morphine, imported from each country of supply. (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

(b) *Manufacture.*

Please give names of owners and situation of factories; state amount of each kind of opium used; percentage (if known) of morphine in the opium; and amount of morphine or salts of morphine manufactured.

N. B. Include morphine subsequently converted into heroin, codeine or other substances, stating amount so converted.

(c) *Exports.*

Please state amount of:

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Salts of morphine,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing morphine, exported to each country of destination. (In the case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

Draw attention to any increases or decreases in amounts exported to any country as compared with the preceding year.

(d) If possible please give statistics of home consumption of morphine for:

- (1) Medicinal,
- (2) Scientific purposes.

(e) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

(7) *Heroin.*

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine (except as regards amount of raw opium used).

(8) *Medicinal Opium.*

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine.

(9) *Cocaine.*

(a) If the coca plant is grown, please state particulars of acreage planted; situation and names of owners of plantations; exports of:

- (1) crude cocaine,
- (2) refined cocaine or its salts

to each country of destination; prices of crude and refined cocaine and amount of crude cocaine and refined cocaine in stock at the end and the beginning of year.

(b) Amount imported of:

- (1) crude cocaine,
- (2) refined cocaine or its salts,
- (3) preparations, etc., containing cocaine (in case of preparations, etc. please state quantities in terms of weight of drug contained).

(c) Please give names of owners, and situation of factories in which cocaine is extracted from the leaves or refined from crude cocaine; and output of each firm, for the year.

(d) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

(10) *Other Drugs to which the Convention is held to apply.*

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine.

C. — MISCELLANEOUS.

(11) *China.*

Please supply any information not hitherto submitted as to execution of Treaty provisions

(12) *International Action.*

Please give references to any treaties or international arrangements made regarding opium or narcotic drugs during the year.....

(13) *Other Drugs.*

Please state any facts of importance with regard to the use of drugs not mentioned in the foregoing questions and any action taken during the year.... in connection therewith.

(14) *Additional Information and Suggestions.*

.....
.....
.....
.....

In replying to questions (4) to (10), it is requested that information may be given as far as possible in the form of statistical tables. It should be stated whether or not goods in transit are included in the returns given of imports and exports.

N.B. — Countries are asked to supply corresponding information in respect of their Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, Leased Territories, Mandated Territories, etc.



ANNEX 4



Letter from the League of Red Cross Societies.

April 6th, 1922.

Sir,

In your letter regarding the abuse of opium, you asked me to submit information as to the part which the League of Red Cross Societies might play in the League of Nations' proposed campaign against that evil. As you will readily understand, the League of Red Cross Societies has no

funds available for direct use in such a campaign; nor do we possess at present on our staff any expert specially equipped for advising us as to the disorders arising out of the abuse of opium. These limitations apart, however, I have pleasure in offering the following observations and suggestions in regard to what I feel we could do to co-operate with you.

1. We have taken the opportunity of the recent meeting of the General Council of the League to consult Colonel H. Ross, of the Indian Medical Service and Secretary of the Indian Red Cross, concerning your project, and it is in conformity with what are understood to be his views that the following proposals are made:

(a) The League of Red Cross Societies should address all those national Red Cross Societies which are especially interested either in the production, use or abuse of opium, and invite their sympathy and aid in, and invoke their advice as to the best means of organising, a campaign of co-operation with government measures to combat the abuse of opium.

(b) As will be apparent from the Resolutions which were passed at the recent General Council meeting, the method upon which the League would rely, and which it would suggest to member societies, would be popular health instruction. As applied to opium, this would mean a campaign of education of the public designed to enlighten them as to the evil results ensuing from the abuse of opium.

(c) In the letter to national Red Cross Societies, I propose to ask for full information as to the legal situation in their countries in regard to the possession, use, sale, etc. of opium, and for suggestions as to the means which they consider that the Red Cross and other voluntary agencies should employ for coming to the aid of the governmental authorities in restraint of the abuse of the drug.

3. As you are aware from Resolution No. 9 passed at the recent General Council meeting of the League of Red Cross Societies, I have been desired to organise an Oriental Red Cross Conference to be held at Bangkok in November, 1922. This decision seems to me to be one which offers a unique opportunity for the adoption of measures concerted between voluntary agencies and Governments in respect of the use of opium, and I suggest that this opportunity should be taken by the League of Nations to obtain the fullest possible information from Governments, so that the Conference to be convened at Bangkok may be in possession of data upon which to form opinions and recommendations of value.

4. I therefore venture to propose, for the consideration of the League of Nations, that, with the concurrence of the Governments Members of the League of Nations concerned, the League of Nations should, at a very early date, depute a qualified representative to proceed to those countries specially concerned, such for instance as China, Japan, the Straits Settlements, India and perhaps Persia, for the purpose of investigating the situation as it stands, with instructions, after collection of such information, to proceed as the representative of the League of Nations to Bangkok in order that the accumulated information may be laid before the Oriental Red Cross Conference. In order that the League of Nations may be able to judge of the value of this suggestion, I shall at the earliest possible moment transmit for your information a copy of a memorandum now under preparation, relating to the subjects for discussion at Bangkok which is about to be despatched to the American, Australian, British, Chinese, French, Indian, Japanese, Netherlands, New Zealand and Siamese Red Cross Societies. A copy of the itinerary of the League delegation and of the agenda of the Conference will be sent to you at the same time. Partly as a result of your reference, I have placed the subject of the opium traffic in a very prominent position on that agenda, and, provided that action such as is herein suggested can be taken by the Health Section of the League of Nations, I feel confident that very valuable suggestions may emerge from the deliberations of the Conference and that these might lead to a co-ordinated plan of co-operative action on the part both of the Governments and of the Red Cross Societies interested.

I regret that two or three days must elapse before the memorandum referred to in the preceding paragraph can reach you, but, in the meantime, I shall hope to have an opportunity of discussing the matter personally, with your approval, with Dr. Rajchman.

I am, Sir, etc.

(Signed) CLAUDE H. HILL,
Director-General.

ANNEX 5

Letter from the Chinese Representative to the Secretary of the Advisory Committee.

April 24th, 1922.

Dear Dame Rachel,

Referring to the draft resolution introduced by the Chairman at the morning session on April 24th, 1922, additional to my proposal adopted by the Committee at its afternoon session of last Saturday, I wish you would be good enough to circulate this letter for the consideration of the members of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium.

First of all I have to say that this resolution was entirely out of order, as it was obviously an amendment to my proposal which had been finally passed.

I recollect that the Chairman said when he put my proposal to the vote that he did not presume it would be adopted. But it was carried by four to one. It should now stand inviolate. No one can now modify it. Even I, the proposer, am not allowed to withdraw it. The Chairman himself realised this on Saturday, for he said that if my proposal were carried, then all similar proposals. After its having been unexpectedly adopted, I congratulated myself, and at the same time I thanked the members of the Committee who sympathised with my view that a *laissez faire* policy should be pursued with regard to the China question. The adoption indicated the wish of the Committee by a majority, and the Chairman has no authority to bring forward any modification.

This amending resolution says that the Chinese Government should invite representatives of the League to accompany the commissioners in their investigations. The wording "should invite" is most unacceptable to the Chinese Government. I have told the Committee repeatedly, that the Chinese Government will never give its consent to a proposal of this character. The words therefore, "should invite" will mean, as far as the Chinese Government is concerned, "shall not invite". Supposing one has no desire to invite a friend to dinner, but the friend insists by saying "You should invite me", then the host will express his intention explicitly in the words "You will not be invited". What is the use of the friend pressing the matter again and again by saying "You should invite me"?

Let me declare to the Committee officially on behalf of the Chinese Government that China will never give consent to this proposal and no invitation will be extended. It is waste of time, therefore, to propose that the invitation should be given.

The second paragraph of this resolution says that "Investigations can only be effective if made during the season of the year while the poppy is in flower" and recommends that "the Chinese Government should be asked to make arrangements accordingly". Naturally investigation will be made during the poppy season, and I can assure you that this was implied in my proposal, and there is no need to introduce a new paragraph in the recommendation already adopted.

To illustrate, let me suggest that the passing of the resolution introduced by the Chairman after the final adoption of my proposal is like adding feet to the picture of a snake.

I strongly object to the additional resolution because it implies a discrimination against China, and is inconsistent with the ordinary procedure of public business.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) CHAO-HSIN CHU,
Representative of China.

[Communiqué au Conseil,
aux Membres de la Société
et aux Délégués à l'Assemblée.]

A. 15. 1922. ✓
(C. 223 (1). 1922. XI.)

GENÈVE, le 8 août 1922.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE
SUR LE TRAFIC DE L'OPIUM

RAPPORT

(approuvé par le Conseil le 21 juillet 1922)
sur les travaux de la Commission à sa deuxième
session tenue à Genève du 19 au 29 avril 1922.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM

REPORT

on the work of the Committee during its Second
Session held at Geneva from April 19th to
29th, 1922 (approved by the Council on July
21st, 1922).

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

O. C. 47/1.

RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM, PRÉSENTÉ AU CONSEIL DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS. AVRIL 1922.

La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium a tenu sa seconde session du 19 au 29 avril 1922.

Etaient présents :

Représentants des gouvernements.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Président) | Empire britannique. |
| M. BOURGOIS (remplaçant M. KAHN), (Vice-Président) | France. |
| D ^r ANSELMINO | Allemagne. |
| M. CHAO HSIN-CHU | Chine. |
| M. J. CAMPBELL | Inde. |
| Son Excellence A. ARIYOSHI | Japon. |
| M. A. de KAT ANGELINO, (remplaçant M. van WETTUM) | Pays-Bas. |
| Son Excellence M. FERREIRA | Portugal. |
| Son Excellence le prince CHAROON | Siam. |

Assesseurs.

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

Secrétaire.

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

« La Commission est chargée de donner au Conseil le bénéfice de ses avis » dans toutes les questions relatives au contrôle général, par la Société des Nations, du trafic de l'opium et autres drogues dangereuses, tâche qui lui est confiée par l'article 23 du Pacte de la Société (résolution adoptée par l'Assemblée le 15 décembre 1920).

La même résolution confie également à la Commission le soin « de présenter au Conseil, afin qu'il le soumette à l'Assemblée », au cours de sa session annuelle, « un rapport sur tous les sujets relatifs à l'exécution des accords concernant le trafic de l'opium et autres drogues dangereuses ».

Pendant sa première session, en mai 1921, la Commission a rédigé un questionnaire à envoyer à tous les gouvernements pour recueillir tous les renseignements qui lui permettraient de présenter au Conseil un rapport complet sur l'état actuel du trafic et les mesures prises pour contrôler la production, la distribution et l'usage des drogues. Ce questionnaire a été envoyé en juin, et le Secrétariat espérait recevoir les réponses avant la fin de l'année. Malheureusement, plusieurs des réponses ne sont parvenues que peu avant la dernière session de la Commission, et quelques-unes ne sont arrivées qu'au cours même de la session. De plus, un certain nombre des rapports étaient rédigés dans la langue du pays intéressé, et non dans l'une ou l'autre des langues officielles. Pour ces deux raisons, le Secrétaire n'a pas pu analyser et examiner comme il convenait dans le peu de temps dont il

disposait, la grande quantité de renseignements intéressants qu'il a reçus, et la Commission a éprouvé une réelle difficulté à essayer de se faire une idée générale de la situation actuelle.

Il est résulté une plus grande difficulté encore du fait que les gouvernements n'ont pu, en plusieurs cas, fournir de statistiques relatives à la fabrication, l'importation, l'exportation et la distribution des drogues, étant donné que la Convention n'est entrée en vigueur qu'en 1920-21 et qu'il n'avait été pris auparavant aucune mesure pour rassembler lesdites informations statistiques.

En outre, un certain nombre de Membres de la Société n'ont pas répondu au questionnaire¹. Parmi eux on peut citer l'Etat serbe-croate-slovène et la Perse, qui produisent l'opium en quantité considérable, et les Etats-Unis d'Amérique qui sont l'un des pays importateurs et fabricants d'opium les plus importants.

Il n'est donc pas possible de donner actuellement un aperçu général sur le trafic de l'opium et autres drogues dangereuses.

Conformément à la recommandation de la Commission approuvée par l'Assemblée, tous les Etats parties à la Convention, sont priés d'envoyer un rapport annuel à la Société sur l'application, dans leur territoire, de la Convention de l'opium, sur les statistiques de production, de fabrication et de commerce. La Commission espère que les rapports de 1921 et surtout ceux de 1922 fourniront des renseignements beaucoup plus complets que ceux fournis jusqu'ici. Pour indiquer aux gouvernements la nature des renseignements désirés, et afin de recevoir des renseignements, autant que possible uniformes, qui faciliteront son travail, la Commission, au cours de sa présente session, est tombée d'accord sur une forme de rapport qu'elle recommande aux gouvernements d'adopter². (Annexe 1.)

Il a déjà été dit que le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique n'avait pas envoyé de renseignements ; tout en n'étant pas Membre de la Société, les Etats-Unis ont cependant accepté, comme les autres Puissances signataires, conformément à l'article 21 de la Convention de l'opium, de communiquer, par l'intermédiaire du Ministère des Affaires étrangères des Pays-Bas :

« a) le texte des lois et des règlements administratifs existants, concernant les matières visées par la présente Convention, ou édictés en vertu de ces clauses ;

» b) des renseignements statistiques, en ce qui concerne le commerce de l'opium brut, de l'opium préparé, de la morphine, de la cocaïne et de leurs sels respectifs, ainsi que des autres drogues ou leurs sels, ou préparations, visés par la présente Convention. »

Les renseignements statistiques qui, autant que la Commission le sache, n'ont pas encore été fournis, seraient de la plus haute importance ; la Commission recommande donc que le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas soit invité à les demander au Gouvernement des Etats-Unis. Elle tient à exprimer l'espoir qu'il sera possible de trouver sous peu le moyen de s'assurer la coopération des Etats-Unis pour la mise en application des dispositions de la Convention de l'opium de 1912, à l'élaboration de laquelle les Etats-Unis ont pris une si large part. La Commission ne saurait insister trop fortement sur le fait que seule la coopération internationale la plus complète permettra d'exercer un contrôle effectif sur un trafic dont les ramifications s'étendent dans le monde entier.

Conformément à la recommandation adoptée par l'Assemblée en septembre dernier, les Gouvernements de l'Allemagne et de l'Etat serbe-croate-slovène ont été invités à désigner des délégués pour siéger à la Commission. Le Gouvernement allemand a nommé le D^r Anselmino, du Service d'hygiène allemand ; la Commission tient à exprimer toute son appréciation du concours que lui a

¹ Les réponses des Etats suivants ne sont pas encore parvenues au Secrétariat :

Membres de la Société Parties à la Convention :

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Bolivie | 5. Libéria | 8. Etat serbe-croate-slovène |
| 2. Brésil | 6. Nicaragua | 9. Suède |
| 3. Cuba | 7. Pérou | 10. Uruguay |
| 4. Honduras | | |

Membres de la Société non Parties à la Convention :

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| 11. Argentine | 14. Costa-Rica | 17. Perse |
| 12. Chili | 15. Finlande | 18. Salvador |
| 13. Colombie | 16. Paraguay | |

² N. B. Les rapports devront parvenir au Secrétariat le 1^{er} juillet au plus tard (s'il s'agit des Etats d'Occident) et le 1^{er} octobre au plus tard (s'il s'agit des Etats de l'Extrême-Orient). Le travail de la Commission consultative sera considérablement facilité si ces dates sont observées et si les rapports sont envoyés dans l'une ou l'autre des langues officielles, le français ou l'anglais, en quinze exemplaires.

apporté le D^r Anselmino. Elle regrette que le Gouvernement serbe-croate-slovène n'ait point répondu à l'invitation adressée par le Conseil.

La Commission se borne, dans le présent rapport, à mentionner les questions principales qui ont fait l'objet de son examen.

SITUATION ACTUELLE AU POINT DE VUE DE LA RATIFICATION DE LA CONVENTION INTERNATIONALE DE L'OPIUM.

A l'époque de la deuxième session de l'Assemblée, en septembre dernier, les Membres suivants de la Société n'avaient encore ni ratifié la Convention de l'opium, ni signé le quatrième Protocole mettant ladite Convention en vigueur :

Albanie, Argentine, Chili, Colombie, Costa-Rica, Esthonie, Finlande, Lettonie, Lithuanie, Paraguay, Perse, Salvador, Suisse.

Le Danemark et le Venezuela, quoique ayant ratifié la Convention, n'avaient pas encore signé le quatrième protocole. Depuis lors, le Chili, la Colombie, le Danemark, la Finlande et la Lithuanie ont soit mis la Convention en vigueur, soit annoncé leur intention de le faire.

Il importe que tous les autres Membres de la Société qui n'ont pas encore pris les mesures nécessaires pour mettre la Convention en vigueur le fassent sans délai. En effet, tout pays restant en dehors de la Convention, peut devenir le centre d'un trafic illicite. La Commission insiste tout particulièrement sur l'importance que présente l'adhésion la plus prompte possible à la Convention de la Suisse et de la Perse. Des difficultés constitutionnelles ont jusqu'ici empêché la Suisse d'appliquer la Convention, la réglementation du trafic des stupéfiants étant de la compétence des cantons et non du Gouvernement fédéral ; mais la question fait l'objet de l'examen du Gouvernement¹. La Commission, d'après les renseignements qui lui ont été fournis, a constaté que la Suisse exporte une quantité considérable de stupéfiants. La Perse a signé la Convention de 1912, mais avec une réserve au sujet de l'article 3 a) qui porte que les Puissances contractantes « prendront des mesures pour empêcher l'exportation de l'opium brut vers les pays qui en auront prohibé l'entrée », et jusqu'à présent, elle n'a pas ratifié la Convention. La Perse est Membre de la Société des Nations où son délégué à l'Assemblée a participé en septembre dernier aux travaux de la Commission chargée d'étudier la question de l'opium, et il a adhéré à ses recommandations. Il se fait un commerce important d'exportation d'opium persan et la Commission demande au Conseil d'insister auprès du Gouvernement de la Perse pour qu'il ratifie le plus tôt possible la Convention, dans son intégralité, et qu'il en mette les dispositions en vigueur.

Parmi les Etats qui ne font pas partie de la Société des Nations et qui n'ont pas encore mis la Convention en application, il convient de citer en premier lieu la Turquie, comme étant le pays le plus important au point de vue du trafic de l'opium. La ratification de la Convention fait partie des clauses du Traité de Sévres, et la Commission désire appeler l'attention du Conseil sur l'importance que présente l'insertion d'une disposition analogue dans tout traité nouveau qui viendrait à être conclu.

D'une façon générale, la Commission demande instamment au Conseil d'insister pour que tous les Etats qui n'ont pas encore appliqué la Convention, l'appliquent au plus tôt. Quant à ceux qui ne sont pas encore Membres de la Société, il y aurait lieu d'avoir recours, pour les mêmes fins, aux bons offices du Gouvernement néerlandais.

Un tableau indiquant la situation des différents Etats au point de vue de la ratification de la Convention, est joint en annexe au présent rapport. (Annexe 2.)

SYSTEME DES CERTIFICATS D'IMPORTATION.

Cette question est étroitement liée à celle qui précède. On se rappelle que le système des certificats d'importation a été recommandé l'année dernière par la Commission consultative et approuvé unanimement par l'Assemblée. La

¹ La Commission suggère que si la ratification de la Convention par la Suisse doit encore être retardée, le Gouvernement helvétique devrait être invité à appliquer le système de certificats d'importation sans attendre la ratification.

Commission a constaté avec regret qu'il n'avait été fait jusqu'ici que bien peu de progrès dans la voie de l'adoption de ce système.

Le système a été recommandé comme le moyen le plus efficace de permettre aux Etats de remplir les obligations qui leur incombent aux termes de la Convention, au point de vue du contrôle des importations et des exportations¹. Il est évident, toutefois, que son succès dépend de son adoption générale, car si certains Etats appliquent le système, tandis que d'autres ne le font pas, les acheteurs étrangers auront tendance à passer leurs commandes dans les Etats où ils peuvent obtenir les stupéfiants sans qu'il soit nécessaire de fournir un « certificat d'importation ». Les gouvernements des pays qui ont introduit le système ont déjà reçu des plaintes de leurs propres commerçants dont les affaires ont subi, de ce chef, un préjudice. Il semble qu'il y ait eu quelque malentendu sur le caractère du certificat que doit délivrer le gouvernement du pays importateur. D'après le système, l'importateur de stupéfiants doit être muni pour toute quantité importée, d'un certificat délivré par son gouvernement, déclarant que ledit gouvernement approuve l'importation et que les produits importés sont destinés uniquement à des besoins médicaux ou scientifiques (ou bien, dans le cas d'opium brut, à des besoins légitimes). Certains gouvernements semblent avoir compris qu'ils devaient garantir qu'il ne serait fait aucun usage illégitime des drogues importées. Il est évident qu'il est impossible de donner une garantie absolue de ce genre. Tout ce que l'on demande, c'est que le gouvernement s'assure que les quantités de stupéfiants importées ne dépassent pas les besoins légitimes du pays et que les personnes sollicitant le permis d'importation, font légalement le commerce des drogues et jouissent d'une réputation honorable.

La Commission espère que ces explications aplaniront les difficultés qui se sont présentées dans certains pays et que tous les Etats Membres de la Société pourront accepter maintenant d'appliquer le système.

Cette application serait grandement facilitée dans la pratique, s'il était possible de déterminer une date à laquelle le système serait mis partout en vigueur. La Commission suggère le 1^{er} septembre de cette année pour les pays d'Europe, l'Amérique, l'Afrique et l'Australie, et le 1^{er} janvier 1923 pour les autres pays.

La Commission a préparé également un projet de certificat d'importation (voir Annexe 4) dont elle recommande l'adoption par les différents gouvernements. Un gouvernement aurait naturellement la faculté d'adopter une forme de certificat plus efficace contenant, par exemple, une clause prohibant la réexportation.

CONTROLE DE LA PRODUCTION D'OPIUM BRUT ET DES STUPÉFIANTS.

a) *Morphine, cocaïne, héroïne et opium médicinal.*

Lors de la session de la Commission qui a eu lieu l'an dernier, la remarque fut faite qu'une des difficultés qu'éprouvent les Etats signataires de la Convention à s'acquitter de leur obligation de limiter l'usage des stupéfiants à des besoins médicaux et autres besoins légitimes (Chapitre III de la Convention) provient du manque de renseignements sur les besoins réels, légitimes, médicaux et autres, des différents pays.

Tant qu'il se fabriquera des stupéfiants en quantités supérieures aux besoins légitimes, il subsistera un danger sérieux, quelles que soient les mesures de contrôle que l'on puisse mettre en vigueur, de voir le surplus s'écouler par des voies illégitimes.

C'est pourquoi la Commission a recommandé qu'il soit procédé à une enquête, en vue de déterminer approximativement les quantités moyennes de stupéfiants nécessaires pour les besoins légitimes des différents pays, et la Commission internationale d'hygiène de la Société a été invitée par le Conseil à se charger de cette enquête.

Malheureusement, la Commission d'hygiène n'a pu, jusqu'à présent, pousser très loin ses investigations. Il est très difficile d'élaborer un plan qui permette d'obtenir des renseignements précis sur la quantité de stupéfiants utilisés pour des fins médicales légitimes dans de grands pays possédant une importante population, comme la Grande-Bretagne ou la France ; en outre, pour ces deux pays, la question se complique encore du fait qu'il existe un commerce important d'exportation des drogues et de leurs préparations. La Commission a décidé de

¹ Voir note explicative communiquée par le Secrétariat et figurant à l'annexe 3.

recueillir en premier lieu des renseignements sur le résultat des expériences faites dans un certain nombre de pays civilisés, à population relativement faible et dans lesquels, pour autant qu'on le sache, il n'existe que peu ou point d'abus de ces stupéfiants. La Belgique, la Suisse, le Danemark, la Suède, l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande furent les pays choisis. Le résultat de ces enquêtes est résumé dans le mémoire de Sir George BUCHANAN et du D^r CARRIÈRE, joint en annexe au présent rapport. (Annexe 5). On pourra constater que les résultats, tout en éclairant quelque peu la question, ne permettent cependant pas de tirer une conclusion générale. Il faut, en effet, s'attendre à constater des différences sérieuses dans les résultats des expériences faites dans les différents pays, car les théories médicales sur l'emploi des stupéfiants varient et la consommation intérieure d'un pays dépend également de la nature des maladies les plus courantes et du taux de morbidité. Par exemple, l'examen des besoins des différents Etats européens ne saurait permettre de déduire les besoins d'un pays d'Orient.

La Commission consultative espère que la Commission d'hygiène poursuivra ses enquêtes. Elle estime également qu'une étude statistique attentive portant sur une série de relevés annuels fournis par les gouvernements et indiquant leurs importations, leurs exportations, etc., facilitera sérieusement l'étude du problème : elle recommande donc que cette étude soit entreprise par le Secrétariat.

b) *Opium brut.*

L'Assemblée, dans sa session de septembre dernier, a adopté une résolution ainsi conçue :

« Qu'étant donné l'intérêt témoigné par le monde à l'attitude de la Société à l'égard de la question de l'opium et le désir universel de limiter la production de l'opium aux besoins légitimes, la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium soit invitée à étudier, au cours de sa prochaine session, la possibilité de procéder à une enquête afin de déterminer la quantité moyenne d'opium brut pour les besoins légitimes dans les différents pays. »

La Commission éprouve quelque difficulté à proposer une méthode qui permette d'obtenir à l'heure actuelle des données sérieuses. Dans les pays occidentaux, la quantité d'opium brut nécessaire aux besoins légitimes dépend principalement de la quantité d'opium médicinal et des dérivés de l'opium utilisés en médecine ; or, comme on l'a vu plus haut, il n'a pas été possible d'arriver jusqu'ici à des conclusions précises à cet égard.

Les quantités nécessaires à des besoins semi-médicinaux pour la population de certains pays d'Orient, besoins reconnus comme légitimes par la cinquième Commission de l'Assemblée en septembre dernier, pourraient être indiquées en ce qui concerne l'Inde, mais il n'existe aucun moyen de déterminer les quantités consommées de cette manière dans d'autres pays, en Perse, par exemple.

La Commission propose que, comme première étape, chaque gouvernement soit invité à fournir le chiffre des quantités d'opium qu'il estime nécessaires pour tous les besoins de la consommation intérieure du pays et celle de ses dépendances. Il est évident que dans beaucoup de cas, il ne sera possible de donner qu'un chiffre très approximatif.

En conséquence, la Commission a adopté la résolution suivante :

« La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements de tous les Etats signataires de la Convention de 1912 et les autres Etats Membres de la Société des Nations à fournir au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations un relevé des besoins totaux de leur consommation intérieure annuelle d'opium et de ses dérivés, en indiquant séparément, si possible, les quantités employées respectivement pour des usages médicaux, scientifiques et autres. Ce relevé devra établir une distinction entre les sortes d'opium utilisées et, dans le cas des dérivés de l'opium, les quantités seront indiquées d'après la teneur en morphine.

» La Commission consultative estime en outre que ce relevé devra parvenir au Secrétaire général le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard, et qu'il est de la plus haute importance que les chiffres relatifs aux quantités d'opium nécessaires à la consommation des pays d'Extrême-Orient où les Chinois sont les principaux consommateurs parviennent au Secrétariat à cette date au plus tard. »

PROCÉDURE A SUIVRE AU SUJET DES PLAINTES RELATIVES A LA NON-OBSERVATION DE LA CONVENTION.

La Commission a examiné la procédure à suivre lorsque la Société des Nations reçoit des plaintes relatives à la non-observation de la Convention ou à des abus provoqués par le trafic de l'opium et des stupéfiants. Il est probable que, dans la plupart des cas, le Conseil décidera tout d'abord de porter les motifs de la plainte à la connaissance du gouvernement intéressé et invitera ce gouvernement à présenter ses observations ainsi que des renseignements sur les mesures prises ou envisagées. Si la question n'est pas résolue de cette manière, une nouvelle enquête peut être nécessaire pour mettre la Société en possession de tous les renseignements désirables ; si cette enquête doit se faire sur les lieux (ce qui peut se produire dans certains cas) la Commission propose que cette enquête s'effectue à la suite d'un accord entre la Société et le gouvernement intéressé, en vue de procéder à la nomination d'une Commission mixte d'enquête où la Société et ce gouvernement seraient représentés.

Elle a introduit cette suggestion dans la résolution générale suivante qu'elle a adoptée et qu'elle soumet à l'examen du Conseil (les débats de la Commission montrent qu'il est désirable que le principe général de cette sorte d'enquête soit reconnu à l'avance) :

« Le Conseil de la Société devra, si la nécessité s'en présente, inviter les gouvernements des Etats parties à la Convention à faciliter sur leur territoire les enquêtes sur toute question relevant de la Convention de l'opium, auxquelles procéderont des commissions mixtes nommées en partie par le gouvernement intéressé, en partie par le Conseil de la Société des Nations. »

PROBLÈME DE L'EXTRÊME-ORIENT.

Culture du pavot en Chine.

La Commission avait examiné au cours de sa dernière session la situation nouvelle créée en Chine par la reprise de la culture du pavot. Elle avait estimé que ce fait avait une très grande importance au point de vue de l'application de la Convention. Sur la proposition de Sir John JORDAN, elle avait recommandé que les Puissances ayant des traités avec la Chine fussent invitées à donner à leurs représentants consulaires dans les provinces, sous réserve du consentement du Gouvernement central, les instructions nécessaires pour adresser des représentations énergiques aux gouverneurs provinciaux qui étaient principalement responsables de la reprise de cette culture.

Quand la question vint devant le Conseil et l'Assemblée, le représentant de la Chine déclara que le Gouvernement chinois avait décidé de nommer des commissaires spéciaux chargés d'enquêter sur la situation dans les provinces intéressées. En conséquence, le Conseil et l'Assemblée décidèrent de ne pas donner de suite pratique à la recommandation de la Commission avant que les commissaires chinois n'eussent soumis leurs rapports. Ces rapports n'ont pas encore été intégralement communiqués à la Société, mais le représentant de la Chine à la Commission consultative a présenté un sommaire de ces rapports qui est donné en annexe (Annexe 6). Selon ces rapports, il n'y a pas eu de reprise de la culture du pavot, sauf dans une proportion très minime, et dans les cas isolés où cette culture avait été reprise, elle a été immédiatement supprimée. La teneur de la réponse du Gouvernement chinois au questionnaire, reçue au début de l'année, est identique. Vers la fin de l'année dernière, le Gouvernement britannique a publié un Livre Bleu contenant la correspondance relative à la culture du pavot en Chine, correspondance qui s'étend jusqu'au 30 juin 1921. Ce Livre Bleu contient des preuves nombreuses de la reprise de la culture dans beaucoup de provinces. On trouvera également d'autres preuves dans le rapport des douanes maritimes chinoises pour l'année 1920 et les renseignements fournis par ces publications sont aussi confirmés par ceux relatifs au Izechuan et au Yunnan, que possède le Gouvernement français et que nous a communiqués le représentant de la France à la Commission. La Commission estime qu'il est impossible de concilier les rapports extrêmement favorables des commissaires chinois avec l'état de choses que révèlent les publications mentionnées.

La Commission regrette d'être obligée d'arriver à la conclusion — à laquelle se range Sir John JORDAN — qu'à l'heure actuelle on se livre en Chine à une culture considérable et étendue du pavot somnifère. Elle a donc adopté la résolution suivante :

« La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium de la Société des Nations,

» Ayant examiné les rapports communiqués par le représentant de la Chine à la Commission, relatifs aux enquêtes instituées par le Gouvernement chinois, sur la reprise de la culture de l'opium qui se serait produite dans diverses provinces ; ayant tenu compte de l'époque, des circonstances et de la situation de certaines des personnes par qui ces enquêtes ont été effectuées, ainsi que du fait que des provinces importantes ont échappé à cette enquête ; ayant comparé ces rapports avec les renseignements contenus dans le Livre Bleu publié par le Gouvernement britannique, ainsi qu'avec d'autres renseignements communiqués à la Commission ;

» Se plaît à reconnaître les efforts qui ont été faits par les autorités dans certaines provinces, en vue de la suppression de l'opium, mais regrette d'avoir à constater qu'il se produit en Chine une recrudescence considérable de la culture et de l'usage de l'opium¹.

CONTREBANDE DE MORPHINE EN EXTRÊME-ORIENT.

Cette question était l'une des plus graves que la Commission eût à examiner. Il existe toutes sortes de preuves qui montrent qu'au cours des dernières années d'énormes quantités de morphine ont été frauduleusement introduites en Chine et que l'usage de cette drogue a pris un énorme développement, surtout dans les provinces de la Chine septentrionale. Cet état de choses cause de vives inquiétudes au Gouvernement chinois et à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la prospérité de la Chine. Bien que la Commission ne possède pas de renseignements complets sur l'étendue du trafic ni sur les moyens employés, il y a des raisons de penser, en se fondant sur les procès-verbaux de saisies des douanes chinoises et sur des renseignements provenant d'autres sources, que ce genre de trafic est exercé en grande partie par des commerçants japonais. La Commission est fermement convaincue que cette question est une de celles qui réclame l'emploi des moyens les plus énergiques et les plus radicaux.

La tâche de la Commission s'est trouvée très facilitée grâce à la documentation très abondante qui lui a été fournie par le Gouvernement japonais en réponse au questionnaire de la Société, tant en ce qui concerne les quantités de morphine importées ou fabriquées au Japon, qu'à l'égard des mesures qui ont été prises depuis le début de 1921 par le Gouvernement japonais pour contrôler ce trafic ; grâce aussi à l'attitude prise par le représentant japonais à la Commission, sur l'ordre de son Gouvernement. Il convint de l'existence d'une contrebande entre le Japon et la Chine septentrionale, en ajoutant que le Gouvernement japonais n'était pas en mesure d'en préciser l'étendue, étant donné qu'avant 1921 il n'existait aucun règlement sur l'importation, l'exportation ou la production de cette drogue, et il déclara que son gouvernement avait l'intention de faire tout ce qui était en son pouvoir pour mettre fin à ce commerce illicite. Le Gouvernement japonais désirerait vivement collaborer étroitement avec les pays exportateurs pour le contrôle du trafic des stupéfiants. Le représentant du Japon déclara enfin que son Gouvernement accepterait avec plaisir l'aide que les représentants de la Société des Nations pourraient lui apporter en vue de procéder à toutes les enquêtes qui paraîtraient nécessaires.

Les chiffres fournis par le Gouvernement japonais dans sa réponse au questionnaire, montrent clairement que le Japon importe depuis plusieurs années des quantités de morphine très supérieures aux besoins légitimes normaux du pays. Le tableau suivant montre les quantités importées et fabriquées au cours des onze dernières années (en livres anglaises) :

¹ Certains passages de cette partie du rapport sont supprimés jusqu'à plus ample examen de la part de la Commission consultative.

| Années. | Importations. | Fabrication. | |
|---------|---------------|--------------|----------|
| | | Japon. | Formose. |
| 1910 | 1.387 | — | — |
| 1911 | 1.830 | — | — |
| 1912 | 2.013 | — | — |
| 1913 | 5.695 | — | — |
| 1914 | 11.295 | — | — |
| 1915 | 22.408 | 100 | 1.290 |
| 1916 | 37.131 | 600 | 6.340 |
| 1917 | 37.294 | 1.190 | 6.518 |
| 1918 | 10.229 | 2.134 | 4.450 |
| 1919 | 25.566 | 4.820 | 3.101 |
| 1920 | 48.689 | 7.833 | 8.018 |

Tout en tenant compte de l'augmentation provoquée par les besoins de la médecine pendant et après la guerre, la Commission ne saurait douter qu'une grande partie de cette morphine n'ait pris le chemin de la Chine.

La Commission prend acte de la promesse faite par le représentant du Japon, au nom de son Gouvernement, de procéder à une enquête aussi serrée que possible sur l'état actuel du trafic clandestin ; il conviendrait, pense-t-elle, de réaliser une coopération intime entre les fonctionnaires des douanes chinoises et les autorités japonaises, de façon qu'il fût possible, chaque fois que l'on saisit de la morphine venant du Japon, de remonter au point de départ et de permettre au Gouvernement japonais de prendre les mesures qui s'imposent.

La Commission désire également appeler l'attention sur le fait que les chiffres japonais pour les importations de certains pays, sont très supérieurs aux chiffres des exportations de ces pays au Japon. Il serait très désirable que les causes de ces divergences fussent tirées au clair.

USAGE DE L'OPIUM PRÉPARÉ.

La Commission a remis à sa prochaine session l'examen de la question de la suppression progressive de l'usage de l'opium préparé, conformément au Chapitre II de la Convention. En effet, les renseignements dont elle dispose sont encore incomplets. Cette question n'intéresse surtout que les régions d'Extrême-Orient où résident des groupements considérables de Chinois. Elle espère, dans l'intervalle, que son examen de cette question sera facilité par les renseignements que doivent fournir les gouvernements des pays intéressés en réponse à l'invitation qui leur a été faite d'indiquer les quantités d'opium brut dont ils auront besoin.

CONTROLE GÉNÉRAL DU TRAFIC DES DROGUES NUISIBLES.

La Commission regrette de ne pouvoir fournir à ce sujet un rapport aussi complet qu'elle l'aurait désiré. Elle reconnaît toute l'importance de cette question. Les statistiques relatives à la fabrication et à la livraison des drogues, qui ont été fournies à la Commission sont encore très incomplètes ; en particulier, plusieurs pays d'une grande importance au point de vue de la fabrication de ces drogues n'ont pas fourni de statistiques à ce sujet. La Commission n'a donc pas été en mesure de pouvoir, soit donner une évaluation approximative de la production mondiale de ces drogues, soit examiner attentivement les moyens et les voies par lesquels s'effectuent leur distribution. L'attention de la Commission a été spécialement attirée sur l'importance de la question, lors de la dernière session de l'Assemblée, par le délégué de la France, et il est notoire qu'un trafic illicite considérable s'effectue dans les pays de l'Europe occidentale, en Amérique et en Extrême-Orient, particulièrement en ce qui concerne la morphine et la cocaïne. En dépit de l'activité de la police, et des sévères sanctions infligées, ce trafic est extrêmement difficile à réprimer en raison de la facilité avec laquelle les drogues peuvent être transportés secrètement ; jusqu'à présent, il semble avoir été impossible de découvrir les moyens par lesquels s'obtiennent les drogues ou les personnes par lesquelles ce trafic est organisé. Ici également, il semble nettement établi que la méthode la plus efficace pour mettre fin à ce trafic est de contrôler la production. En ce qui concerne la cocaïne, la chose devrait être aisée. La fabrication de la cocaïne est compliquée, et seuls, les chimistes experts peuvent s'y livrer. De plus, la cocaïne est employée en proportions beaucoup moins considérables et pour des buts beaucoup plus restreints que la morphine ; il devrait donc être plus

facile de pouvoir évaluer approximativement les besoins mondiaux. En conséquence, la Commission recommande que le Secrétariat s'efforce tout particulièrement de compléter les renseignements relatifs à la cocaïne dans le plus bref délai possible, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les lieux de fabrication, les statistiques de production et les voies de distribution ; les gouvernements devraient également être invités à fournir au Secrétariat le chiffre aussi exact que possible des besoins annuels des différents pays en ce qui concerne cette drogue.

L'expérience montre, pour différents pays, que par suite des profits énormes réalisés par le trafic illicite clandestin, les amendes ne sont plus une peine suffisante. La Commission propose que les gouvernements étudient la question de punir également ce trafic de prison.

Afin de découvrir les voies et moyens employés par le trafic illicite des drogues, il serait très désirable que les renseignements relatifs aux saisies opérées par la douane ou par la police (lorsque le lieu de fabrication et le pays où la drogue a été obtenue sont connus) soient communiqués au gouvernement du pays intéressé, afin qu'il soit procédé à une enquête approfondie.

Les Services d'hygiène des différents gouvernements pourraient également examiner l'opportunité qu'il y aurait à entreprendre une œuvre éducative pour signaler le danger de l'usage des drogues.

Le Gouvernement canadien, dans une lettre adressée au Secrétaire général, a indiqué qu'il serait désirable, outre les autres renseignements statistiques, d'obtenir des renseignements sur les stocks des diverses drogues qui se trouvent dans un pays quelconque à une date donnée. La Commission a estimé qu'il serait très difficile de procéder à un inventaire de ce genre dans les pays où le nombre de détaillants autorisés à vendre des drogues est très considérable ; à son avis, il serait possible d'obtenir seulement des renseignements sur les stocks que détiennent les marchands en gros. Ces renseignements mêmes seraient difficiles à obtenir étant donné qu'une proportion considérable des drogues est préparée et conservée en stock, sous forme de préparations. La Commission a donc ajourné toute recommandation précise à ce sujet jusqu'au moment où les statistiques qui ont déjà été obtenues ou qui seront bientôt obtenues relativement à la production et à la distribution, auront été minutieusement examinées. Elle reconnaît toutefois qu'il serait désirable que les gouvernements examinent dans quelle mesure il serait possible d'obtenir, au point de vue des stocks, les renseignements auxquels le Gouvernement canadien a fait allusion.

Lors de la session de l'Assemblée, en septembre dernier, le délégué de la France a attiré l'attention sur l'emploi croissant par les intoxiqués, d'autres drogues auxquelles ne s'applique pas actuellement la Convention internationale de l'opium. Sur sa proposition, l'Assemblée a adopté une résolution recommandant au Conseil de charger la Commission consultative d'étendre ses études, de façon à ce qu'elles comprennent non seulement les drogues visées dans la Convention de 1912, mais toutes les autres drogues nuisibles, quelle que soit leur origine, et produisant des effets similaires, ainsi que de lui faire connaître les avantages qu'il y aurait à convoquer une nouvelle conférence internationale des Etats signataires de ladite Convention, et de ceux Membres de la Société des Nations, afin que celle-ci rédige une convention à l'effet de supprimer l'usage illégitime de ces drogues.

Le Gouvernement français a été invité par le Secrétariat à fournir une liste des drogues qui, en France, ont été jugées susceptibles d'usages illicites ; la liste fournie par le Gouvernement français a été soumise à la Commission (Voir Annexe 7). Toutefois cette liste n'a été reçue que quelques jours avant la réunion de la Commission qui n'a pas eu le temps d'examiner la question en détail, ni d'obtenir à ce sujet les observations des différents gouvernements. La Commission recommande que cette liste soit renvoyée aux gouvernements intéressés, pour toutes observations qu'auraient à fournir leurs Services d'hygiène. En attendant ces renseignements, la Commission a ajourné l'examen de la question d'une nouvelle conférence internationale. On verra que certaines des drogues comprises dans cette liste sont des dérivés de la morphine. Aux termes de la Convention (Article 14), « tout nouveau dérivé de la morphine, de la cocaïne ou de leurs sels respectifs, ou tout autre alcaloïde de l'opium qui pourrait, à la suite de recherches scientifiques généralement reconnues, donner lieu à des abus analogues et avoir pour résultat les mêmes effets nuisibles » est automatiquement soumis aux dispositions de la Convention. On peut également faire remarquer en passant que certaines des drogues figurant sur cette liste sont employées pour remplacer la morphine et la cocaïne, et, de l'avis des médecins, sont en tout cas beaucoup moins nuisibles. Il ne serait donc pas désirable de mettre des obstacles à leur usage à moins que la nécessité d'un contrôle ne soit nettement établie.

EXPÉDITION DE DROGUES PAR LA POSTE.

Lors de la dernière Conférence postale internationale, réunie à Madrid en automne de 1920, il a été convenu d'interdire l'expédition par lettre des drogues auxquelles s'applique la Convention internationale de l'opium et de ne permettre l'expédition par colis postaux ou par boîtes en valeur déclarée qu'à destination des pays qui autorisent l'importation des drogues par cette voie. Le Secrétariat a reçu, du directeur du Bureau international de l'Union postale universelle, les renseignements relatifs aux pays faisant partie de l'Union postale qui acceptent ou non l'expédition de drogues par colis postaux ou en boîtes de valeur déclarée (Ces renseignements sont reproduits à l'Annexe 8).

PROPAGANDE DANS LES PAYS ORIENTAUX.

Lors de la dernière session de l'Assemblée, le délégué de la Perse a insisté sur l'opportunité qu'il y aurait à ce que la Société entreprenne une propagande sur les dangers qui résultent, au point de vue hygiénique, de l'abus de l'opium et des autres drogues. Le Secrétaire général a invité le Directeur général de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge à donner son opinion sur cette proposition. Le Directeur général a fait les suggestions suivantes :

« La Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge pourrait s'adresser à toutes les Sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge qui sont spécialement intéressées soit à la production, soit à l'usage ou à l'abus de l'opium ; elle pourrait solliciter leur sympathie, leur appui et leurs conseils au sujet des mesures qu'il conviendrait de prendre pour organiser une campagne, avec la collaboration des autorités officielles, en vue de combattre l'usage illicite de l'opium.

» La méthode qui aurait la confiance de la Ligue et dont elle proposerait l'emploi aux Sociétés affiliées, serait celle de l'éducation populaire sur les questions d'hygiène. Appliquée à la question de l'opium, cette campagne serait une campagne d'éducation du public ayant pour but de le renseigner clairement sur les résultats funestes qui résultent de l'abus de l'opium. »

La Commission approuve cordialement ces suggestions ; elle remercie de son offre la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge et elle espère que celle-ci pourra s'assurer la collaboration des Sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge en vue de l'œuvre éducatrice envisagée.

Le Directeur ajoute qu'une conférence des Croix-Rouges orientales se réunira à Bangkok en novembre 1922 et qu'il a mis à l'ordre du jour de cette conférence, en bonne place, la question du trafic de l'opium. Il propose que la Société des Nations envoie à cette conférence un représentant qualifié et il se déclare certain qu'en ce cas de précieuses suggestions seront présentées en vue d'une active collaboration des gouvernements et des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge intéressées. La Commission ne croit pas que la Société des Nations soit en mesure, dans un si bref délai, d'envoyer un représentant à cette conférence, mais elle espère que la question sera discutée en détail à cette conférence. Le Secrétariat pourrait offrir au Directeur de mettre à sa disposition tous les renseignements qu'il possède à cet égard.

OFFRE D'ASSISTANCE DU CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MISSIONNAIRES.

Le Conseil, qui représente des Associations de missionnaires dans toutes les parties du monde et comprend les Eglises de l'Inde, de la Chine, de l'Afrique et d'autres pays, a offert d'aider la Commission en suggérant des sources d'information et en obtenant lui-même des renseignements sur les problèmes relevant de la Commission. La Commission a été heureuse d'accepter cette offre.

BUDGET DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA COMMISSION DE L'OPIMUM.

La Commission a examiné les évaluations qu'il conviendrait de faire au point de vue du budget pour 1923 du Secrétariat de la Commission de l'opium. Elle recommande qu'un crédit de 96.250 francs suisses lui soit consacré. Cette somme est légèrement inférieure aux évaluations proposées pour l'exercice financier en cours. La Commission désire insister vivement sur la nécessité de conserver un personnel suffisant pour le travail à accomplir, si la Société doit s'acquitter de la mission qui lui a été confiée par le Pacte. Outre le travail considérable qu'entraîne la préparation des réunions de la Commission et la mise en vigueur des recommandations, le Secrétariat aura à examiner soigneusement les renseignements fournis par les gouvernements dans le rapport annuel ou de toute autre manière, et il devra donner suite à toutes les questions qui pourraient se poser. Il devra également servir de chambre de compensations (clearing house) pour tous les renseignements concernant le trafic de l'opium et des drogues. La Commission estime que les évaluations présentées dans le projet de budget représentent le minimum nécessaire.

ÉCHANGE DE LOIS ET RÈGLEMENTS.

L'article 21 de la Convention stipule que les Puissances contractantes se communiqueront les textes des lois et des règlements administratifs existants. En ce qui concerne les Membres de la Société, cet échange se fait maintenant par l'intermédiaire du Secrétariat. Ces lois sont devenues très nombreuses et la Commission est d'avis qu'au lieu de communiquer tous les documents reçus, il suffirait — et ce serait une économie de temps et d'argent — de faire tenir périodiquement aux gouvernements une liste de toutes les lois et règlements reçus, en laissant à chaque gouvernement le soin de demander les lois et règlements qu'il désirerait recevoir. La Commission est d'avis qu'il n'y aurait pas d'objection à ce que le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas adopte la même procédure.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTÉES PAR LA COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM.

La Commission consultative a adopté les résolutions suivantes :

1. Le Conseil de la Société est invité à insister auprès de tous les Etats, en particulier auprès de la Suisse, de la Perse et de la Turquie, qui n'ont pas encore mis en vigueur la Convention de l'opium de 1912 dans son intégralité, sur l'importance d'y procéder sans retard.

2. Il est éminemment souhaitable que le système des certificats d'importation adopté à l'unanimité par le Conseil et l'Assemblée de la Société soit mis en vigueur le 1^{er} septembre 1922 au plus tard par les pays d'Europe, l'Amérique, l'Afrique et l'Australie, et le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard par tous les autres pays ; et que les gouvernements soient invités à adopter le modèle de certificat proposé par la Commission consultative.

3. La Commission d'Hygiène de la Société des Nations devrait être invitée par le Conseil à poursuivre ses enquêtes sur les quantités de morphine et autres drogues dont ont besoin les différents pays pour des fins médicales ou scientifiques.

4. La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements de tous les Etats signataires de la Convention de 1912 et les autres Etats Membres de la Société des Nations, à fournir au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations un relevé des besoins totaux de leur consommation intérieure annuelle de l'opium et de ses dérivés, en indiquant séparément, si possible, les quantités employées respectivement pour des usages médicaux, scientifiques et autres. Ce relevé devra établir une distinction entre les sortes d'opium utilisées, et, dans le cas des dérivés de l'opium, les quantités seront indiquées d'après la teneur en morphine.

La Commission consultative estime en outre que ce relevé devra parvenir au Secrétaire général le 1^{er} janvier 1923 au plus tard, et qu'il est de la plus haute importance que les chiffres relatifs aux quantités d'opium nécessaires à la consommation des pays d'Extrême-Orient où les Chinois sont les principaux consommateurs, parviennent au Secrétariat à cette date au plus tard.

5. Le Conseil de la Société devrait, si la nécessité s'en présente, inviter le gouvernement des Etats Parties à la Convention, à faciliter sur leur territoire les enquêtes sur la production de l'opium et la fabrication de la morphine et de la cocaïne, auxquelles procéderont, pour toute question relevant de la Convention de l'opium, des commissions mixtes nommées en partie par le gouvernement intéressé, en partie par le Conseil de la Société.

6. a) La Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium de la Société des Nations, ayant examiné les rapports communiqués par le représentant de la Chine à la Commission, sur la reprise de la culture de l'opium qui se serait produite dans diverses provinces ; ayant tenu compte de l'époque, des circonstances et de la situation de certaines des personnes par qui ces enquêtes ont été effectuées ; ainsi que du fait que des régions importantes ont échappé à cette enquête ; ayant comparé ces rapports avec les renseignements contenus dans le Livre Bleu publié par le Gouvernement britannique, ainsi qu'avec d'autres renseignements communiqués à la Commission ;

Se plaît à reconnaître les efforts qui ont été faits par les autorités dans certaines provinces en vue de la suppression de l'opium, mais regrette d'avoir à constater qu'il se produit en Chine une recrudescence considérable de la culture et de l'usage de l'opium¹.

7. La Commission prend acte de la promesse faite par le représentant du Japon, au nom de son gouvernement, de procéder à une enquête aussi rigoureuse que possible sur le trafic illicite de la morphine, qui se fait actuellement en Extrême-Orient, et qu'à cet effet une étroite coopération soit établie entre les autorités japonaises et les fonctionnaires des douanes maritimes chinoises afin de découvrir l'origine de la morphine de contrebande. Il importe en outre de tirer au clair les causes des divergences existant

¹ Certains paragraphes de la présente résolution sont supprimés jusqu'à plus ample examen de la part de la Commission consultative.

entre les statistiques d'importation japonaises et les statistiques d'exportation fournies par certains autres pays.

8. La Commission émet le vœu, afin de faciliter le contrôle général du trafic des drogues dangereuses :

a) que soient complétées aussitôt que possible les informations relatives à la fabrication de la cocaïne ;

b) que le Conseil de la Société invite les gouvernements à envoyer au Secrétariat des estimations aussi exactes que possible des quantités de cocaïne qu'ils jugent nécessaires pour les besoins de leurs pays respectifs ;

c) que les gouvernements prennent toutes mesures nécessaires pour échanger mutuellement des renseignements complets sur toutes les saisies effectuées par leurs autorités respectives de douane et de police ;

d) que les gouvernements examinent l'opportunité d'éduquer la population au point de vue des dangers que présente l'usage des drogues nuisibles ;

e) que, l'expérience montrant que par suite des énormes profits réalisés par le trafic clandestin des stupéfiants, les amendes ne sont plus une peine suffisante, les gouvernements étudient la question de punir également ce trafic de prison ;

f) que la liste des drogues non comprises dans la Convention de 1912, transmise par le Gouvernement français, soit envoyée aux gouvernements intéressés pour toutes observations qu'ils jugeront utiles, et que, dans l'intervalle, la question de la convocation d'une nouvelle Conférence internationale soit ajournée.

9. La Commission est d'avis que soit acceptée l'offre de la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge, en vue d'inviter les Sociétés nationales de la Croix-Rouge s'intéressant à la question de l'opium, d'entreprendre une œuvre d'éducation populaire au point de vue des conséquences funestes de l'abus de l'opium.

10. La Commission émet le vœu que le Conseil invite les gouvernements, lorsqu'ils établiront leur rapport annuel à la Société des Nations sur l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles, à adopter le projet élaboré par la Commission consultative, à transmettre ce rapport pour le 1^{er} juillet au plus tard (en ce qui concerne les pays d'Occident) et pour le 1^{er} octobre (en ce qui concerne les pays d'Orient), que ce rapport soit rédigé dans l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles de la Société.

(Signé) MALCOLM DELEVINGNE (Président).
G. BOURGOIS (Vice-Président).

RACHEL E. CROWDY (Secrétaire.)

ANNEXE 1.

INDICATIONS GÉNÉRALES POUR L'ÉTABLISSEMENT DU RAPPORT ANNUEL DES GOUVERNEMENTS.

(Texte approuvé par la Commission consultative de l'opium, le 26 avril 1922.)

Le rapport doit être envoyé chaque année au Secrétariat, avant le 1^{er} juillet (pour les pays d'Occident), avant le 1^{er} octobre (pour les pays d'Orient).

RAPPORT DU GOUVERNEMENT DE SUR LE TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM
ET AUTRES DROGUES NUISIBLES, POUR L'ANNÉE

A. — RENSEIGNEMENTS GÉNÉRAUX.

1.

Prière de signaler toutes les nouvelles lois, règlements importants, ordonnances, etc., ayant trait au trafic de l'opium et autres drogues nuisibles, et édictés pendant l'année, ainsi que toutes modifications importantes apportées aux mesures administratives en vigueur.

Prière de fournir des renseignements sur les documents officiels publiés, de nature à intéresser la Commission consultative.

2. RÉGLEMENTATION DES IMPORTATIONS ET EXPORTATIONS.

Fournir un compte rendu détaillé du fonctionnement du système des « Certificats d'importation », en mentionnant les difficultés de toute nature auxquelles son application a pu donner lieu, tant en ce qui concerne :

- a) l'exportation, que
- b) l'importation des stupéfiants.

Quelle est la procédure suivie pour les pays qui n'ont pas encore adopté le système ?

3. RÉGLEMENTATION INTÉRIEURE DE LA FABRICATION, DE LA VENTE, DE LA DISTRIBUTION, DE L'USAGE, ETC. DES STUPÉFIANTS.

Prière de fournir des renseignements sur tout point nouveau présentant un intérêt ou une importance particulière, concernant l'application des lois en vigueur, et, spécialement, le degré de consommation habituelle des stupéfiants ; les difficultés de l'application de ces lois à des cas particuliers ; les difficultés rencontrées dans la mise en vigueur de ces lois et tous les renseignements qu'il sera possible d'obtenir sur le trafic illicite des stupéfiants, ainsi que sur les origines de ce trafic et les voies et moyens employés.

Fournir tous les renseignements possibles sur les poursuites engagées et les condamnations prononcées.

B. — STUPÉFIANTS PARTICULIERS.

4. OPIUM BRUT.

a) Si le pays est un pays producteur d'opium, indiquer la superficie cultivée, la quantité récoltée et la proportion moyenne de morphine contenue dans l'opium.

b) *Importations.*

Indiquer le nom des ports autorisés pour l'année, ainsi que le montant des importations pour chaque espèce d'opium (opium européen, turc, persan, indien et autre).

- c) Indiquer la quantité d'opium de chaque espèce employée à la fabrication :
1. de la morphine,
 2. de l'opium médicinal,
 3. d'autres préparations médicinales.

d) *Autres usages.*

Fournir des renseignements sur la nature de ces usages, les quantités consommées, etc.

e) *Exportations.*

Indiquer les ports autorisés pour l'année, le montant des exportations d'opium de chaque espèce, ainsi que le lieu de destination.

5. OPIUM PRÉPARÉ.

a) *Pays dans lesquels l'importation, la fabrication et l'usage de l'opium préparé sont interdits.*

Indiquer s'il a été possible de supprimer l'habitude de fumer de l'opium,

1. dans la population indigène,
2. dans la population étrangère.

A quelles nationalités appartiennent les fumeurs d'opium ?

Nature des difficultés rencontrées dans l'application des mesures de répression.

A quel degré l'opium est-il introduit en contrebande ?

Mesures législatives prises. Nombre des poursuites, etc.

La collaboration d'autres pays est-elle nécessaire pour arriver à une suppression absolue ? Dans l'affirmative, indiquer les formes de cette collaboration.

b) *Pays dans lesquels l'usage de l'opium préparé n'est pas complètement interdit.*

Indiquer les modifications qui ont pu être apportées pendant l'année au système en vigueur et, le cas échéant, les mesures nouvelles prises en vue de la suppression absolue.

Indiquer, si possible, le chiffre total de la consommation d'opium préparé, le prix de vente au détail, et si on ne l'a déjà fait, tous renseignements utiles sur le fonctionnement d'un système de contrôle.

Dans les pays où les fumeurs doivent être munis d'une licence ou être enregistrés, indiquer le nombre de ces fumeurs.

Indiquer le nombre de Chinois domiciliés dans le pays et si l'habitude de fumer existe également chez des personnes appartenant à une autre nationalité; indiquer le nombre de personnes de cette nationalité domiciliées dans le pays. Indiquer également, le cas échéant, le revenu provenant de la vente d'opium préparé et le montant de ce revenu par rapport au revenu total du pays.

6. MORPHINE.

a) *Importations.*

Indiquer les quantités de :

1. morphine,
2. sels de morphine,
3. préparations, mélanges, etc., contenant de la morphine importée des divers pays fournisseurs; dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de morphine contenu dans ces préparations).

b) *Fabrication.*

Indiquer les noms des fabricants et l'emplacement des fabriques, les quantités de chaque espèce d'opium utilisées pour la fabrication; le pourcentage (si on le connaît) de morphine contenue dans cet opium; la quantité de morphine ou de sels de morphine fabriquée.

N. B. — Comprendre la morphine transformée en héroïne, codéine et autres substances, en indiquant les quantités ainsi transformées.

c) Exportations.

Indiquer les quantités de :

1. morphine,
2. sels de morphine,
3. préparations, mélanges, etc., contenant de la morphine, exportées dans les divers pays destinataires. (Dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de morphine contenu dans ces préparations.)

Signaler toute augmentation ou diminution des exportations à destination d'un pays quelconque par rapport à l'année précédente.

d) Fournir si possible une statistique de la consommation intérieure de morphine pour des usages :

- a)* médicaux,
- b)* scientifiques.

e) Indiquer les catégories de personnes auxquelles ont été délivrées des licences ou des autorisations en vue de l'usage ou de la possession de stupéfiants,

7. HÉROÏNE.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine (sauf en ce qui concerne la quantité d'opium brut utilisée).

8. OPIUM MÉDICINAL.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine.

9. COCAÏNE.

a) Si la coca est cultivée, fournir des renseignements sur la superficie cultivée, l'emplacement des plantations, le nom des propriétaires ; les exportations de :

1. cocaïne brute,
2. cocaïne raffinée ou sels de cocaïne

dans les divers pays destinataires ; le prix de la cocaïne brute et de la cocaïne raffinée, les quantités de cocaïne brute et de cocaïne raffinée, en stock, au début et à la fin de chaque année.

b) le montant des importations de :

1. cocaïne brute ;
2. cocaïne raffinée ou sels de cocaïne ;
3. préparations, etc., contenant de la cocaïne. (Dans le cas de préparations, etc., les quantités indiquées devront représenter le poids de cocaïne contenu dans ces préparations.)

c) Indiquer le nom des propriétaires et la situation des fabriques dans lesquelles on extrait la cocaïne des feuilles ou dans lesquelles on raffine la cocaïne brute ; la production de chaque fabrique pour l'année.

d) Indiquer les catégories de personnes à qui ont été délivrées des licences ou des autorisations en vue de l'usage ou de la possession de stupéfiants.

10. AUTRES STUPÉFIANTS AUXQUELS S'APPLIQUE LA CONVENTION.

Fournir les mêmes renseignements que pour la morphine.

C. — DIVERS.

11. CHINE.

Fournir tous renseignements nouveaux sur l'application des dispositions du Traité.

12. MESURES D'ORDRE INTERNATIONAL.

Signaler les traités ou accords internationaux, relatifs à l'opium ou aux narcotiques, signés au cours de l'année

13. AUTRES STUPÉFIANTS.

Signaler tous les faits intéressants se rapportant à l'usage de stupéfiants non mentionnés dans le questionnaire qui précède, ainsi que les mesures prises à ce sujet au cours de l'année

14. RENSEIGNEMENTS COMPLÉMENTAIRES ET SUGGESTIONS.

.....
.....
.....
.....

Présenter autant que possible sous forme de tableaux statistiques, les renseignements demandés aux paragraphes 4 à 10. Indiquer si les marchandises en transit sont comprises ou non dans les chiffres donnés pour les importations et les exportations.

N. B. — Les gouvernements sont priés de vouloir bien fournir les mêmes renseignements pour leurs colonies, possessions, protectorats, territoires à bail, territoires sous mandat, etc.



ANNEXE 2.

EXPOSÉ AU SUJET DES SIGNATURES ET RATIFICATIONS DE LA CONVENTION DE L'OPIUM.

| PARTIES A LA CONVENTION | | | MEMBRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS | | | ÉTATS NON MEMBRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <i>Pays pour lesquels la Convention est entrée en vigueur avant le 10 janvier 1920.</i> | <i>Pays pour lesquels la Convention est entrée en vigueur par suite des stipulations de Traités de paix.</i> | <i>Autres pays pour lesquels la Convention est en vigueur.</i> | <i>Pays ayant ratifié la Convention mais n'ayant pas signé le Protocole qui la met en vigueur.</i> | <i>Pays parties à la Convention</i> | <i>Pays ayant signé et ratifié la Convention mais n'ayant pas signé le Protocole qui la met en vigueur.</i> | <i>Pays qui ont signé la Convention mais ne l'ont pas ratifiée.</i> | <i>Pays non parties à la Convention.</i> | <i>Pays parties à la Convention</i> | <i>Pays ayant signé et ratifié la Convention, mais n'ayant pas signé le Protocole qui la met en vigueur.</i> | <i>Pays qui ont signé la Convention mais ne l'ont pas ratifiée.</i> | <i>Pays non parties à la Convention.</i> |
| Etats-Unis d'Amérique | Allemagne | Danemark | Equateur | Afrique du Sud | Venezuela | Argentine | Albanie | Etats-Unis d'Amérique | Dantzig | République Dominicaine | Abyssinie |
| Belgique | Autriche | Espagne | Venezuela | Australie | | Chili | Esthonie | d'Amérique | Equateur | Mexique | Afghanistan |
| Chine | Bolivie | Suède | | Autriche | | Colombie | Lithuanie | Allemagne | | Monténégro | Hedjaz |
| Honduras | Brésil | | | Belgique | | Costa-Rica | | Hongrie | | Russie | Liechtenstein |
| Norvège | Bulgarie | | | Bolivie | | Finlande | | | | | Monaco |
| Pays-Bas | Cuba | | | Brésil | | Lettonie | | | | | Turquie |
| | France | | | Bulgarie | | Luxembourg | | | | | |
| | Grande-Bretagne | | | Canada | | Paraguay | | | | | |
| | Grèce | | | Chine | | Perse | | | | | |
| | Guatemala | | | Cuba | | Salvador | | | | | |
| | Haiti | | | Danemark | | Suisse | | | | | |
| | Hongrie | | | Espagne | | | | | | | |
| | Italie | | | France | | | | | | | |
| | Japon | | | Grande-Bretagne | | | | | | | |
| | Libéria | | | Grèce | | | | | | | |
| | Nicaragua | | | Guatemala | | | | | | | |
| | Panama | | | Haiti | | | | | | | |
| | Pérou | | | Honduras | | | | | | | |
| | Pologne | | | Inde | | | | | | | |
| | Portugal | | | Italie | | | | | | | |
| | Roumanie | | | Japon | | | | | | | |
| | Etat serbe-croate-slovene | | | Libéria | | | | | | | |
| | Siam | | | Nouvelle-Zélande | | | | | | | |
| | Tchéco-Slovaquie | | | Nicaragua | | | | | | | |
| | Uruguay | | | Norvège | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Pays-Bas | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Panama | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Pérou | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Pologne | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Portugal | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Roumanie | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Etat serbe-croate-slovene | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Siam | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Suède | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Tchéco-Slovaquie | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Uruguay | | | | | | | |

ANNEXE 3.

TRAFIC DE L'OPIUM. SYSTÈME DES CERTIFICATS D'IMPORTATION.

Note explicative par le Secrétaire général.

Il y a lieu de croire que le système des certificats d'importation recommandé par la Commission consultative de l'opium de la Société des Nations au cours de sa session de mai dernier, et ultérieurement approuvé par le Conseil et l'Assemblée de la Société, n'a pas encore été bien compris par certains gouvernements. L'objet de la présente note est donc de dissiper tout malentendu et de préciser la portée et l'objet dudit système.

Le contrôle du commerce d'importation et d'exportation des stupéfiants constitue une des parties les plus importantes du régime établi par la Convention internationale de l'opium pour la prévention de l'abus des drogues dangereuses. A moins qu'on ne puisse établir un contrôle efficace du commerce d'importation et d'exportation, tout contrôle *national* devient excessivement difficile, pour ne pas dire impossible ; ce commerce d'importation et d'exportation ne pourra être efficacement contrôlé que s'il existe une coopération étroite entre tous les pays intéressés. Le système des certificats d'importation a été élaboré par la Commission consultative de l'opium pour donner plein effet aux dispositions de la Convention de l'opium relatives au contrôle des importations et des exportations. Il a été approuvé à l'unanimité par le Conseil et l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations. Il est désirable que tous les pays intéressés l'adoptent et le mettent en vigueur dans le plus bref délai possible. En attendant, les efforts des divers pays et ceux de la Société des Nations elle-même, en vue d'exercer un contrôle sur ce trafic, se trouvent gravement gênés.

Le système des certificats d'importation recommandé par la Commission consultative porte que :

« Toute demande d'exportation faite par un importateur pour la fourniture de l'un quelconque des produits auxquels s'applique la Convention, devra être accompagnée d'un certificat du gouvernement du pays importateur, stipulant que l'importation de l'envoi en question est approuvée par le gouvernement et qu'elle est requise pour des besoins légitimes. Dans le cas de drogues visées par le chapitre III de la Convention, le certificat spécifiera qu'elles sont destinées exclusivement à des fins médicales ou scientifiques. »

Le système peut se présenter sous deux aspects :

a) Si un négociant en stupéfiants appartenant à un pays A désire importer des produits d'un pays B, il devra au préalable obtenir de son gouvernement un certificat stipulant que l'importation de cette livraison particulière de drogues est approuvée par le gouvernement et qu'elle est requise pour des besoins légitimes (ou, dans le cas de la morphine, de l'héroïne, de la cocaïne, ou de l'opium médicinal, qu'elle est destinée exclusivement à des fins médicales ou scientifiques); le négociant devra faire parvenir le certificat en même temps que sa commande ou à l'appui de celle-ci à la maison exportatrice du pays B. Le gouvernement du pays B n'accordera la licence d'exportation pour l'envoi de drogues à destination du pays A que lorsque le certificat lui aura été présenté par l'exportateur du pays B à qui la commande de drogues aura été faite.

b) Inversement, si un négociant en stupéfiants d'un pays A veut exporter des drogues à destination d'un pays C, le gouvernement du pays A n'en permettra l'exportation que sur présentation d'un certificat analogue émanant du gouvernement du pays C, stipulant que l'envoi dont il s'agit, destiné à l'exportation, est requis dans le pays C pour des besoins légitimes (ou des fins médicales ou scientifiques, suivant le cas), et qu'en outre l'importation de ces drogues est approuvée par le gouvernement du pays C.

On constatera que, par l'adoption de ce système, le pays A est protégé contre l'exportation de stupéfiants en provenance du pays B pour des besoins illégitimes, car le gouvernement du pays B n'autorisera l'exportation à destination du pays A qu'avec l'approbation du gouvernement du pays A. En second lieu, le gouvernement du pays A possède la garantie que les stupéfiants ne seront pas exportés de son territoire à destination d'autres pays pour des besoins illégitimes, puisqu'il n'autorisera l'exportation des drogues qu'avec l'approbation du gouvernement du pays importateur et sur l'assurance de ce dernier que les drogues sont requises pour des besoins légitimes.

Ce système est fondé sur l'hypothèse que tous les Membres de la Société des Nations exercent un contrôle sur l'exportation des drogues dangereuses de leur propre territoire, en interdisant l'exportation de drogues qui ne seraient pas accompagnées de licence du gouvernement.

Nous nous permettons de faire observer ici que pour mettre à exécution le projet recommandé par la Commission consultative de l'opium et approuvé par le Conseil et l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations, il est nécessaire d'exiger une licence d'exportation distincte pour chaque expédition de drogues exportées. Il est clair que si un gouvernement accordait des licences générales d'exportation aux exportateurs, ceux-ci auraient toute latitude d'exporter des drogues en quantité quelconque à toute personne de n'importe quel pays, et qu'une telle mesure serait insuffisante pour exécuter les engagements contractés par ce gouvernement en vertu de la Convention internationale de l'opium.

ANNEXE 4.

Avril 1922.

PROJET DE CERTIFICAT D'IMPORTATION

Soumis par la Section de l'opium à l'examen de la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium de la Société des Nations.

CONVENTION INTERNATIONALE DE L'OPIUM DE 1912.

CERTIFICAT OFFICIEL D'IMPORTATION.

Nous certifions par la présente que le Ministère du....., chargé de l'application de la loi sur les stupéfiants visée par la Convention internationale de l'opium de 1912, a approuvé l'importation par :

(Nom, adresse et profession de l'importateur.)

a)
(Description exacte du stupéfiant et quantité destinée à l'importation.)

de b)
(Nom et adresse de la maison du pays exportateur qui fournit le stupéfiant.)

en provenance de c)

(Indiquer toutes les conditions spéciales à observer; mentionner par exemple que le stupéfiant ne doit pas être expédié par la poste.)

sous réserve des conditions suivantes d)
et déclarons que l'envoi destiné à l'importation est nécessaire :

1. pour les besoins légitimes (dans le cas d'opium brut) ¹.
2. pour des besoins médicaux ou scientifiques exclusivement (dans le cas des stupéfiants visés par le chapitre III de la Convention).

Pour le Ministre et par son ordre

Signé

Titre

Date

¹ Les pays qui n'ont pas supprimé l'habitude de fumer l'opium et qui désirent importer de l'opium doivent délivrer des certificats établissant que l'opium importé est destiné aux fumeurs, que les fumeurs sont soumis aux restrictions gouvernementales en attendant la suppression complète de l'opium, et que l'opium importé ne sera pas réexporté.

ANNEXE 5.

Le 11 avril 1922.

MÉMOIRE

PRÉSENTÉ PAR SIR GEORGE BUCHANAN ET LE D^r CARRIÈRE, MEMBRES DE LA SOUS-COMMISSION DU COMITÉ D'HYGIÈNE DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS, AU SUJET DES ENQUÊTES FAITES A LA DEMANDE DE LA COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DE L'OPIUM,

SUR

LA CONSOMMATION LÉGITIME DES DROGUES NUISIBLES AU CHAPITRE III DE LA CONVENTION INTERNATIONALE DE L'OPIUM.

A la demande du directeur médical de la Section d'hygiène, nous avons examiné aujourd'hui les renseignements recueillis à la suite des enquêtes entreprises par le Comité d'hygiène, sur l'invitation de la Commission consultative de l'opium.

On se rappellera que le Comité d'hygiène a examiné en détail les différentes méthodes que l'on pourrait employer pour obtenir les chiffres approximatifs désirés ; la plupart des méthodes suggérées ont été considérées comme peu pratiques, en raison de la complexité des enquêtes qu'elles nécessiteraient et de la grande difficulté de s'assurer de la valeur des données ainsi recueillies. Le Comité d'hygiène, toutefois, avait décidé de chercher à recueillir des renseignements sur les résultats des expériences faites dans un certain nombre de pays civilisés, de population relativement faible, et dans lesquels, autant qu'on peut le savoir, il ne se produit guère d'abus des drogues, ou, s'il y existe un usage illicite des stupéfiants, il y a également des moyens de calculer avec assez d'exactitude la quantité utilisée légitimement pour des besoins médicaux. A cet effet, le Comité a fait procéder à des enquêtes particulières en Belgique par M. Velghe, en Suisse par le D^r Carrière, au Danemark et dans les autres pays scandinaves par le professeur Madsen. En même temps, Sir George Buchanan s'est mis en rapport, par l'intermédiaire des Hauts Commissaires, avec les autorités d'hygiène publique d'Australie et de Nouvelle-Zélande. On croyait que le total des importations de stupéfiants dans ces deux derniers pays représenterait d'une façon suffisamment exacte la consommation légitime de la population, puisque, d'une part, il n'y existe dans ces pays aucune exportation importante ni aucune fabrication de stupéfiants, et que, d'autre part, la population y est très peu adonnée à l'usage des stupéfiants.

Toutefois, l'espoir que l'on avait de recueillir auprès de l'Australie et de la Nouvelle-Zélande des données utiles ne s'est pas trouvé réalisé. Les chiffres fournis pour le total des importations ne s'appliquent qu'à des périodes relativement courtes. Le montant de ces importations est extrêmement variable, et comme il n'existe aucun moyen d'évaluer les stocks se trouvant dans le pays au début et à la fin des périodes en question, on ne possède en réalité aucune indication des quantités consommées par la population pour une année donnée. Les autorités d'hygiène publique en Australie et en Nouvelle-Zélande, en communiquant leurs renseignements, qui sont les seuls chiffres officiels disponibles, ont toutes deux exprimé l'avis qu'on ne saurait déduire de ces renseignements aucune conclusion sérieuse au point de vue du but que s'est proposé le Comité ; nous n'avons pu que nous rallier à cette opinion.

Lors de la session d'octobre du Comité d'hygiène, M. Velghe a fait de la situation en Belgique un exposé extrêmement intéressant, qu'il est particulièrement utile d'étudier pour la question générale du contrôle des stupéfiants. M. Velghe a signalé qu'en raison de la nouvelle législation qui vient d'être mise en vigueur et des nouvelles mesures administratives prises en Belgique, il serait possible d'ici peu d'obtenir les renseignements que l'on désire sur la consommation légitime des drogues en question pour les besoins de la médecine. Cependant, cette législation et ces nouvelles méthodes administratives sont de date toute récente et, en ce qui concerne la Belgique, il n'est pas possible à l'heure actuelle de donner aucun chiffre indice, ceux que l'on possède n'étant basés que sur une expérience incomplète.

Toutefois, la Suisse nous a donné des résultats beaucoup plus féconds, à la suite des enquêtes sérieuses et détaillées auxquelles s'est livré le Dr Carrière. Le résultat de ces enquêtes est résumé dans les réponses que la Suisse a envoyées à un questionnaire communiqué par la Commission consultative de l'opium, indépendamment de la Commission d'hygiène. Le Dr Carrière, profitant de la pratique en vigueur chez les docteurs, les pharmaciens et dans les hôpitaux de la Suisse tout entier, a obtenu, grâce à leur coopération, des chiffres qui, avec les réserves nécessaires, semblent représenter d'une façon assez exacte la consommation légitime totale, pour les besoins médicaux, d'opium, de composés d'opium, extraits d'opium, morphine, héroïne, dionine, y compris la cocaïne avec l'eucaine, la novocaïne, etc. On estime que l'erreur ne dépasserait pas 20 %, quoique le Dr Carrière hésite naturellement à fixer d'une façon aussi précise le coefficient d'erreur. En tout cas, nous pouvons considérer comme pratiquement négligeable une erreur aussi peu importante et présenter les chiffres du tableau ci-dessous avec confiance, étant bien entendu qu'ils ne s'appliquent qu'au cas de la Suisse et à une année seulement (1921).

Les enquêtes du Dr Madsen au Danemark et en Suède ont permis également de fournir au Comité les données qui figurent dans le tableau suivant. Les renseignements ont été fournis par le Service d'Hygiène de l'Etat.

RÉSULTATS DES ENQUÊTES FAITES EN SUISSE, EN SUÈDE ET AU DANEMARK SUR LA CONSOMMATION DE L'OPIMUM, MORPHINE, HÉROÏNE, COCAÏNE, ETC., DANS CES DIFFÉRENTS PAYS.

Suisse (1921) ; population : 4.000.000 d'habitants.

| | Quantité totale kg. | Par tête (grammes) |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Opium | 520 | 0,17. |
| Préparations d'opium (pantopon, etc.) exprimées selon leur contenu d'opium | 75 | |
| Extraits d'opium | 109 | |
| Morphine | 234 | 0,058 |
| Héroïne | 174 | 0,043 |
| Dionine | 18 | — |
| Cocaïne | 229 | 0,057 |

Suède (1920) ; Population : 5,903,762 habitants.

| | | |
|-----------------|------|-------|
| Opium | 1600 | 0,27 |
| Morphine | 120 | 0,02 |
| Héroïne | 2 | — |
| Cocaïne | 150 | 0,025 |

Danemark (1917) ; population : 2.960,000 habitants.

| | | |
|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Opium | 467,4 | 0,16 |
| Morphine | 98 | 0,033 |
| Cocaïne | 48 | 0,016 |

Au moment où nous rédigeons le présent rapport, nous n'avons pas encore reçu de renseignements sur les méthodes employées pour recueillir les données figurant ci-dessus, en ce qui concerne la Suède et le Danemark. Ces renseignements ont été demandés. Si nous considérons que ces chiffres représentent une approximation de la réalité aussi proche que ceux donnés pour la Suisse, nous pouvons remarquer certaines analogies et certaines divergences.

Les chiffres de la consommation d'opium en Suisse et au Danemark par tête d'habitant et par an, présentent une analogie frappante, 0,17 et 0,16 grammes respectivement. Le chiffre suédois est considérablement plus élevé, soit 0,27 gr. ; toutefois, en Suède, la consommation de la morphine, soit 0,02, est moitié moindre que celle de la Suisse, soit 0,058 ; la consommation de la morphine au Danemark atteint une moyenne entre les chiffres précédents, soit 0,033.

La consommation particulièrement élevée d'héroïne en Suisse (0,043 par tête) semble n'avoir de contre-partie dans aucun des deux pays scandinaves.

La consommation de la cocaïne en Suisse (0,057) est plus de deux fois supérieure à celle de la Suède (0,025) et plus de trois fois supérieure à celle du Danemark (0,016).

Les trois pays présentent certaines caractéristiques communes : aucun d'eux n'a fait partie des Etats belligérants pendant la guerre et tous trois ont un niveau

sanitaire relativement élevé, ainsi qu'en témoignent les taux de mortalité annuelle suivants : Suisse, 14 par mille,
Suède, 13,29 par mille,
Danemark, 13,4 par mille.

Pour conclure, la Sous-Commission, tout en se rendant compte que les données fournies ci-dessus sont maigres, tient à exprimer quelque doute sur la question de savoir s'il serait possible de recueillir des renseignements très utiles du même ordre, en étendant à l'heure actuelle l'enquête à d'autres pays, particulièrement aux pays d'Europe. Elle est convaincue, en tout cas, qu'il est pratiquement impossible d'obtenir des résultats satisfaisants dans des pays comme l'Angleterre et la France, qui ont une nombreuse population et dont le trafic en ce qui concerne ces drogues est particulièrement complexe. Le Comité a été informé toutefois qu'en réponse au questionnaire envoyé par la Commission consultative de l'opium, il a été possible de recueillir beaucoup de renseignements nouveaux, et, au cas où cette nouvelle documentation soulèverait quelque question pour laquelle il serait nécessaire d'obtenir l'avis d'experts médicaux, la Sous-Commission se fera un plaisir d'examiner toutes les communications qu'elle pourrait encore recevoir de la Commission consultative sur la question.

ANNEXE 6.

RÉSUMÉ PAR LE REPRÉSENTANT DE LA CHINE D'UN RAPPORT ENVOYÉ PAR SON GOUVERNEMENT.

PROVINCE DE FOOKIEN.

RAPPORT DU GOUVERNEUR DE FOOKIEN ADRESSÉ PAR TÉLÉGRAPHE AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR. PÉKIN, 30 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Une enquête approfondie a été effectuée dans toute la province par le Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung, accompagné de M. Chen Pei-Kun, Taoyin d'Amoy, et M. Yu Shac-Ying, directeur du Bureau pour la suppression de l'opium. Ils se sont assurés de l'abolition générale de la culture du pavot, bien que dans la partie inférieure de la province il ait été encore cultivé, mais il a été procédé à la destruction, par force, de ces cultures. . . .

RAPPORT DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL WANG TAH-CHUNG AU MINISTRE DE L'IN- TÉRIEUR, PÉKIN, ADRESSÉ PAR TÉLÉGRAMME LE 25 NOVEMBRE 1921.

J'ai parcouru les régions de Chin-Kiang, Nan-An, Yung, Chiun, An-Chi, Hua-An, Sen-Yiu et Pu-Tien. Nous n'avons trouvé dans ces régions aucune culture de pavot, sauf à Hua-An et Sen-Yiu, où cette plante était cultivée sous l'influence des bandits. Heureusement, le gouverneur Lee a envoyé ses troupes sur les lieux et a détruit toutes les plantations de pavot. Quand je suis arrivé avec ma suite, il ne restait presque pas de pavot dans les champs.

A notre arrivée à Pu-Tien, nous avons été informés par les notabilités qu'on n'avait jamais cultivé de pavot dans cette région, affirmation qui nous a été confirmée par les missionnaires américains et anglais qui s'étaient livrés à une enquête dans cette région et dans les alentours. Ce fait a été également confirmé par la Section de Foochow de l'Association internationale contre l'opium.

District de Tung-An. — Tung-An était bien connu pour ses cultures de pavot, mais elles ont été détruites par l'ordre du magistrat qui avait reçu du gouverneur les instructions en vue de la destruction immédiate de toutes les cultures signalées.

La Commission n'a rien aperçu au cours de son voyage entre la ville principale et les grands villages comme Ma-Shieng et Quan-Kow.

Districts de Sze-Ming et Chin-Mun. — Le pavot n'est pas cultivé dans ces deux districts en raison de leur caractère insulaire et montagneux qui ne convient pas à ce genre de plantation.

La Commission a parcouru douze districts du comté (Tao) d'Amoy pendant six semaines et nous nous sommes assurés que la situation était satisfaisante à cet égard.

RAPPORT DU GOUVERNEUR DE FOOKIEN ADRESSÉ PAR TÉLÉGRAPHE AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN : 17 JANVIER 1922.

Le Commissaire spécial Wang Tah-Chung, accompagné de M. Wang Sou-Chun, Taoyin de Chang-Chow et Ting-Chow, a fait une enquête personnelle dans les districts suivants :

Lung-Chi. — Les fermiers de ce district cultivent surtout la canne à sucre. Ils ont cessé de cultiver le pavot d'opium il y a quelques années. La Commission a été bien accueillie à son arrivée, particulièrement par les étudiants qui ont tous des sentiments très hostiles à l'égard de l'opium.

Nan-Ching. — A son arrivée dans ce district, la Commission a été reçue avec enthousiasme, particulièrement par les étudiants qui partagent les mêmes sentiments que leurs camarades de Lung-Chi. Au cours de notre voyage à travers le district, nous n'avons pas vu une seule tête de pavot.

Chang-Pu. — Le pavot somnifère ne pousse pas dans ce territoire montagneux, comme l'a attesté le missionnaire étranger qui réside dans ce district.

Chang-Tai et Ping-Hu. — Dans plusieurs endroits de ces deux districts, le pavot était cultivé, mais il a été détruit aussitôt que découvert. Le commissaire, en arrivant dans ce district, n'a vu dans les champs que du riz.

De plus, suivant un rapport complémentaire du Taoyin de Chang-Chow, les plantations de pavot ont été supprimées partout, sauf à Yuin-Shiao, où l'ordre n'est pas très strictement maintenu à l'heure actuelle. (Un rapport spécial sur ce district est donné séparément.)

RAPPORT DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL WANG TAH-CHUNG, ADRESSÉ AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN : 12 FÉVRIER 1922.

Yuin-Shiao. — La culture du pavot était considérable presque partout dans le district, car cette région échappait au contrôle des autorités, de sorte qu'elle ne pouvait faire respecter l'interdiction. Quand le gouverneur a envoyé des troupes pour essayer de détruire le pavot, la foule est entrée en collision avec les soldats. Cependant, après de longs efforts, elle a laissé passer les soldats et le pavot a été détruit. Le gouverneur avait l'intention de punir sévèrement ces fauteurs de troubles, mais on a montré pour eux une certaine indulgence, en raison des cautions fournies par la Chambre de Commerce, l'Association agricole et l'Association d'enseignement de Lung-Chi.

RAPPORT DU GOUVERNEUR LEE, ADRESSÉ PAR TÉLÉGRAPHE AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN : 14 JANVIER 1922.

Ting-Chow. — Tous les districts de ce comté ont été soigneusement inspectés par le commissaire spécial, accompagné de M. Wang Sou-Chun, Taoyin. La culture du pavot a complètement cessé.

EXTRAIT D'UNE DÉPÊCHE DU GOUVERNEUR DE FOOKIEN, ADRESSÉE AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN : 15 FÉVRIER 1922.

Foo-An, Sah-Pu, Foo-Ting, Ning-Teh et Sou-Ning. — Aucune culture de pavot n'a été trouvée dans ces districts ; la section de Foochow, de l'Association internationale contre l'opium, a procédé à une vérification. Une lettre adressée par ladite Association au directeur du Bureau pour la suppression de l'opium est ainsi conçue :

« Le vice-président de cette Association a reçu un rapport de son ami, le secrétaire de l'Association des missionnaires de Shanghai, disant

qu'il avait fait un voyage à Amoy, Chin-Kieng, Hua-An, Sing-Hua et retour à Foochow. Il n'a pas trouvé de culture du pavot somnifère dans les endroits qu'il a traversés. Un autre rapport a été envoyé par un missionnaire américain qui a voyagé entre Yung-Chuen et Sing-Hua. Cette année, il a à peine trouvé quelques têtes de pavots. Il en a été très surpris, car l'année précédente il avait constaté que le pavot somnifère était cultivé en 94 endroits différents dans le district. Il a fait ce voyage au commencement de l'hiver, alors que la saison de culture était passée, de sorte qu'il est certain qu'il n'y aura pas de culture de pavot cette année. C'est là le résultat de la stricte application des mesures destinées à la suppression, par les autorités provinciales, de la culture du pavot somnifère. »

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL WANG TAH-CHUNG AU
MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 11 NOVEMBRE 1921.

A mon arrivée dans la partie méridionale de la province de Fookien, j'ai reçu les salutations des représentants de la noblesse, de l'enseignement et du commerce. J'ai été escorté à la Chambre de Commerce où j'ai prononcé un discours sur la suppression de l'opium. Les auditeurs ont paru convaincus et ont promis de collaborer à notre œuvre.

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL WANG TAH-CHUNG
AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 25 OCTOBRE 1921.

A mon arrivée à Fou-Tcheou, j'ai appris que le pavot était cultivé dans les parties sud de la province. En conséquence, j'ai secrètement chargé certaines personnes dignes de confiance de faire une enquête. J'ai divisé la province en quatre taos et envoyé un fonctionnaire procéder à une enquête dans chacun des taos. En même temps, j'ai demandé au gouverneur de faire savoir aux magistrats de tous les districts que le pavot devait être détruit partout. Au cas où il ne serait pas détruit avant l'arrivée des personnes chargées de l'enquête, le magistrat du district serait tenu responsable et passible de renvoi. M. Yu Shao-Ying, directeur du Bureau principal pour la suppression de l'opium, a été également chargé de procéder à des enquêtes en différentes parties de la province. Il est donc certain qu'à la suite de ces mesures, la culture du pavot disparaîtra de la province.

PROVINCE DE KANSU.

DÉPÊCHE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL PAN LING-KOU AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR
A PÉKIN, LE 5 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Pour se faire aider dans son enquête sur la culture du pavot dans la province, la Commission a nommé, comme conseiller honoraire, un missionnaire étranger : le Révérend Yensouchien (?). Grâce à sa collaboration, on peut être certain que l'enquête sera menée à bonne fin.

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL PAN LING-KOU AU MINISTÈRE
DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 25 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Ning-Sha, Shi-Ning, Kau-Liang et An-Su. — La culture du pavot est strictement interdite dans ces quatre taos. La Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation.

Wei-Chieun et Ching-Yuen. — Il existait des plantations de pavot dans la juridiction de ces deux taos. Elles avaient été signalées en été, mais la Commission n'a rien trouvé lorsqu'elle s'est rendue sur les lieux.

Loan-Shan. — Le pavot était cultivé dans quelques districts de ce tao. Cette culture avait été signalée, mais les propriétaires, en apprenant l'arrivée de la Commission, craignant d'être punis, ont détruit eux-mêmes les plantations.

PROVINCE DE SHENSI.

RAPPORT DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL SUNG LEN-KWOI ADRESSÉ PAR TÉLÉGRAPHE AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 8 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Des rapports dignes de foi qui ont été reçus des enquêteurs établissent que dans tous les districts du Yu-Ling Tao, ils n'ont pas trouvé trace de cultures de pavots; la raison en est que le climat ne convient pas à cette culture. Les magistrats des différents districts ont fourni toutes garanties à cet égard.

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL SUNG LEN-KWOI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 20 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Il avait été signalé que le pavot était cultivé en secret dans la partie nord de Chang-An. Le magistrat de ce district a reçu l'ordre de faire détruire les plantations, ce qui a été fait. L'enquête se continue dans les autres districts. Jusqu'ici, la Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation de pavot. Elle transmettra ultérieurement de nouveaux rapports.

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL SUNG LEN-KWOI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 25 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Han-Yang, Sing-Kou, Mei-Shien, Pao-Gi, Shian-Shien, Chou-Yi, Hua-Yin, Hua-Shien, Tah-Li. — Des rapports dignes de foi ont été reçus des fonctionnaires chargés de l'enquête qui ont voyagé à travers tous les districts énumérés ci-dessus et qui ont reconnu qu'il n'existait aucune plantation de pavot. Ils ont recueilli des déclarations des autorités militaires locales leur donnant l'assurance qu'il n'existait dans le district aucune plantation.

RAPPORT TÉLÉGRAPHIQUE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL SUNG LEN-KWOI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 28 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Wei-Nan, Tung-Kuan, Lok-Nan, Shian-Nan. — Une enquête détaillée a été faite dans ces districts, mais la Commission n'a découvert aucune plantation de pavot.

Yen-Len, Fun-Shien, Shan-Yang. — Il existait dans ces districts des plantations de pavot, mais les autorités locales les ont fait détruire.

Den-Wu. — On signale qu'il existe dans plusieurs endroits de ce district un certain nombre de plantations. La Commission a chargé les autorités civiles et militaires de procéder à leur destruction.

PROVINCE DE HUPEI.

DÉPÊCHE DU GOUVERNEUR CIVIL DE HUPEI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 31 OCTOBRE 1921.

La province du sud-est vient d'être délivrée de l'invasion des troupes méridionales. Dès que l'ordre sera rétabli, l'interdiction de la culture du pavot sera strictement appliquée. Les plantations de pavot ont été déjà détruites en plusieurs endroits.

PROVINCE DE SHANSI.

DÉPÊCHE DU GOUVERNEUR DE SHANSI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN.

La culture du pavot a été strictement interdite dans la province. Les autorités locales ont saisi et détruit de l'opium passé en contrebande et provenant de la province voisine.

PROVINCE D'ANHUI.

DÉPÊCHE DU GOUVERNEUR D'ANHUI AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN

La partie nord de la province était reconnue, avant l'application de la loi d'interdiction, comme l'un des districts où l'opium était cultivé. Toutefois, depuis l'établissement de la République, l'interdiction de cette culture a été strictement observée. On possède à cet effet les témoignages de la Commission mixte anglo-chinoise qui se livrait à une enquête détaillée dans la province en 1917.

Dans quelques districts éloignés, on signalait quelques cas de culture de pavot, mais les plantes ont été détruites. Le fait est vérifié également dans une lettre d'un missionnaire américain qui déclare s'être assuré que le pavot a été détruit par des autorités locales.

PROVINCE DE KILIN.

DÉPÊCHE DU GOUVERNEUR DE KILIN AU MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN.

On signale dans la province un certain nombre de districts où le pavot est cultivé. Toutefois, la plupart des plantations ont été détruites à mesure qu'elles ont été découvertes. Une loi d'interdiction de la culture du pavot comprenant quinze articles a été promulguée et mise en vigueur.

PROVINCE DE HEILUNG-KIENG.

COMMUNICATION DU GOUVERNEUR DE HEILUNG-KIENG AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN.

Des mesures rigoureuses ont été prises en vue de l'interdiction de la culture du pavot dans la province, sauf dans certaines régions telles que le massif intérieur des montagnes de Sing-An, que ne peut atteindre le contrôle de l'administration à cause de leur éloignement et de la proximité de la frontière russe. Cependant, les autorités provinciales s'efforceront de leur mieux d'assurer l'exécution de la loi.

SUIYIEN.

COMMUNICATION DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL WU PUN-CHIH AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN: 14 JANVIER 1922.

La Commission a procédé à une enquête minutieuse dans tous les districts. Elle a découvert des cultures de pavots en certains endroits, mais a fait détruire les plants. Les autorités locales ont déployé tous leurs efforts pour assurer l'exécution de la loi d'interdiction ; c'est pourquoi les membres de la Commission sont satisfaits du résultat obtenu, à savoir que toutes les plantations de pavots ont été supprimées dans les différents districts.

PROVINCE DE HSINCHIANG.

COMMUNICATION DU GOUVERNEUR D'HSINCHIANG AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN.

Des mesures rigoureuses ont été prises en vue de l'interdiction de la culture du pavot dans la province. Nous possédons à cet égard le témoignage du vice-consul britannique à Kasah ; en avril dernier, il s'est rendu de Kasah dans les districts de Kan-Ke-Su, Bai-Chung, Fu-Ju et Yen-Chi, et également de Kan-Ke-Su et Ping-Tah-Pan à Yi-Li. Il n'a découvert aucune culture de pavot sur une étendue de plusieurs milliers de li, au cours d'un voyage qui a duré une centaine de jours. Le mois d'avril est la saison des pavots, le moment où les fleurs sont facilement visibles. Certainement le vice-consul britannique n'aurait pas manqué de s'apercevoir de l'existence des plantations de pavots, s'il y en avait eu.

On a découvert de l'opium en certains lieux ; il a été confisqué par la police et brûlé publiquement.

PROVINCE DE SZE-CHEUN.

COMMUNICATION DU COMMISSAIRE DE LA DÉFENSE DE LA FRONTIÈRE DE SZE-CHEUN AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN.

Le pavot n'a jamais été cultivé dans plus de vingt districts de cette partie de la province, occupés par des tribus indigènes, car ces tribus n'ont jamais contracté l'habitude de fumer l'opium. En d'autres endroits, des plants de pavots ont été découverts, mais ils ont été détruits par les autorités militaires. On a découvert de nombreux cas de contrebande d'opium et l'opium a été confisqué et brûlé publiquement.

JEHOL.

LETTRÉ DU COMMANDANT MILITAIRE DE JEHOL AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN.

Une loi spéciale a été promulguée interdisant la culture du pavot. On peut être assuré que les autorités locales appliqueront cette loi aussi rigoureusement que possible.

EXTRAIT DE LA LETTRE DU COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL YAO CHI-YUEN AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR, PÉKIN, 10 JANVIER 1922.

La culture du pavot somnifère est rigoureusement interdite dans le pays depuis 1915. Il a été procédé à une enquête en 1916, 1917 et 1918 et il n'a pas été découvert de plants de pavots.

Des plantations de pavots ont été signalées dans des districts éloignés, tels que ceux de Ping-Cheun, Wei-Chang, Cze-Fung, Lung-Hua, Ling-Yuen, Kien-Ping, Fung-Chi, Ning-Liun, Ping-Fu, Heinching-Chia, mais les autorités locales ont reçu l'ordre de les détruire. Tous les magistrats relevant des princes de la Mongolie ont donné l'assurance que la culture du pavot était rigoureusement interdite pendant la présente année et le demeurerait à l'avenir.

PROVINCE DE HEILUNG-KIENG.

EXTRAIT D'UNE DÉPÊCHE ADRESSÉE PAR LE COMMISSAIRE SPÉCIAL CHAO-SEN-CHANG AU MINISTRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR A PÉKIN, LE 6 DÉCEMBRE 1921.

Nord-Ouest. — Cette partie de la province n'est pas propre à la culture du pavot, car certaines régions sont désertes et d'autres ne sont pas suffisamment peuplées.

Sud. — Cette partie de la province se trouve sous la juridiction de Suo-Laon Rao. Bien que les champs soient fertiles et propres à la culture du pavot, la population a observé strictement la loi d'interdiction, car les cultures de pavots seraient facilement découvertes en raison de la proximité de la capitale.

Est. — Dans cette région, la population est peu dense et des régions très étendues sont entièrement désertes. Mais de l'autre côté de la rivière se trouve la frontière russe, qui échappe à la juridiction des autorités chinoises. Des mesures ont été prises pour empêcher la contrebande.

Sud-Est. — C'est la région des forêts. Il est plutôt difficile d'assurer le respect de la loi d'interdiction, mais le gouverneur militaire a établi des petits postes de soldats pour empêcher la culture du pavot.

ANNEXE 7.

LISTE DE DIVERS PRODUITS CHIMIQUES DONT LES EFFETS SONT ANALOGUES A CEUX DE LA MORPHINE OU DE LA COCAÏNE.

(Fournie par le Gouvernement français).

Paris, le 12 avril 1922.

1. *Produits dont les effets sont analogues à ceux de la morphine :*

Dionine ou chlorhydrate d'éthylmorphine,
Péronine ou chlorhydrate de benzylmorphine,
Apomorphine,
Eupomorphine ou brométhylate d'apomorphine.

2. *Produits dont les effets sont analogues à ceux de la cocaïne :*

Cocaïne artificielle : éthylbenzoylégonine ou cocaéthylque, propylbenzoylégonine, butylbenzoylégonine, cinnamylecocaïne.

Holocaïne ou paradichoxyéthényldéphenylamidine (3 ou 4 fois plus toxique que la cocaïne).

Eucaïne A ou pentaméthylbenzoyloxypipéridine.

Eucaïne B ou triméthylbenzoyloxypipéridine.

Euphtalmine ou phénylglycolyméthylvinylidiacetone alkasmine.

Novocaïne ou chlorhydrate de paraaminobenzoyldiéthylamine éthanol.

Anesthesine ou paraamidobenzoate d'éthyle.

Subcutine ou paraphenolsulfonate d'anesthesine.

Antéinésine et antiron.

Alypine ou chlorhydrate de benzoyltétraméthylldiaminopentonal.

Strovaïne ou chlorhydrate de l'adiméthylamine benzoylpentonal.

Tropacocaïne.

La plupart de ces produits, qui sont des composés synthétiques, ne rentrent pas dans les catégories de produits visés par la Convention de 1912. La Commission de l'opium pourra, conformément à la décision du Conseil du 12 octobre 1921, examiner s'il ne conviendrait pas d'étendre à tous ces produits les dispositions de la Convention de 1912.

ANNEXE 8.

Lettre du Directeur du Bureau International de l'Union Postale Universelle.

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL
DE
L'UNION POSTALE UNIVERSELLE

Berne, le 23 mars 1922.

MONSIEUR LE SECRÉTAIRE,

Vous avez bien voulu, par lettre du 17 mars courant, N° 12 A/12494/1717, me demander, à l'occasion des travaux de la Section de l'Opium de la Société des Nations, de vous communiquer les renseignements dont je pourrais disposer, concernant les pays de l'Union postale universelle qui acceptent les envois d'opium effectués dans un but médical, sous forme de colis postaux ou de boîtes avec valeur déclarée, et ceux qui ne les acceptent pas.

J'ai l'honneur de vous adresser ci-joint un exemplaire de la circulaire par laquelle j'ai eu l'occasion de fournir aux Administrations de l'Union un certain nombre de renseignements à ce sujet (Annexe 1).

J'ai en même temps l'avantage de vous communiquer, par note également ci-jointe, les renseignements complémentaires qui me sont parvenus depuis la publication de cette circulaire (Annexe 2).

Dans le cas où ces renseignements pourraient vous être utiles, mon Bureau ne manquerait pas de vous transmettre, si vous m'en exprimiez le désir, un exemplaire des circulaires qu'il serait encore amené à publier à ce sujet.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Secrétaire, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

Pour le Directeur :
le Vice-Directeur,
ROTTNER.

Monsieur le Secrétaire du Comité consultatif
du Trafic de l'Opium,
Société des Nations, Genève.

APPENDICE

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL
DE
L'UNION POSTALE UNIVERSELLE.

Objet. — Convention principale,
valeurs déclarées et colis
postaux, envois de mor-
phine, etc.

MONSIEUR,

Par circulaire du 31 octobre 1921, n° 6633/334, relative aux envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants, j'ai eu l'honneur de prier les Administrations de l'Union de vouloir bien me faire connaître si elles admettaient les envois de l'espèce effectués dans un but médical, soit sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée, soit sous forme de colis postaux (Arrangement de Madrid concernant l'échange des lettres et des boîtes avec valeur déclarée, article 9, § 2, lettre *d*, et Convention des colis postaux, article 15, § 1, lettre *b*).

J'ai l'avantage de vous communiquer ci-après les réponses qui me sont parvenues jusqu'à ce jour:

Belgique.

L'opium, la cocaïne, la morphine et autres stupéfiants peuvent être expédiés en Belgique sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée ou de colis postaux aux conditions suivantes:

1^o Lorsque les envois sont adressés aux pharmaciens tenant officine, ainsi qu'aux médecins ou médecins-vétérinaires, tenant un dépôt de médicaments;

2^o Lorsqu'ils sont adressés aux personnes qui en ont fait la déclaration préalable au Ministère de l'Intérieur belge et moyennant production de l'accusé de réception détaillé reçu du dit Ministère.

Bulgarie.

L'Office bulgare admet à l'importation les envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants effectués dans un but médical, sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée et de colis postaux, à condition qu'ils soient destinés exclusivement aux pharmaciens.

Il y a lieu de rappeler, toutefois, que le service des boîtes avec valeur déclarée est suspendu dans les relations avec la Bulgarie.

République Dominicaine.

L'importation d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants, sous une forme quelconque, est interdite sauf autorisation spéciale du Gouvernement de la République Dominicaine.

Egypte.

L'Office d'Egypte admet l'opium brut, la morphine, la cocaïne et autres stupéfiants importés dans un but médical sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée ou de colis postaux.

Par suite, les articles de l'espèce ne peuvent être retirés que par:

1^o Les pharmaciens reconnus par le Gouvernement;

2^o Les personnes munies d'un permis d'importation général ou spécial délivré par l'Administration des Services sanitaires;

3^o Les personnes munies d'un permis de vente du Ministère de l'Intérieur.

Grande-Bretagne.

L'Office britannique fait connaître que l'importation en Grande-Bretagne d'opium préparé (prepared opium), c'est-à-dire d'opium à fumer, y compris le *dross* et tous autres résidus restant après que l'opium a été fumé, est absolument interdite.

L'opium brut, y compris l'opium en poudre et l'opium en grains, l'opium médicinal, — c'est-à-dire l'opium qui a été artificiellement desséché, — la morphine, la cocaïne, l'ecgonine et la diamorphine (ordinairement désignée sous le nom d'héroïne) et leurs sels respectifs, ainsi que toute préparation, tout mélange, extrait ou autre substance ne contenant pas moins de 1/5 de 1 pour cent de morphine, ou de 1/10 de 1 pour cent de cocaïne, d'ecgonine ou de diamorphine, peuvent être importés en Grande-Bretagne, au moyen de boîtes assurées et de colis postaux assurés, lorsque les destinataires ont préalablement obtenu une autorisation du sous-secrétaire d'Etat du Ministère de l'Intérieur à Londres.

Une communication ultérieure fera connaître les règlements en vigueur à ce sujet dans les Colonies représentées, au sein de l'Union, par le *Postmaster General*.

Canada.

L'exportation ou l'importation d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants est interdite par la voie de la poste.

Union de l'Afrique du Sud.

Les envois d'opium, de morphine, etc., sont admis dans un but médical, mais seulement sous forme de colis postaux, à condition qu'ils soient adressés à un pharmacien enregistré (registered chemist) et qu'un permis ait été préalablement obtenu du Département de la Salubrité publique à Prétoria.

Honduras (République).

L'importation en Honduras d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne, etc., dans un but médical, n'est pas interdite.

Norvège.

L'importation des stupéfiants ne peut avoir lieu que dans un but médical et seulement par les apothicaires et les marchands de drogues. Les envois de l'espèce peuvent être importés sous forme de colis postaux, l'Office de Norvège ne participant pas, pour le moment, à l'échange des boîtes avec valeur déclarée.

Pays-Bas.

L'importation de l'opium et de ses dérivés, y compris l'opium brut, l'opium préparé, l'opium médicinal, la morphine, l'héroïne et la cocaïne, est admise sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée et sous forme de colis postaux, lorsque les envois de l'espèce sont effectués dans un but médical et adressés à des pharmaciens, des médecins-pharmaciens, des vétérinaires, ou aux personnes autorisées par le Ministère du Travail.

Pologne.

L'importation en Pologne d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants dans un but médical est admise sous forme de colis postaux.

L'importation des envois de l'espèce est autorisée à condition que le destinataire ait obtenu auparavant la permission des autorités administratives polonaises.

Etat serbe-croate-slovène.

L'importation de l'opium, de la morphine et de la cocaïne dans un but médical est admise sous la double réserve que ces substances soient expédiées sous forme de colis postaux et adressées à des pharmaciens ou droguistes.

Suède.

L'importation d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants, expédiés dans un but médical, est admise sous forme de colis postaux. (L'Office de Suède ne participe pas à l'échange des boîtes avec valeur déclarée.)

Tchécoslovaquie.

L'importation en Tchécoslovaquie de l'opium, de la morphine, de la cocaïne et autres stupéfiants est admise tant sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée que sous forme de colis postaux.

Au sujet des documents nécessaires pour l'importation des dites préparations, il appartient à l'expéditeur de s'entendre avec le destinataire avant d'expédier son envoi.

Tunisie.

Les envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants effectués dans un but médical sont admis à l'importation par l'Office tunisien, sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée et sous forme de colis postaux.

Je ne manquerai pas de publier les renseignements qui me parviendraient encore concernant le même objet.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

Le Directeur :
(Signé) DECOPPET.

APPENDICE

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL
DE
L'UNION POSTALE UNIVERSELLE

Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

L'importation d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants est absolument prohibée aux Etats-Unis, aussi bien par colis postaux que par les malles postales régulières. (Les Etats-Unis ne participent pas à l'Arrangement concernant l'échange des lettres et des boîtes avec valeur déclarée.)

Finlande.

L'opium, la morphine, la cocaïne et autres stupéfiants ne peuvent être importés en Finlande que par les personnes qui exercent le métier de pharmacien ou celui de droguiste, par un établissement scientifique public, ainsi que par les industriels et les artistes qui, dans leur métier ou leur art, ont besoin d'employer de tels poisons. Aux bureaux de douane, ces matières ne sont livrées aux industriels et aux artistes que si ceux-ci présentent un certificat de l'Administration des industries que ce poison est nécessaire pour l'exercice de leur métier ou de leur art, et ce certificat doit avoir été délivré au cours des six derniers mois.

Puisque la Finlande ne participe point à l'échange des boîtes avec valeur déclarée, ces stupéfiants ne peuvent être envoyés que dans des colis postaux.

Inde britannique.

L'importation par la poste d'opium brut, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants est absolument prohibée.

France.

Indépendamment des autorisations à obtenir et des formalités à remplir par les importateurs auprès des autorités françaises compétentes, l'importation en France de substances telles que l'opium, la morphine, la cocaïne et autres stupéfiants est soumise aux dispositions ci-après:

Ces substances doivent être renfermées dans des enveloppes ou récipients portant inscrits, avec les noms et adresses de l'expéditeur et du destinataire, le nom et la qualité des dites substances, en caractères noirs très apparents, sur une étiquette rouge-orange, fixée de telle sorte qu'elle ne puisse être volontairement détachée.

Ces inscriptions doivent, en outre, être accompagnées de la mention « *Poison* » portée sur une bande de même couleur faisant le tour de l'enveloppe ou du récipient.

Sous réserve de l'application de ces dispositions, l'importation en France des substances ci-dessus mentionnées est admise sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée ou de colis postaux.

Chine.

La Chine admet les envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants, effectués dans un but médical, sous forme de colis postaux.

Les destinataires de ces colis postaux doivent être munis d'un permis spécial délivré par les autorités douanières.

L'importation des substances susmentionnées n'est pas admise sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée.

Maroc (à l'exclusion de la zone espagnole).

Cet Office autorise l'importation, sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée ou sous forme de colis postaux, des envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants effectués dans un but médical, sous réserve de la justification d'emploi de ces substances.

Perse.

Cet Office admet les envois d'opium, de morphine, de cocaïne et autres stupéfiants effectués dans un but médical, sous forme de boîtes avec valeur déclarée et de colis postaux. Cette importation dans un but médical est subordonnée, en ce qui concerne la morphine et ses dérivés, à une autorisation du Gouvernement persan. L'importation de l'opium n'est admise que moyennant une autorisation du Conseil sanitaire persan.

La Perse admet l'exportation de l'opium pour les destinataires qui se conforment aux règlements en vigueur dans les pays de destination. La Perse a suspendu provisoirement sa participation à l'exécution de l'Arrangement concernant les lettres et boîtes avec valeur déclarée.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

O. C. 47/1.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM TO THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE, APRIL 1922

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium held its second meeting on April 19th to 29th, 1922. The following were present :

Government Representatives.

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

Assessors.

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

Secretary.

Dame Rachel CROWDY.

The function of the Committee is " to assist and advise the Council in dealing with any questions that may arise " in connection with the exercise by the League of the general supervision over the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs entrusted to it by Article 23 of the Covenant of the League (Resolution adopted by the Assembly on December 15th, 1920).

The Committee is also required by the same Resolution to " present to the Council, for submission to the Assembly " at its annual meeting, " a report on all matters regarding the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs."

At its first meeting in May, 1921, the Committee drew up a questionnaire to be issued to all Governments in order to obtain the information, which would enable it to present to the Council a full report on the present position in regard to the traffic and the measures taken to control the production, distribution and use of the drugs. This questionnaire was issued in June and it was hoped that the replies would be received by the Secretariat before the end of the year. Unfortunately, many of the replies were not received until shortly before the present meeting of the Committee and some were in fact only received during the course of the meeting. This, and the fact that a number of the reports were made in the language of the country, and not in one or other of the official languages, rendered it impossible for the Secretariat in the short time available for the work

to analyse and examine adequately the large amount of important information received, and the Committee have experienced considerable difficulty in attempting to review the general situation at the present time.

A still greater difficulty has arisen from the fact that the Governments were unable, in many cases, to furnish statistics as to the manufacture, import, export and distribution of the drugs, as the Convention had only been brought into effect in 1920-21, and arrangements for the collection of statistical information on the subject had not previously existed.

Moreover, no information has been received from a number of Members of the League¹, including the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and Persia, which are important opium-growing countries, nor has any information been received from the United States of America, which is one of the largest importing and manufacturing countries.

A general review of the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs is therefore not yet possible.

All countries which are parties to the Convention are being asked, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee, approved by the Assembly, to make an annual report to the League on the execution in their territory of the provisions of the Opium Convention with statistics of production, manufacture and trade, and the Committee expect that the reports for 1921 and still more the reports of 1922 will give much more complete information.

The Committee, at its present meeting, have, in order to indicate to the Governments the nature and extent of the information desired and to facilitate the work of the Committee by obtaining the information as far as possible in a uniform manner, agreed upon a form of report which they recommend for adoption by the Governments². (Annex 1.)

The Committee have referred to the fact that no information has been forthcoming from the Government of the United States of America. The United States, though not a Member of the League, has, under Article 21 of the Opium Convention, agreed like the other signatory Powers, to communicate through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Netherlands :

“(a) The texts of the existing laws and administrative regulations respecting the matters referred to in the present Convention or promulgated in virtue of the clauses thereof ;

“(b) Statistical information as regards the trade in raw opium, prepared opium, morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, as well as in the other drugs or their salts or preparations referred to in the present Convention.”

The statistical information which, as far as the Committee are aware, has not yet been furnished, would be of the greatest value, and they recommend that the Netherlands Government should be asked to make application for it to the United States Government. The Committee venture to express the hope that means may be found before long by which the co-operation of the United States in the work of giving full effect to the provisions of the Opium Convention of 1912, in the framing of which they took so large a part, may be secured. The Committee feel that they cannot emphasise too strongly that it is only by the fullest international co-operation that a traffic which is world-wide in its ramifications can be effectively controlled.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Assembly last September, the Council invited the Governments of Germany and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State to appoint representatives on the Committee. Dr. Anselmi o, of the German Health Department, was accordingly appointed by the German Government, and the Committee desire to express their sense of the great value of his assistance.

Replies have not yet been received from the following :

Members of the League and Parties to the Convention :

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Bolivia | 5. Liberia | 8. Serb-Croat-Slovene State |
| 2. Brazil | 6. Nicaragua | 9. Sweden |
| 3. Cuba | 7. Peru | 10. Uruguay |
| 4. Honduras | | |

Members of the League but not Parties to the Convention :

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| 11. Argentine | 14. Costa Rica | 17. Persia |
| 12. Chile | 15. Finland | 18. Salvador |
| 13. Colombia | 16. Paraguay | |

¹ N.B.—The reports should reach the Secretariat each year not later than July 1st (in the case of Western States) and October 1st (in the case of Far-Eastern States). It will greatly facilitate the work of the Advisory Committee if these dates can be observed, and if the reports can be made in one or other of the official languages — French or English. Fifteen copies of the report should be sent.

They regret that no reply to the invitation of the Council has been received from the Government of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

The Committee in this report confine themselves to the chief matters which have engaged their consideration.

PRESENT POSITION IN REGARD TO THE RATIFICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION.

At the time of the meeting of the Assembly last September the following Members of the League had not ratified the Opium Convention nor signed the Fourth Protocol bringing the Convention into force :

Albania, Argentine, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Esthonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, and Switzerland ;

and the States of Denmark and Venezuela, though they had ratified the Convention, had not signed the Fourth Protocol. Since that date, the States of Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland and Lithuania have put, or announced their intention of putting, the Convention into force.

It is important that all the other Members which have not yet taken steps to put the Convention into force should do so as speedily as possible. Any country which remains outside the Convention is liable to be made a centre of illicit traffic. The Committee would urge in particular the importance of securing the adherence of Switzerland and Persia to the Convention. It is understood that the constitutional difficulties have so far prevented Switzerland from putting the Convention into effect, the regulation of the trade in dangerous drugs being a matter within the province of the Cantonal Governments and not of the Federal Government ; but the matter is under the consideration of the Government¹. There was evidence before the Committee that Switzerland is a considerable exporter of the drugs. Persia signed the Convention of 1912 but with a reservation in regard to Article 3 (a), which requires the Contracting Powers to "take measures to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry," and she has not so far ratified the Convention. Persia is a Member of the League and her representative at the Assembly 1. st September took part in the work of the Committee which considered the opium question and agreed to its recommendations. There is an important export trade in Persian opium and the Committee ask the Council to urge the Persian Government to adhere to the Convention in its entirety and to put its provisions into force with as little delay as possible.

Of the States which are not Members of the League and which have not yet put the Convention into force, the most important country from the point of view of the opium traffic is Turkey. The ratification of the Convention was made one of the terms of the Treaty of Sèvres and the Committee desire to call the attention of the Council to the importance of securing the insertion of a similar provision in any fresh treaty which may be concluded.

Generally, the Committee again invite the Council to press the question of bringing the Convention into force on all States which have not yet done so. In the case of States which are not yet Members of the League, the good offices of the Netherlands Government might be invoked.

A table showing the position of all States in regard to ratification of the Convention is appended to this Report (see Annex 2).

SYSTEM OF IMPORTATION CERTIFICATES.

Closely connected with the foregoing question is that of the adoption of the system of importation certificates which was recommended by the Advisory Committee last year and unanimously approved by the Assembly. The

¹ The Committee suggest that, if there is likely to be any further delay in regard to the ratification of the Convention by Switzerland, the Swiss Government should be invited to put into force the system of importation certificates without waiting for ratification.

Committee regret that very little progress has been made with the introduction of the system up to the present.

It will be remembered that this system was recommended as the most effective way of enabling the State to carry out their obligations under the Convention in regard to the control of exports and imports¹; but its success depends on its being generally adopted. It is obvious that if some States adopt the system and others not, foreign buyers will tend to send their orders to the States from which they can obtain the drugs without the necessity of furnishing an "importation certificate." Complaints are already being received by Governments of countries which have introduced the system that the business of their traders is being prejudiced. It appeared that a certain amount of misapprehension existed as to the nature of the certificate required to be given by the Government of an importing country. The system requires an importer of the drugs to obtain from his Government in the case of each consignment imported, a certificate that the import of that consignment is approved by the Government and is required solely for medicinal or scientific (or, in the case of raw opium, for legitimate) purposes. Some Governments appear to have understood that this meant they had to guarantee that no illegitimate use would be made of the drugs when imported. An absolute guarantee of this kind cannot of course be given. All that is required or expected is that the Government should be satisfied that the imports are within the limits of the legitimate requirements of the country and that the persons applying for permission to import are persons engaged in carrying on a legitimate trade in the drugs and are of good repute.

The Committee hope that this explanation will remove the difficulties which have been felt in some quarters, and that all States Members of the League will now see their way to bring the system into operation.

It would greatly facilitate the application of the system if a fixed date could be arranged on which the system should come into effect. The Committee suggest that September 1st of this year should be adopted as the date by countries in Europe, America, Africa and Australia, and January 1st, 1923, by other countries.

The Committee have also prepared a form of importation certificate (Annex 4) which they recommend for general adoption by the Governments. A Government desiring to adopt a form of certificate of a more stringent character (*e. g.*, with a clause prohibiting re-exportation) would, of course, be at liberty to do so.

CONTROL OF PRODUCTION OF RAW OPIUM AND DANGEROUS DRUGS.

(a) *Morphine, Cocaine, Heroin and Medicinal Opium.*

At the meeting of the Committee last year, it was pointed out that one difficulty with which the Parties to the Convention were faced in carrying out their obligation to limit the use of the drugs to medical and other legitimate uses (Chapter III of the Convention) was the want of information as to the actual medical and other legitimate requirements of the various countries.

As long as the drugs are produced in quantities exceeding the legitimate requirements there is a grave danger that, whatever measures of control may be enforced, the surplus will find its way into illegitimate channels.

They accordingly recommend that an enquiry should, if possible, be made to determine approximately the average legitimate requirements of these drugs in various countries, and the International Health Committee of the League was asked by the Council to undertake it.

The Health Committee have, unfortunately, not been able to carry their investigations very far up to the present date. Very great difficulties were experienced, we are informed, in framing any scheme for obtaining data as to the extent to which the drugs are used in legitimate medical practice in large and populous countries, such as Great Britain or France, where, moreover, the question is complicated by the fact that a large export business is carried on in the drugs and their preparations. In the first instance, the Health Committee decided to obtain the "experience of a few civilised countries, relatively small in population, in which, so far as it is known, little if any material abuse of these drugs exists."

¹ See Explanatory Memorandum circulated by the Secretariat which is printed in Annex 3.

Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Australia and New Zealand were the countries selected. The results of these enquiries are summarised in the memorandum by Sir George BUCHANAN and Dr. CARRIÈRE, which is appended to this report (Annex 5). It will be seen that the results, though they throw some light on the question, do not enable any general conclusions to be drawn. Considerable variations indeed must be expected between the experience of different countries, as medical theories regarding the employment of the drugs vary, and the consumption in any country also depends on the nature of the diseases prevalent and on the morbidity rate. The experience, for instance, of the requirements in European countries is little guide to the requirements in an Eastern country.

The Advisory Committee hope that the Health Committee will pursue their enquiries. They are also of the opinion that a careful statistical study over a series of years of the returns supplied by the Governments of their imports, exports, etc., will throw considerable light on the problem, and they recommend that this should be undertaken by the Secretariat.

(b) *Raw Opium.*

The Assembly at its meeting last September adopted a resolution to the following effect :

“ That in view of the world-wide interest in the attitude of the League of Nations towards the Opium Question and of the general desire to reduce and restrict the cultivation and production of opium to legitimate purposes, the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium be requested to consider and report, at its next meeting, on the possibility of instituting an enquiry to determine approximately the average requirements of raw opium for legitimate purposes in different countries. ”

The Committee find it difficult to suggest any means by which a reliable estimate can be reached at the present time. In the Western countries the amount of raw opium required for legitimate purposes depends mainly on the amount of medicinal opium and opium derivatives used in medical practice, and, as has been seen above, it has not been found possible yet to arrive at any definite conclusion on this point.

The amount required for semi-medicinal use by the general population in certain Oriental countries, which was recognised by the Fifth Committee of the Assembly last September as legitimate, could be stated for India, but there is no means of ascertaining the amount consumed in this way in other countries, *e.g.*, Persia.

The Committee suggest that, as a first step, each Government should be asked to state what it estimates the total requirements for domestic consumption in the country and its dependencies to be. In many cases, no doubt, only the roughest approximation could be given.

They have accordingly adopted the following resolution :

“ The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium recommends that the Council should invite the Governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912, and other States Members of the League, to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption per annum of opium and its derivatives, indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required, and in the case of opium derivatives the amounts should be given in terms of morphine content.

“ The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far-Eastern countries, where the Chinese are the principal consumers, should be available by that date. ”

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN REGARD TO COMPLAINTS OF THE NON-OBSERVANCE OF THE CONVENTION.

The Committee have had under consideration the procedure to be followed when complaints are received by the League of Nations of the non-observance of the Convention or of abuses in connection with the traffic. It is probable that in most cases the Council would decide in the first instance to bring the matter complained of to the notice of the Government of the State concerned, and invite it to furnish its observations and particulars of any action taken or proposed. If the matter was not cleared up in this way, further enquiries might be necessary in order that the League might be fully informed in regard to the matter, and if these enquiries had to be made on the spot, as may be possible in some cases, the Committee suggest that such enquiry could best be carried out by an agreement between the League and the Government concerned to appoint a joint commission of enquiry on which both would be represented.

They have embodied this suggestion in the following general resolution which they have adopted and recommend for the consideration of the Council. (The course of the Committee's discussions show that it is desirable to have the general principle of such enquiries recognised in advance.)

“ That the Council of the League should, if the necessity arises, invite the Governments of States which are Parties to the Convention to facilitate the carrying out in their territories of joint investigations by commissions, appointed partly by the Government concerned and partly by the Council of the League, into any question arising under the Opium Convention.”

FAR-EASTERN PROBLEM.

Cultivation of the poppy in China.

The Committee had under consideration at its last meeting, the new situation which had arisen in China through the revival of the cultivation of the poppy. They considered that this had a very important bearing on the execution of the Convention, and, on the suggestion of Sir John JORDAN, they recommended that the Treaty Powers should be invited to instruct their consular representative in the provinces, subject to the consent of the Central Government, to make strong representations to the Provincial Governors who were mainly responsible for the revival of the cultivation.

When the matter came before the Council and Assembly, the representative of China stated that the Chinese Government had decided to appoint special Commissioners to investigate the situation in the provinces concerned; and the Council and Assembly therefore decided to take no action on the Committee's recommendation before the reports of the Chinese Commissioners had been made. These reports have not yet been communicated in full to the League, but the Chinese representative on the Advisory Committee submitted a summary of the reports, which appears in Annex 6. According to these reports there has been no revival of opium cultivation except on a very small scale, and in isolated cases, where there has been some revival, it has immediately been suppressed. The tenor of the Chinese Government's reply to the questionnaire which was received early this year was to the same effect. Towards the close of last year the British Government issued a Blue Book containing correspondence respecting the cultivation of opium in China, the last despatch in which is dated June 30th, 1921. This Blue Book contains a mass of evidence as to the revival of cultivation in many provinces. Evidence to the same effect will be found in the report of the Chinese Maritime Customs for 1920, and the information in these publications is also confirmed by the information on Szechuan and Yunnan in the possession of the French Government, which was supplied to us by the French representative on the Committee. The Committee feel it is impossible to reconcile the extremely favourable reports presented by the Chinese Commissioners with the state of things disclosed in these publications.

The Committee regret they can only come to the conclusion—a conclusion in which Sir John JORDAN concurs—that at the present moment there is a large and widespread cultivation of the poppy in China. They have accordingly adopted the following resolution :

“ The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium of the League of Nations :

“ Having considered the reports, as communicated by the Chinese representative on the Committee, of the enquiries instituted by the Chinese Government into the alleged revival of opium cultivation in various provinces, and having had regard to the time at which, the conditions under which, and the position of certain of the persons by whom the enquiries were made, and to the fact that certain important provinces had not been covered, and having compared the reports with the information contained in the Blue Book issued by the British Government and with other information before the Committee,

“ Regrets that, while gladly acknowledging that in certain provinces efforts have been made by the authorities to enforce the prohibition of opium, it is forced to the conclusion that there is a large and widespread revival both of the cultivation and use of opium in China¹.”

MORPHINE SMUGGLING IN THE FAR EAST.

This was one of the most serious questions which the Committee had to consider. There is a large body of evidence that in recent years morphine has been introduced illicitly into China on an enormous scale and that the morphine habit has become widespread, particularly in the provinces of North China. This state of things has become a matter of the gravest anxiety to the Chinese Government and to all who are interested in the welfare of China. Though complete information as to the extent of the traffic, or the channels by which it is carried on is not in the possession of the Committee, there is reason to suppose, from the records of seizures by the Chinese Customs and other sources of information, that at the present time the traffic is largely in the hands of Japanese traders. The Committee feel strongly that the matter is one in which the strongest and most energetic measures are necessary.

The Committee's task has been considerably facilitated by the very full information which has been given by the Japanese Government in reply to the League's questionnaire both as to the quantities of morphine imported into Japan or manufactured in Japan, and as to the measures which, since the beginning of 1921, the Japanese Government has been taking to control the traffic; and also by the attitude taken up by the Japanese representative on the Committee on behalf of his Government. He admitted that smuggling had been carried on between Japan and North China, though to what extent the Japanese Government were unable to state, as previous to 1921 there had been no regulations concerning import, export or production; and expressed the intentions of his Government to do all in its power to stop the illicit traffic. He stated that the Japanese Government would earnestly desire to have the close co-operation of the exporting countries in the matter of the control of the traffic in dangerous drugs. He also said that the Japanese Government would welcome the assistance of representatives of the League in carrying out any investigations that might be thought necessary.

It is clear from the figures supplied by the Japanese Government in its reply to the questionnaire that Japan has been importing, for several years past, quantities of morphine far in excess of the normal legitimate requirements of Japan itself. The following table shows the quantities imported and manufactured during the past eleven years in pounds :

¹ Certain passages from this Section of the Report are for the time being omitted pending reconsideration by the Advisory Committee.

| Year. | Imported. | Manufactured. | |
|-------|-----------|---------------|----------|
| | | Japan. | Formosa. |
| 1910 | 1,387 | — | — |
| 1911 | 1,830 | — | — |
| 1912 | 2,013 | — | — |
| 1913 | 5,695 | — | — |
| 1914 | 11,295 | — | — |
| 1915 | 22,408 | 100 | 1,290 |
| 1916 | 37,131 | 600 | 6,340 |
| 1917 | 37,294 | 1,190 | 6,548 |
| 1918 | 10,229 | 2,134 | 4,450 |
| 1919 | 25,566 | 4,820 | 3,101 |
| 1920 | 48,689 | 7,833 | 8,018 |

After making allowance for the increase in the medical requirements during and after the war, the Committee can feel little doubt that much of this morphine has found its way into China.

They note the promise of the Japanese Government, conveyed through its representative, to make the strictest possible investigation into the present illicit traffic; and they suggest that very close co-operation should be established between the Chinese Maritime Customs and the Japanese authorities so that in all cases of seizure of morphine coming from Japan, the morphine may be traced back to its source and the necessary measures taken by the Japanese authorities.

The Committee desire to call attention to the fact that the Japanese figures of imports from certain countries are much larger than the quantities shown as exported from those countries to Japan. It is very desirable that the causes of these discrepancies should be ascertained.

USE OF PREPARED OPIUM.

The Committee have postponed to their next meeting the consideration of the question of the gradual suppression of the use of prepared opium, in accordance with Chapter II of the Convention, as the information in their possession is not yet complete. This is a question which, in the main, concerns only those places in the Far East where there are large resident communities of Chinese. In the meantime, they hope that the information to be supplied by the Governments of the countries concerned in reply to the invitation to state their estimated requirements of raw opium will assist the consideration of the subject.

GENERAL CONTROL OF THE TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

The Committee regret that they are not able to report as fully as they could have wished on this subject, of the importance of which they are aware. The statistics as to the manufacture and distribution of the drugs which have been furnished to the Committee are at present very incomplete; in particular, no statistics as to manufacture have been supplied by several important manufacturing countries. They have not been in a position therefore either to form an estimate of the total world production of the drugs or to consider closely the machinery and channels of distribution. Attention was specially called to the importance of the question by the Delegate of France at the last meeting of the Assembly, and it is notorious that a large illicit traffic is being carried on in the countries of Western Europe and America as well as in the Far East, particularly in morphine and cocaine. In spite of the activity of the police and the heavy penalties imposed, the traffic is extremely difficult to check on account of the ease with which the drugs can be secretly conveyed, and so far it appears to have proved impossible to discover the means by which the drugs are obtained or the persons by whom the traffic is organised. Here too it seems clear that the most effective method of putting a stop to the traffic is to control production. In the case of cocaine this should not be a difficult matter. The manufacture of cocaine is an elaborate process and can only be undertaken by expert chemists. Cocaine also is employed to a much smaller extent and for a much more limited number of purposes than morphine, and it should accordingly be easier to

arrive at an approximate estimate of the world's requirements. The Committee accordingly recommends that a special effort should be made by the Secretariat to complete the information with regard to cocaine as soon as possible, particularly in regard to the places of manufacture, statistics of production and channels of distribution and that the Governments should also be asked to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of the drug in their respective countries.

The experience of different countries shows that in consequence of the enormous profits realised by illicit traffic, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent and the Committee suggests that the question of providing for substantial sentences of imprisonment as an alternative penalty should be considered by the Governments.

It is very desirable that, with a view to discovering the channels of the illicit traffic in the drugs, information as to all seizures by the Customs or police authorities (where the place at which the drug was manufactured and the country from which it has been obtained are known) should be communicated to the Government of the country concerned so that full investigation may be made.

It also seems worth the consideration of the Health Departments of the various Governments whether educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs should not be undertaken.

The Canadian Government have pointed out, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General, the desirability of obtaining, in addition to other statistical information, information as to the stocks of various drugs in any country on a given date. The Committee felt that there would be a very great difficulty in taking such an inventory in countries where the number of retailers authorised to sell the drugs is very large, and that the most that can be done is to obtain the stocks in the hands of the wholesalers. Even so, the information will be difficult to obtain, as a considerable amount of the drugs is made up into, and stocked in, the form of preparations. The Committee have postponed making a definite recommendation on the matter until the statistics already obtained or about to be obtained as to production and distribution have been thoroughly examined, but they agree that it would be desirable that the Governments should consider how far it would be possible to obtain the information as to stocks suggested by the Canadian Government.

At the meeting of the Assembly last September, the Delegate of France called attention to the growing use by drug takers of other drugs not at present covered by the International Opium Convention, and on his suggestion the Assembly adopted a resolution recommending that the Council should request the Advisory Committee to "extend their investigations to include not only the drugs mentioned in the Convention of 1912, but also all dangerous drugs of whatever origin which produce similar effects and to advise as to the desirability of convoking a further international Conference of States which are Parties to the Convention as well as States Members of the League of Nations with a view to drawing up a Convention for the suppression of the abuse of such drugs".

The French Government was requested by the Secretariat to supply a list of drugs which had been found in France to be specially liable to abuse and the list supplied by the French Government has been laid before the Committee (Annex 7). It was only received, however, a few days before the meeting of the Committee, and there has been no time to examine the matter in detail or to obtain the observations of the different Governments. The Committee recommend that the list should be referred to the interested Governments for the observations of their Health Departments and, pending the receipt of this information, the Committee have postponed the consideration of the question of a further international conference. It will be seen that some of the drugs included in the list are derivatives of morphine and under the provisions of the Convention (Article 14) "all new derivatives of morphine, cocaine or their respective salts and every other alkaloid of opium which may be shown by scientific research, generally recognised, to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill effects", are automatically brought under the operation of the Convention. It may be well to observe in passing that some of the drugs in the list are used as substitutes for morphine and cocaine and are regarded by medical opinion as being, at any rate, much less injurious. It will not be desirable, therefore, to place any obstacles in the way of their use unless the necessity for control is fully proved.

DISTRIBUTION OF DRUGS THROUGH THE POST.

At the last International Postal Conference held in Madrid in the autumn of 1920, it was agreed to prohibit the transmission by letter post of the drugs to which the International Opium Convention applies, and to permit transmission by parcel post or in boxes of declared value only to those countries which permit the importation of drugs in that way. The Secretariat has been furnished with information by the Director of the International Office of the Universal Postal Union as to the countries in the Postal Union which accept, and the countries which do not accept, consignments of drugs sent by parcel post or in boxes of declared value. (This information will be found in Annex 8.)

PROPAGANDA IN ORIENTAL COUNTRIES.

At the last meeting of the Assembly the delegate of Persia urged the desirability of the League undertaking propaganda work as to the danger to health resulting from the abuse of opium and other drugs. The Secretary-General invited the Director-General of the League of Red Cross Societies to furnish his views on the proposal and the Director-General has made the following suggestions :

“ The League of Red Cross Societies should address all those national Red Cross Societies which are especially interested either in the production, use or abuse of opium, and invite their sympathy and aid in, and invoke their advice as to the best means of organising a campaign of co-operation with, government measures to combat the abuse of opium.

“ The method upon which the League would rely, and which it would suggest to member societies, would be popular health instruction. As applied to opium, this would mean a campaign of education of the public designed to enlighten them as to the evil results ensuing from the abuse of opium. ”

The Committee cordially approve this suggestion, thank the League of Red Cross Societies for their offer and hope that they will find it possible to secure the co-operation of the national Red Cross Societies in educational work of the kind suggested.

The Director also states that an Oriental Red Cross Conference is to be held at Bangkok in November of this year and he has placed the subject of the opium traffic in a prominent position on the Agenda of the Conference. He proposes that the League of Nations should send a qualified representative to the Conference, and feels confident that if this could be done, very valuable suggestions may be made for co-operative action on the part of the Governments and the Red Cross Societies interested. The Committee do not think it probable that the League of Nations will be in a position at such short notice to send a representative to the Conference, but they hope that the subject will be fully discussed at the Conference. The Secretariat might offer to place at the disposal of the Director all necessary information in its possession on the subject.

OFFER OF ASSISTANCE FROM THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL.

The International Missionary Council, which represents Missionary Associations in all parts of the world and includes the Churches of India, China, Africa and other countries, has offered its assistance to the Committee by suggesting sources of information and itself securing information with regard to the problems with which the Committee has to deal. The Committee gladly accepted this offer.

BUDGET OF THE OPIUM SECRETARIAT.

The Committee have considered what provision should be made for the Opium Secretariat in the Budget for 1923, and they recommend that a sum of 96,250 Swiss francs should be appropriated for this work. This represents a slightly smaller provision than was made for the current financial year. The Committee desires to insist strongly on the necessity of maintaining an adequate staff for dealing with the work, if the League is to discharge the duty placed upon it by the Covenant. Apart from the heavy work of preparing for the meetings of the Committee and giving effect to the recommendations, the Secretariat will have to examine carefully the information supplied by the Governments in their annual reports and otherwise, and follow up any points that may arise. They will also have to act as a clearing-house for information in regard to the traffic. They consider that the provision made in the draft Budget is the minimum that will be sufficient for the purpose.

EXCHANGE OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

Article 21 of the Convention requires the Signatory Powers to communicate to one another the texts of their laws and administrative regulations. In the case of Members of the League, this exchange is now effected through the Secretariat. The number of these laws has become very large and the Committee think it would be sufficient and an economy both of time and money, if, instead of circulating all the documents received, the Secretariat issued periodically to the Governments a list of all the laws and regulations received, leaving it to each Government to ask for any laws and regulations it desires to receive. The Committee consider that no objection would be taken if the Netherlands Government thought fit to adopt the same procedure.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

The Advisory Committee have agreed to the following resolutions :

(1) That the Council of the League should be requested to urge on all States which have not yet done so, and in particular on Switzerland, Persia and Turkey, the desirability of bringing the Opium Convention of 1911 into force in its entirety without delay.

(2) That it is most desirable that the system of Importation Certificates unanimously adopted by the Council and the Assembly of the League should be brought into force by countries in Europe, America, Africa and Australia not later than September 1st, 1922, and by other countries not later than January 1st, 1923; and that the governments should be asked to adopt the form of Importation Certificate proposed by the Advisory Committee.

(3) That the Health Committee of the League of Nations should be asked by the Council to continue their enquiries into the requirements of the various countries of morphine and other dangerous drugs for medicinal and scientific purposes.

(4) That the Council should invite the governments of all States signatory to the Convention of 1912, and other States Members of the League, to furnish the Secretary-General of the League with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption *per annum* of opium and its derivatives, indicating separately, if possible, the quantities employed respectively for medicinal, scientific and other uses. The statement should distinguish the kinds of opium required and in the case of opium derivatives the amounts should be given in terms of morphine content.

The Advisory Committee is further of the opinion that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it is of particular importance that the quantities of opium required for consumption in Far-Eastern countries, where the Chinese are the principal consumers, should be available by that date.

(5) That the Council of the League should, if the necessity arises, invite the governments of States which are Parties to the Convention to facilitate the carrying out in their territories of joint investigations by commissions, appointed partly by the government concerned, and partly by the League, into any questions arising under the Opium Convention.

(6) (a) That the Committee, having considered the reports, as communicated by the Chinese representative on the Committee, of the enquiries instituted by the Chinese Government into the alleged revival of opium cultivation in various provinces, and having had regard to the time at which, the conditions under which, and the position of certain of the persons by whom the enquiries were made, and to the fact that certain important districts had not been covered and having compared the reports with the information contained in the Blue Book issued by the British Government and with other information before the Committee,

Regrets that while gladly acknowledging that in certain provinces efforts have been made by the authorities to enforce the prohibition of opium, it is forced to the conclusion that there is a large and widespread revival both of the cultivation and the use of opium in China ¹.

(7) That the Committee notes the promise of the Japanese Government, conveyed through its representative, to make the strictest possible investigation into the illicit traffic in morphine at present being carried on in the Far East; and it recommends that co-operation should be established between the Japanese authorities and the Chinese Maritime Customs, with a view to tracing the sources of contraband morphine. It is further desirable

¹ Certain paragraphs of this Resolution are omitted for the time being pending reconsideration by the Advisory Committee.

that the discrepancies between the Japanese import statistics and the export statistics of certain other countries should be cleared up.

(8) That, in order to facilitate the general control of the traffic in dangerous drugs, the Committee recommends :

(a) that the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible ;

(b) that the Council of the League should invite the governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries ;

(c) that the governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures made by their respective Customs and Police authorities ;

(d) that the governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in the drugs ;

(e) that, as experience shows that, in consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs, pecuniary penalties are no longer a sufficient deterrent, the governments should consider the question of providing for a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty ;

(f) that the list of drugs not covered by the Convention of 1912, communicated by the French Government, should be referred to the interested governments for their observations ; and that pending the receipt of such information, the question of holding a further International Conference should be postponed.

(9) That the offer of the League of Red Cross Societies to invite the National Red Cross Societies which are interested in the Opium question to undertake educational work as to the evil results of the abuse of opium should be accepted.

(10) That the Council should invite the governments, in making their annual report to the League on opium and other dangerous drugs, to adopt the form prepared by the Advisory Committee ; to furnish the report not later than July 1st (in the case of Western countries) ; and October 1st (in the case of Eastern countries) ; and to make the report in one or other of the official languages of the League.

(Signed) MALCOLM DELEIVINGNE (*Chairman*).
G. BOURGOIS (*Vice-Chairman*).

RACHEL E. CROWDY (*Secretary*).

ANNEX 1.

FORM OF ANNUAL REPORT BY GOVERNMENTS

As approved by the Advisory Committee on Opium (April 26th, 1922.)

To be forwarded to the Secretariat each year not later than July 1st (in the case of Western States) and October 1st (in the case of Far Eastern States).

REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR
ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND DANGEROUS DRUGS.

(1) A.—GENERAL.

Please mention any new legislation and important regulations and orders affecting the traffic in Opium and other dangerous drugs that have been issued during the year and any important changes in the administrative arrangements.

Please state particulars of any publication issued likely to be of interest to the Opium Advisory Committee.

(2) REGULATIONS OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Please give a full account of the working of the "Import Certificates" system, mentioning any difficulties which have arisen in carrying it out in regard both to :

- (a) export of the drugs from the country;
- (b) import of the drugs into the country;

What is the practice with regard to countries which have not yet adopted the system ?

(3) INTERNAL REGULATION OF THE MANUFACTURE, SALE, DISTRIBUTION, USE, ETC., OF THE DRUGS.

Please give particulars regarding any new points of interest or importance relating to the administration of the laws in force, and especially as to the prevalence of the drug habit ; difficulties in the application of the laws to particular cases ; difficulties in the enforcement of the laws, and particulars available of the illicit traffic carried on and the channels by, and the sources from which, this traffic is fed.

Please give such information as is possible regarding prosecutions and penalties imposed.

B.—PARTICULAR DRUGS.

(4) RAW OPIUM.

(a) If country is a producing country, please state acreage under cultivation, amount produced and average morphine content.

(b) Imports.

Please state names of ports approved during the year and amount of each kind of opium (*i.e.* European, Turkish, Persian, Indian, other) imported.

(c) Please state amount of each kind used in manufacture of :

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Medicinal opium,
- (3) Other medicinal preparations.

(d) *Other uses.*

Please state particulars of nature of use, amount used, etc.

(e) *Exports.*

Please state names of ports approved during the year and amount of each kind exported and to what destinations.

(5) **PREPARED OPIUM.**

(a) *Countries where import, manufacture and use of prepared opium is prohibited.*

Please state whether it has been found possible to suppress opium smoking:

- (1) among national population ;
- (2) among alien population.

If not, what nationalities are addicted, what is the nature of the difficulties which have been experienced in suppressing the practice ; and to what extent is opium illicitly introduced ?

What action has been taken to enforce the law ?

Please state number of prosecutions, etc.

Is the co-operation of any country necessary to effect the complete suppression, and if so, on what lines, and in what directions ?

(b) *Countries where use of prepared opium is not entirely prohibited.*

☒ Please state whether any change has been made in the system during the year, and what further steps, if any, have been taken towards suppression.

Please state, if possible, total amount of prepared opium consumed, price at which retailed, and particulars, if not already given, of the working of the system of control.

Where smokers are required to be licensed or registered, please state number of licensed or registered smokers.

State number of Chinese resident in the country, and, if smoking is prevalent among persons of any other nationality, the number of residents of that nationality as well. State also revenue, if any, derived from the sale of prepared opium and what proportion it bears to the total revenue of the country.

(6) **MORPHINE.**

(a) *Imports.*

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Salts of Morphine,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing morphine, imported from each country of supply. (In case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

(b) *Manufacture.*

Please give names of owners and situation of factories ; state amount of each kind of opium used ; percentage (if known) of morphine in the opium ; and amount of morphine or salts of morphine manufactured.

N. B. Include morphine subsequently converted into heroin, codeine or other substances, stating amount so converted.

(c) *Exports.*

Please state amount of

- (1) Morphine,
- (2) Salts of morphine,
- (3) Preparations, admixtures, etc., containing morphine, exported to each country of destination. (In the case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug contained.)

Draw attention to any increases or decreases in amounts exported to any country as compared with the preceding year.

(d) If possible please give statistics of home consumption of morphine for :

- (1) Medicinal,
- (2) Scientific purposes.

(e) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

(7) HEROIN.

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine (except as regards amount of raw opium used).

(8) MEDICINAL OPIUM.

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine.

(9) COCAINE.

(a) If the coca plant is grown, please state particulars of acreage planted, situation and names of owners of plantations ; exports of :

- (1) crude cocaine,
- (2) refined cocaine or its salts

to each country of destination ; prices of crude and refined cocaine and amount of crude cocaine and refined cocaine in stock at the end and the beginning of year.

(b) Amount imported of :

- (1) crude cocaine,
- (2) refined cocaine or its salts,
- (3) preparations, etc., containing cocaine (in case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of weight of drug contained) ;

(c) Please give names of owners, and situation of factories in which cocaine is extracted from the leaves or refined from crude cocaine ; and output of each firm, for the year.

(d) Please state classes of persons to whom permits or authorities for the use or possession of the drug have been granted.

(10) OTHER DRUGS TO WHICH THE CONVENTION IS HELD TO APPLY.

Please give the same particulars as in the case of morphine.

C.—MISCELLANEOUS.

(11) CHINA.

Please supply any information not hitherto submitted as to execution of Treaty provisions.

(12) INTERNATIONAL ACTION.

Please give references to any treaties or international arrangements made regarding opium or narcotic drugs during the year

(13) OTHER DRUGS.

Please state any facts of importance with regard to the use of drugs not mentioned in the foregoing questions and any action taken during the year in connection therewith.

(14) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND SUGGESTIONS.

.....
.....
.....
.....

In replying to questions (4) to (10), it is requested that information may be given as far as possible in the form of statistical tables. It should be stated whether or not goods in transit are included in the returns given of imports and exports.

N.B.—Countries are asked to supply corresponding information in respect of their Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, Leased Territories, Mandated Territories, etc.

ANNEX 2.

STATEMENT AS TO SIGNATURES AND RATIFICATIONS OF THE OPIUM CONVENTION.

| PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION | | | | MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE | | | NON-MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <i>States for which the Convention came into force before January 10th, 1920.</i> | <i>States for which the Convention came into force by reason of the Provisions of the Peace Treaties.</i> | <i>Other States for which the Convention has come into force.</i> | <i>States having ratified the Convention but not having signed the Protocol putting it into force.</i> | <i>States Parties to the Convention.</i> | <i>States which have signed and ratified the Convention but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force.</i> | <i>States which have signed the Convention but have not ratified.</i> | <i>States non-Parties to the Convention.</i> | <i>States Parties to the Convention.</i> | <i>States which have signed and ratified the Convention but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force.</i> | <i>States which have signed the Convention but have not ratified.</i> | <i>States non-Parties to the Convention.</i> |
| United States of America Belgium China Holland Honduras Norway | Austria Bolivia Brazil Bulgaria Cuba Czecho-Slovakia France Germany Great Britain Greece Guatemala Haiti Hungary Italy Japan Liberia Nicaragua Panama Peru Poland Portugal Roumania Serb-Croat-Slovene State Siam Uruguay | Denmark Spain Sweden | Ecuador Venezuela | South Africa Australia Austria Belgium Bolivia Brazil Bulgaria Canada China Cuba Czecho-Slovakia Denmark France Great Britain Greece Guatemala Haiti Honduras India Italy Japan Liberia Netherlands New Zealand Nicaragua Norway Panama Peru Poland Portugal Roumania Serb-Croat-Slovene State Siam Spain Sweden Uruguay | Venezuela | Argentina Chile Colombia Costa Rica Finland Latvia Luxemburg Paraguay Persia Salvador Switzerland | Albania Esthonia Lithuania | United States of America Germany Hungary | Danzig Ecuador | Dominican Republic Mexico Montenegro Russia | Abyssinia Afghanistan Hedjaz Lichtenstein Monaco Turkey |

C. L. 15. 1922. XI.

ANNEX 3.

TRAFFIC IN OPIUM.

SYSTEM FOR IMPORTATION CERTIFICATES.

Explanatory Note by the Secretary-General.

It appears that the system of import certificates recommended by the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations at its meeting last May, and subsequently approved by the Council and Assembly of the League, has not been fully understood by certain Governments, and the present note is being circulated for the purpose of removing misunderstandings and explaining the exact scope and object of the system.

The control of the import and export trade in dangerous drugs is one of the most important parts of the system established by the International Opium Convention for the prevention of abuse of dangerous drugs. Unless an effective control of the import and export trade can be established, effective *national* control becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible; and the import and export trade can only be effectively controlled if there is close co-operation between all the countries concerned. The system of import certificates was devised by the Opium Advisory Committee in order to give full effect to the provisions of the Opium Convention in regard to the control of imports and exports, and was unanimously approved by the Council and Assembly of the League. It is hoped that all countries concerned will consent to adopt it and put it into full force at the earliest possible moment. Until that is done, the efforts of the different countries and of the League itself to control the traffic are gravely impeded.

It will be remembered that the system of import certificates recommended by the Advisory Committee provides as follows :

“ Every application for the export to an importer of a supply of any of the substances to which the Convention applies shall be accompanied by a certificate from the Government of the importing country that the import of the consignment in question is approved by that Government and is required for legitimate purposes. In the case of the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies, the certificate shall state specifically that they are required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes.”

The system has a twofold aspect, thus :

(a) If a dealer in dangerous drugs in country A desires to import a supply of drugs from country B, he must, in the first place, obtain from his own government a certificate that the import of that particular consignment of the drugs is approved by the government and is required for legitimate purposes (or, in the case of morphine, heroin, cocaine, or medicinal opium, that it is required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes), and must forward the certificate with or in support of his order to the exporting firm in country B. The government of country B will not issue its licence for the export of the consignment of the drugs to country A until the certificate has been produced to it by the supplier in country B from whom the drugs have been ordered.

(b) Conversely, if a dealer in dangerous drugs in country A desires to export drugs to country C, the government of country A will allow the export only on the production of a similar certificate from the government of country C that the particular consignment desired to be exported is required in country C for legitimate purposes (or for medicinal or scientific purposes, as the case may be), and that its import is approved by the government of country C.

It will be seen that, by the adoption of this system, country A is protected against the export of dangerous drugs from country B for improper purposes, as the government of country B will not allow the export to country A except with the approval of the government of country A; and, secondly, that the government of country A has a guarantee that the dangerous drugs are not being exported from its own territory to other countries for improper purposes, as it will only allow the export of the drugs with the approval of the government of the importing country, and on the assurance that the drugs are required for proper purposes.

The system is based on the assumption that every Member of the League controls the export of the dangerous drugs from its own territories by prohibiting the export of the drugs except with the licence of the government. It may be pointed out here that in order to carry out the scheme recommended by the Opium Advisory Committee and approved by the Council and Assembly of the League, it is necessary that a separate licence should be required in respect of each consignment of the drugs exported. It is obvious that the grant by a government of general export licences to the exporting firms which would leave the exporting firms free to export any quantities of the drugs to any persons in any country would not be sufficient to carry out the obligations which the government has undertaken by the International Opium Convention.

ANNEX 4.

April 1922.

DRAFT IMPORT CERTIFICATE

Submitted by the Opium Section for the consideration of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium of the League of Nations.

INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION 1912.

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL APPROVAL OF IMPORT.

I hereby certify that the Ministry of
being the Ministry charged with the administration of the law relating to the dangerous drugs to which the International Opium Convention of 1912 applies, has approved the importation by

(Name, address and business of importer.)

(a)

(Exact description and amount of drug to be imported.)

of (b)

(Name and address of firm in exporting country from which the drug is to be obtained.)

from (c)

(State any special conditions to be observed, e.g., not to be imported through the post.)

subject to the following conditions (d)
and is satisfied that the consignment proposed to be imported is required :

- (1) for legitimate purposes (in the case of raw opium) ¹
- (2) solely for medicinal or scientific purposes (in the case of drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies).

Signed on behalf of the Ministry of

Signature

Official Rank

Date

¹ Where the use of prepared opium has not yet been suppressed and it is desired to import opium for this purpose, a certificate should be given to the effect that it is required for the purpose of smoking under government restrictions pending complete suppression, and that it will not be re-exported.

ANNEX 5.

April 11th, 1922.

MEMORANDUM

BY SIR GEORGE BUCHANAN AND DR. CARRIERE OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE HEALTH COMMITTEE OF THE LEAGUE, ON ENQUIRIES MADE, AT THE REQUEST OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OPIUM, IN REGARD TO THE

LEGITIMATE CONSUMPTION OF DANGEROUS DRUGS SPECIFIED IN CHAPTER III OF THE INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION.

At the request of the Medical Director of the Health Section, we have to-day considered the information which has been obtained as a result of enquiries undertaken by the Health Committee at the request of the Advisory Committee on Opium.

It will be remembered that the Health Committee considered in some detail the various means which might possibly be employed to obtain the approximate estimates which are desired ; most of the methods suggested were regarded as impracticable on account of the great complexity of the investigations which would be required and of the very great difficulty of assessing the value of facts so collected. The Health Committee, however, decided to endeavour to obtain the experience of a few civilised countries, relatively small in population, in which either, so far as is known, little if any material abuse of these drugs exists, or in which, even if the drugs be used illicitly, means exist for determining with reasonable accuracy the extent of their legitimate use for medicinal purposes. For this purpose the Committee invited special enquiries in Belgium by M. Velghe, in Switzerland by Dr. Carrière, in Denmark and in other Scandinavian countries by Professor Madsen. Sir George Buchanan at the same time communicated, through the High Commissioners, with the Public Health Authorities of Australia and New Zealand. It was believed that the total imports of the drugs in question into Australia and New Zealand would represent sufficiently accurately the legitimate consumption of the population, in view of the fact that, on the one hand, there is neither any material exportation, nor any manufacture of these drugs in these countries, and, on the other hand, that the population of these countries is little addicted to drug habits.

The anticipation that useful data would be obtained from Australia and New Zealand has, however, not been realised. Figures have been given regarding the total imports for certain rather short periods. The amount of these imports is extremely variable, and as no means exist for estimating the stocks at the beginning and end of the periods in question, no indication of the amounts consumed by the population in any given year is forthcoming. The Public Health Authorities in Australia and New Zealand, in communicating their data — the only official figures available — both expressed the view that no reliable inference can be drawn from them for the purposes of the Committee's enquiry, and with this view we agree.

At the October session of the Health Committee an interesting account was given by M. Velghe of the position in Belgium, which is especially worth studying in connection with the whole question of control of dangerous drugs. M. Velghe indicated that, owing to the operations of new legislation and new administrative measures in Belgium, it would before long be practicable to obtain the information desired in regard to the legitimate medicinal consumption of the drugs in question. This legislation and the new methods of administration, however, are quite recent, and, so far as Belgium is concerned, it is not practicable at the moment to give any index figures based on past experience.

A much more promising result has, however, been obtained from Switzerland, as a result of careful and detailed enquiries specially made for the purpose by Dr. Carrière. The result of these enquiries is summarised in the replies sent from Switzerland to a questionnaire issued independently of the Health Committee by the Advisory Committee on Opium. Dr. Carrière, taking advantage of the recognised practice of doctors, pharmacies and hospitals throughout Switzerland, obtained through their co-operation estimates which, when all due reservations are made, seem to represent fairly accurately the total legitimate consumption for medicinal purposes of opium, opium compounds, opium extracts, morphine, heroin, dionin, as well as cocaine, including eucaïne, novocaine, etc. The error in these estimates it is thought would not exceed 20 %, although naturally Dr. Carrière would hesitate to define the margin of error too closely. We may assume that in any case an error of this magnitude would be almost negligible for the purpose of the Opium Advisory Committee, and we may present the estimate in the table below with some confidence, provided that it is understood that it relates to the experience of Switzerland in one year only (1921).

The result of Dr. Madsen's enquiries in Denmark and in Sweden has been to furnish the Committee with the data also shown in the following table. The information in each case was kindly supplied by the Government Health Department.

RESULTS OF ENQUIRIES MADE IN SWITZERLAND, SWEDEN AND DENMARK WITH REGARD TO THE CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM, MORPHINE, HEROIN, COCAINE, ETC., IN THESE COUNTRIES.

Switzerland (1921) ; population : 4,000,000.

| | Total quantity kg. | Per head of population (grammes). |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Opium | 520 | } 0.17 |
| Preparations made with opium (pantopon, etc.) in terms of opium | 75 | |
| Extracts of opium | 109 | |
| Morphine | 234 | 0.058 |
| Heroin | 174 | 0.043 |
| Dionin | 18 | — |
| Cocaine | 229 | 0.057 |

Sweden (1920) ; population : 5,903,762.

| | | |
|-------------------|------|-------|
| Opium | 1600 | 0.27 |
| Morphine | 120 | 0.02 |
| Heroin | 2 | — |
| Cocaine | 150 | 0.025 |

Denmark (1917) ; population : 2,960,000.

| | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------|
| Opium | 467.4 | 0.16 |
| Morphine | 98 | 0.033 |
| Cocaine | 48 | 0.016 |

At the moment of writing, information is lacking regarding the methods employed in obtaining the information in Sweden and Denmark detailed above. This has been asked for. Assuming that the figures represent as close approximation to fact as do those of Switzerland, certain similarities and divergencies presented by the figures are worthy of note.

The figures for the consumption of opium in Switzerland and Denmark per head of population per annum are strikingly similar, 0.17 and 0.16 grammes respectively. The Swedish figure is considerably higher, 0.27, but in Sweden the morphine consumption, 0.02, is less than half that of Switzerland, 0.058 : the morphine consumption in Denmark is midway between the two, 0.033.

The considerable consumption of heroin in Switzerland (0.043 per head of population) appears to have no counterpart in either of the Scandinavian countries.

The consumption of cocaine in Switzerland (0.057) is more than twice as high as in Sweden (0.025), and more than three times as high as in Denmark (0.016).

The three countries present certain features in common ; neither was a belligerent country during the war, and all three have a relatively high standard of health as evinced by the following annual mortality rates :

| | | |
|-------------|-------|---------------|
| Switzerland | 14 | per thousand, |
| Sweden | 13.29 | per thousand, |
| Denmark | 13.4 | per thousand. |

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee, while realising that the data submitted above are meagre, ventures to express doubt whether such useful information of a similar character could be obtained by extending these enquiries to other countries, particularly those in Europe at the present moment. They have been convinced in any case of the practical impossibility of getting the matter satisfactorily worked out in countries such as England and France, with large populations, and with a commerce in these drugs which is very complex and intricate. The Committee understand, however, that in reply to the questionnaire sent out by the Advisory Committee on Opium a good deal of new information has been obtained, and should any question arise in connection with this new material which seems to require medical expert advice, the Sub-Committee will be glad to receive and consider further communications from the Opium Advisory Committee on the matter.

ANNEX 6.

SUMMARY PRESENTED BY THE CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE OF A REPORT RECEIVED FROM HIS GOVERNMENT.

FOOKIEN PROVINCE.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF FOOKIEN TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 30th, 1921.

Investigation has been thoroughly made throughout the province by the Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung, accompanied by Mr. Chen Pei-Kun, the Taoyin of Amoy, and Mr. Yu Shao-Ying, the Director of the Bureau of Suppression of Opium. They are satisfied with the general abolition of poppy plantation, although in the lower part of the province some had been cultivated, but it was already destroyed by force.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER WANG TAH-CHUNG TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : NOVEMBER 25th, 1921.

I have travelled throughout the districts of Chin-Kiang, Nan-An, Yung, Chiun, An-Chi, Hua-An, Sen-Yiu and Pu-Tien. We did not find any cultivation of the poppy in these districts except in Hua-An and Sen-Yiu, where the poppy plantation was carried on under the influence of the bandits. Happily, Governor Lee sent his troops to the spot and destroyed all the poppy there. When my party arrived there we hardly found any poppy left in the fields.

On arrival at Pu-Tien, we were informed by the gentry that no poppy had ever been cultivated in the district, and we were convinced by the confirmation which was given to us by the American and British missionaries, who had privately investigated throughout the district and its neighbourhood. This message was also confirmed by the Foochow Branch of the International Anti-Opium Association.

Tung-An District. Tung-An was well known as a place of poppy plantation, but the poppy was destroyed by the order of the magistrate, who was instructed by the Governor to destroy as soon as cultivation was discovered, and the Commission found nothing when we travelled from the chief town to the large villages such as Ma-Shieng and Quan-Kow.

Sze-Ming and Chin-Mun Districts. There has been no cultivation of poppy in these two districts on account of their insular and hilly character, which is unsuitable for such plantation.

The Commission has gone through twelve districts within the County (or Tao) of Amoy for over six weeks and we are so far satisfied with the conditions on the spot.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF FOOKIEN TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : JANUARY 17th, 1922.

Special Commissioner Wang Tah-Chung, accompanied by Mr. Wang Sou-Chun, the Taoyin of Chang-Chow and Ting-Chow, made personal investigation into the following districts :

Lung-Chi. The farmers in this district are largely growers of sugar cane. They ceased to grow opium poppy some years ago. The Commission was welcomed upon arriving there, particularly by the students, who are all anti-opium elements.

Nan-Ching. Upon arrival at this district the Commission was enthusiastically welcomed, particularly by the students, who are all anti-opium elements. Travelling throughout the district, not a single poppy plant could be seen.

Chang-Pu. Opium poppy does not grow in this mountainous territory, and this has been testified to by the foreign missionary located in the district.

Chang-Tai and Ping-Hu. In several places in these two districts the poppy was cultivated, but it was destroyed immediately upon discovery. The Commissioner, when he arrived there, found nothing in the fields but rice.

Moreover, according to an additional report by the Taoyin of Chang-Chow, poppy plantation has been cleared out throughout the country with the exception of Yui-Shiao, where order is not well maintained at present. (Special report on this district is to be furnished separately.)

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER WANG TAH-CHUNG TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : FEBRUARY 12TH, 1922.

Yui-Shiao. The poppy cultivation was very extensive nearly everywhere in the district, because it was out of the control of the authorities, so that the prohibition was not enforced. When the Governor sent troops to endeavour to destroy the poppy, the mobs came out against them. It took time to conquer them, but they were finally convinced and gave way to the troops and the poppy was destroyed. The Governor intended to punish these stubborn natives, but they were leniently disposed of on the guarantee provided by the Chamber of Commerce, the Agricultural Association and the Educational Association of Lung-Chi.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF GOVERNOR LEE TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : JANUARY 14TH, 1922.

Ting-Chow. All districts under this county have been investigated throughout by the special Commissioner, accompanied by M. Wang Sou-Chun, the Taoyin. The cultivation of the poppy has been completely done away with.

EXTRACT FROM A DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF FOOKIEN TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : FEBRUARY 15th, 1922.

Foo-An, Sah-Pu, Foo-Ting, Ning-Teh and Sou-Ning. No poppy cultivation was found in these districts, which was verified by the Foochow branch of the International Anti-Opium Association. A letter from the said Association addressed to the Director of the Suppression of Opium Bureau, read as follows:

“ The Vice-President of this Association received a report from his friend who was the Secretary of the Missionary Association in Shanghai

saying that he made a trip to Amoy, Chin-Kiang, Hua-An, Sing-Hua and back to Foochow. He found no opium poppy cultivated in the places where he travelled. Another report was sent in by an American missionary, saying that he was travelling from Yung-Chuen to Sing-Hua. He could hardly find a single plant of poppy this year. He was surprised, because he found 94 places in the district in the previous year where opium poppy was cultivated. He made this journey at the beginning of the winter, when the season was over, so that he was sure that there would be no cultivation in that year. This was the result of the strict enforcement of the suppression of opium growing by the provincial authorities. "

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSIONER WANG TAH-CHUNG TO THE
MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : NOVEMBER 11th, 1921.

Upon my arrival in the southern part of the Fookien province I was welcomed by the representatives of the gentry and the educational and commercial bodies. I was escorted to the Chamber of Commerce, where I made a speech on opium suppression, and the audience was cheerfully convinced and promised their co-operation to the end.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER WANG TAH-CHUNG TO THE
MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : OCTOBER 25th, 1921.

Upon my arrival in Foochow, I was informed that in the lower part of the province there was some poppy cultivation. I therefore secretly detailed reliable parties to make investigation. I divided the province into four "Taos", and to each Tao I detailed two officials to investigate. Simultaneously I have asked the Governor to notify the magistrates of all the districts to destroy all poppy where found. If it were not destroyed before the arrival of the investigators, the magistrate of that district would be held responsible and be subject to dismissal. Mr. Yu Shao-Ying, the Director of the chief Bureau of Opium Suppression, was also instructed to make investigations personally in different parts of the province. In this way it could be assured that the poppy cultivation in the province would be cleared out.

KANSU PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER PAN LING-KOU TO THE MINISTRY OF THE
INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 5th, 1921.

In order to obtain assistance in investigating the poppy cultivation in the province, the Commission has appointed a foreign missionary, the Rev. Yen-souchien (?) as honorary adviser, and with his co-operation it can be assured that the investigation will be carried out satisfactorily.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER PAN LING-KOU TO THE MINISTRY
OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 25th 1921.

Ning-Sha, Shi-Ning, Kau-Liang and An-Su. The prohibition of the cultivation of poppy in these four Taos was strict ; therefore the Commission has found no plantations.

Wei-Chieun and Ching-Yuen. There was poppy cultivation within the jurisdiction of these two Taos which was reported in the summer, but the Commission found nothing upon its arrival.

Loan-Shan. A few districts in this Tao were reported as containing poppy plantations, but the owners, upon hearing of the coming of the Commission, were afraid of punishment and destroyed the plants themselves.

SHENSI PROVINCE.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER SUNG LEN-KWOI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 8th, 1921.

Reliable reports have been received from investigators that all the districts of the Yu-Ling Tao have been found free from poppy plantations, the reason being that the climate there does not suit such cultivation. Magistrates of different districts have furnished guarantees to this effect.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER SUNG LEN-KWOI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 20th, 1921.

It was reported that in the northern part of Chang-An the people secretly cultivated poppy, but the magistrate of this district was instructed to destroy the plants, which was well done.

Investigation is going on in other districts. The Commission so far has not discovered any poppy cultivation. It will make further reports later on.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER SUNG LEN-KWOI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 25th, 1921.

Han-Yang, Sing-Kou, Mei-Shien, Pao-Gi, Shian-Shien, Chou-Yi, Hua-Yin, Hua-Shien, Tah-Li. Reliable reports have been received from the investigators who have travelled throughout the above districts, verifying that no poppy plantations have been discovered, statements being furnished by the local military authorities as a guarantee of non-cultivation of the poppy in the districts.

TELEGRAPHIC REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER SUNG LEN-KWOI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 28th, 1921.

Wei-Nan, Tung-Kuan, Lok-Nan, Shian-Nan. Investigations have been made carefully in these districts and the Commission has found no poppy plantation there.

Yen-Len, Fun-Shien, Shan-Yang. There was poppy cultivation in these districts, but the plants have been destroyed by the local authorities.

Den-Wu: Report has been received that there are poppy plantations in several places in this district. The Commission has requested the local military and civil authorities to order destruction.

HUPEI PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE CIVIL GOVERNOR OF HUPEI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : OCTOBER 31st, 1921.

The south-west of the province has just been recovered from the invasion of the Southern troops. As soon as order has been restored in these localities prohibition of poppy cultivation will be enforced. Poppy plants have been destroyed in many places.

SHANSI PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF SHANSI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

Poppy cultivation has been strictly prohibited in the province. Some smuggled opium from the neighbouring province has been seized by the local authorities and destroyed.

ANHUI PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANHUI TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

The northern part of the province was known as an opium-poppy-growing district before the prohibition law was enforced. But since the Republic was established, prohibition of cultivation has been observed. This was testified to by the Joint Anglo-Chinese Commission, which made a thorough investigation of the province in 1917.

In some distant districts it was reported that poppy cultivation was discovered, but the plants were destroyed. This was testified to by an American missionary in his letter saying that he was satisfied with the destruction of the poppy plants by the local authorities.

KILIN PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF KILIN TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

Some districts in the province are reported as containing poppy cultivation, but most of it was destroyed upon discovery. A law of prohibition of poppy cultivation containing fifteen articles has been proclaimed and enforced.

HEILUNG-KIENG PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF HEILUNG-KIENG TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

Prohibition of poppy cultivation has been strictly enforced in the province, except in some places, such as the inner mountains of Sing-An, which is out of civil control on account of its remote situation and its proximity to the Russian frontier. However, the provincial authorities will use their best efforts to enforce the prohibition law.

SUIYIEN.

DESPATCH OF SPECIAL COMMISSIONER WU PUN-CHIH TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : JANUARY 14th, 1922.

Investigation has been made thoroughly by the Commission throughout all the districts. Poppy cultivation was discovered in some places, but the plants were destroyed. The local authorities have made a great effort to enforce the prohibition law; therefore the investigators are satisfied with the result, that the whole of the poppy plantation has been cleared out of the different districts.

HSINCHIANG PROVINCE.

DESPATCH OF THE GOVERNOR OF HSINCHIANG TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

Prohibition of poppy cultivation has been strictly enforced in the province. This has been testified to by the British Vice-Consul at Kasah; last April he made a trip from Kasah through the districts of Kan-Ke-Su, Bai-Chung, Fu-Ju and Yen-Chi, and also from Kau-Ke-Su and Ping-Tah-Pan as far as Yi-Li. He did not find any poppy cultivation on the journey of several thousand *li*, which took him over a hundred days. April is the poppy season when the flowers can easily be seen. Certainly the eyes of the British Vice-Consul could not have been deceived if any poppy plantation had been in existence.

In some places opium was discovered, confiscated by the police authorities and burnt publicly.

SZE-CHEUN PROVINCE.

DESPATCH FROM THE DEFENCE COMMISSIONER OF THE FRONTIER OF SZE-CHEUN
TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING.

More than twenty districts in this part of the province, which are occupied by the native tribes, never cultivated poppy because the tribes have never had the habit of opium smoking. In some other places poppy plants were discovered but destroyed by the military authorities. Many cases of opium smuggling were discovered and the opium was confiscated and publicly burnt.

JEHOL.

DESPATCH OF THE MILITARY COMMANDER OF JEHOL TO THE MINISTRY OF THE
INTERIOR, PEKING.

A special law has been made to prohibit the cultivation of the poppy. It can be assured that this law will be enforced to the fullest extent by the local authorities.

EXTRACT FROM DESPATCH OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSIONER, YAO CHI-YUEN,
TO THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : JANUARY 10th, 1922.

The cultivation of opium poppy here has been strictly prohibited since 1915. Investigation was made in 1916, 1917, 1918, and no poppy plants were discovered.

Some remote districts, such as Ping-Cheun, Wei-Chang, Cze-Fung, Lung-Hua, Ling-Yuen, Kien-Ping, Fung-Chi, Ning-Liun, Ping-Fu, Heinching-Chia, were reported as having poppy plantations, but the local authorities have been instructed to destroy them. Guarantees have been furnished by all the magistrates of the Mongolian Princes that cultivation of the poppy is strictly prohibited for the present year and for ever.

HEILUNG-KIENG PROVINCE.

EXTRACT FROM A DESPATCH BY SPECIAL COMMISSIONER CHAO SEN-CHANG TO THE
MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, PEKING : DECEMBER 6th, 1921.

North-West. Districts situated in this part of the province are not suitable for poppy cultivation, because parts of them are desert and parts are not sufficiently populated.

South. Districts situated in this part of the province are under the jurisdiction of Suo-Laon Rao. Although the fields are fertile and good for poppy cultivation, the people have observed the prohibition law strictly because plantation would be easily discovered on account of the proximity of the capital.

East. Districts here are sparsely populated, very large areas being entirely uninhabited. But across the river is the Russian frontier, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Chinese authorities. Measures have been taken to check smuggling.

South-East. This is the region of forests. It is rather difficult to enforce the prohibition law, but the Military Governor has detailed soldiers to scattered stations to prevent cultivation.

ANNEX 7.

April 12th, 1922.

**LIST FURNISHED BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT OF THE VARIOUS
CHEMICAL PRODUCTS THE EFFECTS OF WHICH ARE SIMILAR
TO THOSE OF MORPHINE AND COCAINE.**

1. *Products the effects of which are similar to those of morphine :*

Dionine or chlorhydrate of ethylmorphine.
Peronine or chlorhydrate of benzylmorphine.
Apomorphine.
Eupomorphine or bromethylate of apomorphine.

2. *Products the effects of which are similar to those of cocaine :*

Artificial cocaine : ethylbenzoylegonine or ethylic coca, propylbenzoylegonine,
butylbenzoylegonine, cinnamylecocaine.
Holocaine or paradichoxye thenyldephenylamidine (3 or 4 times more
poisonous than cocaine).
Eucaine A or pentamethylbenzoyloxypiperidine.
Eucaine B or trimethylbenzoyloxypiperidine.
Euphtalmine or phenylglycolymethylvinylidiacetone alkamine.
Novocaine or chlorhydrate of paraaminobenzoyldiethylaminoethanol.
Anesthesine or paraamidobenzoate of ethyl.
Subcutine or paraphenolsulfonate of anesthesine.
Anteinesine and antiron.
Alypine or chlorhydrate of benzoyltetramethyldiaminopentonal.
Strovaine or chlorhydrate of adimethylamine benzoylpentonal.
Tropacocaine.

¶ Most of these products, which are synthetic compounds, are not included in the categories of products referred to by the Convention of 1912. The Opium Commission may, in conformity with the decision of the Council of October 12th, 1921, consider whether it would not be desirable to extend the provisions of the Convention of 1912 to include all these products.

ANNEX 8.

Letter from the Director
of the International Office of the Universal Postal Union.

[*Translation.*]

INTERNATIONAL OFFICE
OF
THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION.

Berne, March 23rd, 1922.

Sir,

In connection with the work of the Opium Section of the League of Nations, you asked me, in your letter of the 17th inst., No. 12A/12494/1717, to send you any information I might have as to which countries in the Postal Union accept and which do not accept consignments of opium for medical purposes sent by parcel post or in boxes of declared value.

I have the honour to send you herewith a copy of the circular containing certain information on this subject which I have furnished to the Administrations of the Union (Annex 1).

I also enclose a note containing further details which have reached me since the publication of their circular (Annex 2).

If they would be of use to you, my Office would send you, on your request, copies of any circulars on the subject which it may subsequently have occasion to publish.

I have the honour, etc.,

For the Director:
(Signed) ROTTNER,
Vice-Director.

To the Secretary of the Advisory Committee
on Traffic in Opium,
League of Nations, Geneva.

[*Translation.*]

APPENDIX.

INTERNATIONAL OFFICE
OF
THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION.

Berne, February 8th, 1922.

Subject. — Main Convention regarding objects of declared value and postal packages. Consignments of morphine, etc.

Sir,

In my circular letter No. 6633/334 dated October 31st, 1921, regarding consignments of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, I had the honour to request the Administrations of the Union to be good enough to inform me if they admitted consignments of articles of this nature, for medical purposes, in the form either of boxes of declared value or by parcel post. (See Madrid Agreement regarding the exchange of letters and boxes of declared value, Article 9, para. 2 (a); and the Convention on Postal Packages, Article 15, para. 1 (b).

I have the honour to communicate to you herewith the replies which I have received up to the present time:

Belgium.

Opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs may be despatched in Belgium, in the form of boxes of declared value or by parcel post, under the following conditions:

1. When the consignments are addressed to apothecaries possessing laboratories or to doctors or veterinary surgeons who keep dispensaries;
2. When they are addressed to persons who have already declared them to the Belgian Home Office and who produce a detailed acknowledgment received from the above-mentioned Office.

Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian Office allows the importation of consignments of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs for medical purposes, both in boxes of declared value and by parcel post, provided that they are consigned exclusively to apothecaries.

It should, however, be remembered that the service of boxes of declared value is suspended as regards communication with Bulgaria.

The Republic of Dominica.

The importation in any form whatsoever of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, is prohibited unless special authorisation has been obtained from the Government of the Republic.

Egypt.

The Egyptian Office permits the importation, for medical purposes, of raw opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, in boxes of declared value or by parcel post.

The articles in question can only be delivered to:

1. Apothecaries recognised by the Government;
2. Persons possessing a general or special import license issued by the Health Administration;
3. Persons possessing a sales license issued by the Home Office.

Great Britain.

The British Office states that the importation into Great Britain of prepared opium, *i.e.*, opium for smoking, including dross and other residues remaining after the opium has been smoked, is absolutely forbidden.

Raw opium, including opium in the form of powder or of grain, medicinal opium — *i.e.*, opium which has been artificially dried — morphine, cocaine, ecgonine and diamorphine (generally known as heroin) and their respective salts, as also all preparations, mixtures, extracts of other substances containing not less than 1/5 of 1% of morphine or of 1/10 of 1% of cocaine, ecgonine or diamorphine, may be imported into Great Britain in registered boxes or registered parcel post, provided that the consignees have previously obtained authorisations from the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office in London.

A further communication will be made regarding the regulations in force on this subject in those Colonies which are represented in the Union by the Postmaster-General.

Canada.

The export or import through the post, of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, is prohibited.

South African Union.

Consignments of opium, morphine, etc., for medical purposes are admitted but only by parcel post and only if consigned to a registered chemist, and if permission has been previously obtained from the Public Health Department at Pretoria.

Republic of Honduras.

The importation into Honduras of opium, morphine, cocaine, etc., for medical purposes, is not prohibited.

Netherlands.

The importation of opium and its derivatives — including raw opium, prepared opium, medicinal opium, morphine, heroin and cocaine, is permitted, both in boxes of declared value and by parcel post, provided that the substances are being sent for medical purposes and are consigned to apothecaries, doctors with dispensaries, veterinary surgeons, or persons duly authorised by the Ministry of Labour.

Norway.

Narcotic drugs can only be imported for medical purposes, and only by apothecaries and druggists. The substances in question may be imported by parcel post, as the Norwegian Post Office has not, at present, adhered to the Agreement regarding the exchange of boxes of declared value.

Poland.

Poland permits the importation by parcel post of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, for medical purposes.

The importation of such consignments is authorised on condition that the consignee has first obtained permission from the Polish administrative authorities.

Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

The importation of opium, morphine and cocaine for medical purposes, is permitted on the twofold condition that these substances are sent by parcel post and addressed to pharmacists or druggists.

Sweden.

The importation by parcel post of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, for medical purposes, is permitted. (The Swedish Office does not participate in the exchange of boxes of declared value.)

Czecho-Slovakia..

The importation into Czecho-Slovakia of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs is permitted both in boxes of declared value and by parcel post.

As regards the document necessary for the importation of these preparation, the consignor must come to an agreement with the consignee before sending the consignment.

Tunis.

The importation of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, for medical purposes, is permitted by the Tunisian Office both in boxes of declared value and by parcel post.

I shall not fail to publish any further information on the same subject which may reach me.

I have the honour, etc.,

(Signed) DECOPPET,
The Director.

[Translation.]

APPENDIX.

INTERNATIONAL OFFICE
OF
THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION.*United States of America.*

The importation into the United States of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs either by parcel post or in the ordinary mails, is absolutely prohibited. (The United States have not adhered to the Agreement regarding letters and boxes of declared value.)

Finland.

Opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs may only be imported into Finland by persons who are apothecaries or druggists by vocation, by public scientific institutions and by manufacturers or artists who find it necessary to employ poisons of this nature in their trade or their art. Substances of this kind can only be delivered from the Customs Offices to manufacturers and artists upon production by the latter of a certificate from the Industrial Administration that the poison is necessary for the practice of their trade or their art; the certificate in question must have been issued within the previous six months.

Since Finland has not adhered to the Agreement regarding boxes of declared value, these drugs may only be sent by parcel post.

British India.

The importation through the post of raw opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, is absolutely prohibited.

France.

The importation into France of substances such as opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, is subject to the following provisions, apart from the permission which must be obtained by the importers from the French Authorities and the formalities with which they have to comply:

The substances in question must be enclosed in envelopes or vessels bearing the names and addresses of the consignor and of the consignee and, in addition, the names and descriptions of the substances, clearly marked in black letters on a red-orange coloured label, affixed in such a way that it cannot become detached.

In addition to these marks the envelope or vessel must be encircled by a band of the same colour bearing the word "*Poison.*"

The importation into France of the substances mentioned above is permitted, subject to compliance with the above provisions, in the form of boxes of declared value or by parcel post.

China.

China admits consignments by parcel post, of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs required for medical purposes.

The persons to whom these postal packages are addressed must be in possession of a special license issued by the Customs Authorities.

The importation of the above-mentioned substances is not allowed in the form of boxes of declared value.

Morocco (exclusive of the Spanish zone).

This Office permits the importation, in the form of boxes of declared value or by parcel post, of consignments of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs required for medical purposes, provided that evidence is forthcoming justifying the use of these substances.

Persia.

This Office admits consignments of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs, required for medical purposes in the form of boxes of declared value or by parcel post. As regards morphine and its derivatives, the importation for medical purposes is conditional upon permission having been obtained from the Persian Government. The importation of opium is only permitted when authorised by the Persian Health Council.

Persia allows opium to be exported to consignees who comply with the regulations in force in the country of destination. Persia has provisionally suspended her participation in the carrying out of the Agreement regarding letters and boxes of declared value.

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

✓ C. 602. M. 192. 1925. XI

GENEVA, November 1st, 1925.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER
DANGEROUS DRUGS.

MINUTES
OF THE
SEVENTH SESSION

HELD AT

GENEVA FROM AUGUST 24th TO 31st, 1925.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | Pages |
|---|-------|
| LIST OF MEMBERS. | 5 |
| FIRST MEETING, August 24th, 1925, at 11 a.m. | |
| 1. Opening Speech by the Chairman | 6 |
| 2. Absence of the Chinese Representative | 6 |
| 3. Order of Work | 6 |
| SECOND MEETING, August 24th, 1925, at 3 p.m. | |
| 4. Welcome to Dr. Carrière, Representative of Switzerland | 6 |
| 5. Election of the Chairman | 7 |
| 6. Election of the Vice-Chairman | 7 |
| 7. Adoption of the Agenda | 7 |
| 8. Progress Report by the Secretary | 8 |
| 9. Importation of Dangerous Drugs : Procedure to be adopted by the Secretariat in dealing with Reports or Statistics received from Governments. | 11 |
| 10. Relation between the Date of Meeting of the Committee and the Date of Despatch of the Annual Reports from Governments | 12 |
| 11. Question of a Standard Form for the Annual Reports from Governments : Proposal by the Canadian Government | 13 |
| THIRD MEETING, August 25th, 1925, at 10 a.m. | |
| 12. Progress Report by the Secretary (<i>continuation</i>) : Sale of Drugs to French Nationals in China | 14 |
| 13. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments | 15 |
| 14. Method of preparing the Summary of Annual Reports drawn up by the Secretariat | 16 |
| 15. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments (<i>continuation</i>) | 16 |
| FOURTH MEETING, August 25th, 1925, at 3 p.m. | |
| 16. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments (<i>continuation</i>) | 21 |
| 17. Absence of Annual Reports from Certain Governments. | 27 |
| 18. Annual Report for 1924 from the Netherlands Government | 28 |
| FIFTH MEETING, August 26th, 1925, at 10 a.m. | |
| 19. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments : Resumption of the Discussion on the Report from Japan | 28 |
| 20. Form of the Summary of Annual Reports : Appointment of a Sub-Committee | 29 |
| 21. List of Offices in Various Countries competent to deal with Export Authorisation or Diversion Certificates : Request of the British Government | 29 |
| 22. Report on the Steps taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention drawn up by the Second Opium Conference | 31 |
| 23. Question of the Simplification of Statistics | 31 |
| 24. Question of the Issue of Licences for the Import of Dangerous Drugs from Countries which have not ratified and put into force the Hague Convention nor adopted the Import and Export Certificate System : Resolution No. II of the Assembly of 1922 | 32 |
| 25. Indian Hemp | 33 |
| SIXTH MEETING, August 26th, 1925, at 3 p.m. | |
| 26. Welcome to M. Nicolas Petrovitch, Representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes | 34 |
| 27. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments : Resumption of the Discussion on the Report from Japan | 34 |
| 28. Propaganda : Resolution of the Council dated December 8th, 1924 | 36 |
| 29. Opium Situation in Mandated Territories. | 38 |
| 30. Opium Situation in China | 39 |
| 31. Treaty between Canada and the United States of America making Offences against Narcotic Laws punishable by Extradition | 40 |

| | Pages |
|--|-------|
| SEVENTH MEETING, August 27th, 1925, at 10 a.m. | |
| 32. Traffic in Opium in the Persian Gulf | 42 |
| EIGHTH MEETING, August 27th, 1925, at 3 p.m. | |
| 33. Traffic in Opium in the Persian Gulf (<i>continuation</i>) | 48 |
| 34. Question of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs : General Discussion . . | 49 |
| NINTH MEETING, August 28th, 1925, at 5 p.m. | |
| 35. Relation between the Date of Meeting of the Committee and the Date of Despatch of the Annual Reports from Governments | 52 |
| 36. Flag Transference in connection with the Illicit Traffic | 53 |
| 37. Annual Report from the Portuguese Government concerning Macao | 53 |
| 38. Publication of Documents submitted to the Committee | 55 |
| 39. Report of the Sub-Committee on the Form of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments | 56 |
| TENTH MEETING, August 31st, 1925, at 10 a.m. | |
| 40. Consideration of the Report of the Committee to the Council | 56 |
| 41. Memorandum on Persian Opium submitted by the Persian Delegation to the Second Opium Conference | 59 |
| 42. Adoption of the Minutes of the Session | 59 |
| ELEVENTH MEETING, August 31st, 1925, at 3 p.m. | |
| 43. Adoption of the Minutes of the Session (<i>continuation</i>). | 60 |
| 44. Smuggling of Opium from British North Borneo to the Philippines : State- ment by Mrs. Hamilton Wright | 60 |
| 45. Statement by Mr. Pinkney Tuck | 60 |
| 46. Close of the Session | 61 |
| ANNEXES | 62 |

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Representatives of Governments.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dr. CUELLAR ¹ | <i>Bolivia.</i> |
| M. Chao-Hsin CHU ¹ | <i>China.</i> |
| M. BOURGOIS | <i>France.</i> |
| Dr. ANSELMINO | <i>Germany.</i> |
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, K.C.B. | <i>Great Britain.</i> |
| Sir John CAMPBELL, G.S.I., O.B.E. | <i>India.</i> |
| Dr. TSURUMI | <i>Japan.</i> |
| M. VAN WETTUM | <i>Netherlands.</i> |
| His Excellency M. FERREIRA. | <i>Portugal.</i> |
| M. Nicolas PETROVITCH | <i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.</i> |
| Luang Sri VISARVAJA | <i>Siam.</i> |
| Dr. CARRIÈRE | <i>Switzerland.</i> |

Mr. S. Pinkney TUCK² *United States of America.*

Assessors.

M. Henri BRENIER.

Sir John JORDAN, G.C.I.E., K.C.B., K.C.M.G.

Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT.

Secretary. — Dame Rachel CROWDY.

¹ Bolivia and China were not represented at the Seventh Session of the Committee.

² Attended the meetings in an unofficial capacity.

FIRST MEETING

Held at Geneva on Monday, August 24th, 1925, at 11 a.m.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) in the Chair.

1. Opening Speech by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed all the members and the assessors present, as well as Mr. S. Pinkney Tuck (United States of America), who had been instructed by his Government to attend the meetings in an unofficial capacity. All members present would regret that Mr. Neville, of whom the Committee had the most agreeable recollections, was not present at this session. He was sure that soon the Committee would be on the same good terms with Mr. Tuck.

The delegate of Bolivia (Dr. Cuellar) was unable to be present owing to the illness of his daughter.

M. Yovanovitch, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, would not arrive for two days.

Dr. Carrière, the Swiss representative, had stated that he would arrive during the afternoon.

Further, M. Bourgois (France) was not present, probably owing to a railway accident which had just occurred in France. In these circumstances, he proposed that the election of the Chairman should be postponed until the next meeting.

For the moment the Committee had only to decide whether the meetings would be private until after the agenda had been adopted.

The Committee decided to meet in private until after the adoption of its agenda.

2. Absence of the Chinese Representative.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a telegram had been received from the Chinese Minister at Rome (M. Tang Tsai-Fou) in the following terms :

“Have honour confirm you that M. Chao-Hsin Chu has been instructed by Government not to attend present Opium Committee session. — TANG TSAI-FOU.”

3. Order of Work.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that the Committee should settle each day the items to be discussed on the following day in order to give members an opportunity to read the papers in the proper order and to come fully prepared for the discussion of the subject which would then be before the Committee.

M. BRENIER seconded Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

SECOND MEETING

Held at Geneva on Monday, August 24th, 1925, at 3 p.m.

Chairman : M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), later Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

4. Welcome to Dr. Carrière, Representative of Switzerland.

The CHAIRMAN, in the name of the Committee, welcomed the representative of Switzerland, who was sitting for the first time as a member of the Committee. The co-operation of Switzerland was of the greatest importance to the Committee's work.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) thanked the Chairman and the Committee for their welcome. He would do his utmost to be of use to the Committee.

5. Election of the Chairman.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) proposed that Sir Malcolm Delevingne should be elected Chairman. Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) proposed Sir John Campbell.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India), in declining to stand for the office of Chairman, explained that his duties in Greece in connection with the Greek Refugees Committee would not permit him to represent the Committee at the Assembly were he to be elected.

After a short exchange of views, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (*Great Britain*) was unanimously elected Chairman.

6. Election of the Vice-Chairman.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed that Dr. Tsurumi should be appointed Vice-Chairman.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) begged to be allowed to decline the invitation on the ground that he was not yet sufficiently accustomed to the work of the Committee. He proposed Dr. Anselmino (Germany).

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) preferred not to be elected Vice-Chairman since his knowledge of the official languages of the League was insufficient.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT proposed M. Ferreira.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) begged to decline on the grounds that he had neither the time nor the ability to perform the task.

After a short exchange of views, the Committee unanimously elected Dr. ANSELMINO as Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

7. Adoption of the Agenda.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that at the last moment there had been inserted in the agenda, Item 14 (f) : "What steps can be taken to prevent the smuggling of opium from States whose production and traffic are not fully controlled ?"

He did not know who had been responsible for putting that item on the agenda, but he was afraid that the Committee, if it discussed the question, would be going over ground which had already been covered, and, in addition, would lose much time. If, however, the Committee desired to discuss the question, it should be included under Item 8 of the agenda : "Resolution II of the Assembly of 1922. See also Resolution III of the Report of the Advisory Committee to the Council 1924 (doc. A. 32. 1924. XI)".

The CHAIRMAN explained that, in accordance with Article 5 of the Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat had prepared some months previously a provisional agenda, which had been distributed to the members of the Committee for their observations. After receiving those observations, the Secretariat had distributed the final agenda. Item 14 (f) had been inserted since the final agenda had been distributed. Paragraph 3 of Article 5 of the Rules of Procedure therefore applied. It was as follows :

"If, after the circulation of the agenda, any member proposes a new question for discussion during a session of the Committee, the Committee shall decide whether it will discuss such subject".

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) repeated that any discussion of the question would take two or three weeks. If the Committee, however, decided to discuss it, then it should be included under Item 8.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she had been responsible for the insertion of this item on the agenda, because she had not received the agenda before leaving America. The question of illicit traffic should be discussed because it was a very important point, and she hoped that the Committee would find means to prevent leakages and illicit traffic.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, as the question had been discussed at the Second Opium Conference, it seemed unnecessary to go over the ground again. Moreover, an article dealing with leakage had been included in the Convention adopted by the Second Conference. In these circumstances, he saw no necessity for discussing the question afresh.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that the question should come under Item 14 (a) of the agenda. It was of interest to the United States, which had to protect the Philippines. She saw no reason why it was not a legitimate subject for discussion without giving rise to controversy.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. Van Wettum that the Second Opium Conference had discussed how far the Powers which signed the Convention should apply the provisions of the Convention to countries which stood outside. At the Conference he had not taken quite the same view as that held by M. Van Wettum on the subject. The question, however, had been disposed of for the time being. Mrs. Hamilton Wright desired to deal with smuggling. He suggested, therefore, that she should do so under Item 14 (a) of the agenda, which related to smuggling.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT was willing to accept the Chairman's suggestion.

M. Van WETTUM, in agreeing to this course, did so on the understanding that the Committee did not again discuss the question which had been discussed at the Second Opium Conference in January 1925 because Article 24 of the Convention then drawn up dealt with countries that came under the Convention and Article 26 dealt with those countries which did not.

The Committee adopted its agenda, omitting paragraph (f) of Item 14 (Annex 1).

8. Progress Report by the Secretary (Annex 2).

Signatures and Ratifications of the Agreement and Convention prepared by the First and Second Opium Conferences.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) enquired whether Germany had signed the Convention, Protocol and Final Act prepared by the Second Opium Conference with any reservation.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied in the affirmative. The reservations concerned the inclusion in the Central Board of a member of German nationality.

The CHAIRMAN thought that France had also made certain reservations regarding quarterly statistics.

In reply to M. Van WETTUM, Dame Rachel CROWDY said that the Legal Section had informed her that France had not signed the Protocol.

The CHAIRMAN said that the fact that the period of signature did not expire until September 30th, 1925, probably explained why no ratifications of the Convention had yet been received. He would like to know the exact position.

Dame Rachel CROWDY explained that, in the opinion of the Legal Section of the Secretariat, ratification could take place any time after the Convention was open for signature.

Resolutions requiring Action, passed at the Last Session of the Advisory Committee in August 1924.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no mention had been made of the action taken by the Council in regard to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention drawn up by the Second Conference. These articles dealt with the measures to be taken by the Health Committee of the League concerning the addition of new drugs to the Convention and the exemption of certain drugs from its provisions.

Dame Rachel CROWDY explained that the Council had passed a special resolution instructing the Health Committee to deal with the question.

It was decided to put a paragraph to this effect in the revised edition of the Progress Report.

Extra-territorial Rights in China.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the French Government stated that the sale and distribution of drugs in China was prohibited to French nationals. Was this strictly correct even when the drugs were sold for medical and scientific purposes?

M. BRENIER explained that the French representative, on his arrival, would answer this point.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the same laws were in force with regard to nationals of the United States of America in China as in the United States of America. By the provisions of the China Pharmacy Law, the Harrison Bill was applied to any American chemist in China, which meant that it was impossible to obtain narcotic drugs from any American pharmacy. As they could be obtained, however, from other foreign pharmacies, the restriction on American pharmacies did not have much effect.

Dr. CARRIÈRE wished to explain briefly why Switzerland had not yet replied to the Secretariat's letter. The reason was that the introduction into the law applicable under Swiss consular jurisdiction of special provisions relating to the traffic in narcotics was still under consideration. The fact that the Swiss law on narcotics had only just been put into force was sufficient to

explain why this question, which was beset with very special difficulties for Switzerland, had had not yet been solved. Its solution would certainly not be long delayed.

In the meanwhile, the Swiss consular courts in China applied, in respect of their nationals, the Chinese Customs tariff of 1922, which prohibited the importation of morphine, cocaine and other harmful drugs, except by authorised doctors, chemists and druggists who had given the necessary undertaking.

In reply to the Chairman, M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he hoped to submit a statement on the question before the end of the session.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the question had been discussed informally at the Second Opium Conference by a small Committee composed of representatives of the Treaty Powers, convened at the request of the Chinese representative, to consider whether a certain number of common regulations could not be drawn up. The withdrawal of the Chinese delegation had left the work of this Committee incomplete, and the matter had advanced very little. In these circumstances, the Committee might perhaps think it worth while to repeat and reinforce the resolution it had adopted last year, so that the matter could once more come before the Council and the Assembly.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) enquired whether all the countries mentioned in the Secretary's report, including Brazil, Denmark and Spain, possessed extra-territorial rights in China.

The CHAIRMAN replied that a list of Powers with extra-territorial rights had been drawn up for the use of the Second Opium Conference, and that that list had been used in the preparation of the report before the Committee.

Sir John JORDAN questioned the accuracy of the list.

Dame Rachel CROWDY, referring to the list of the Treaty Powers prepared by the Legal Section of the Secretariat for the Second Opium Conference, said that the list given in the Secretary's report was correct. All the countries mentioned possessed extra-territorial rights, or particular rights, which had led the Legal Section to include them in the list. Great Britain should have figured in the first draft of this report, but, owing to a typing error, it was not mentioned as a country from which a reply had been received.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) was in doubt whether it was necessary for the Committee to repeat its recommendation to the Council, since most countries had sent a reply.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee decided to adopt the proposal of the Chairman.*

Manufacture of Heroin.

The CHAIRMAN was astonished to find that the only countries which had been communicated with had been Albania, Australia and Haiti. When he had moved the proposal at the last session he had in mind one or two important Powers which should have been approached, among them the Indian Government. Did Sir John Campbell know the view of the Indian Government with regard to the suppression of the use of heroin? If the Chairman remembered rightly, the Indian delegation at the Second Opium Conference had taken the view that the use of heroin for medical purposes ought not to be suppressed.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) did not think that any definite official opinion on the subject had been expressed by the Government of India itself, but he had little doubt as to what its opinion was. It was the same as that of Great Britain. He believed that medical opinion in India maintained that the use of heroin should be continued, subject to the imposition of the strictest possible safeguards. One of the reasons given was that heroin was the only remedy for a particular class of tuberculous disease.

The Committee agreed with the Chairman in thinking that, as the question had been considered and disposed of by the Second Opium Conference, a further resolution on this point was unnecessary.

Import Certificate System.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) explained that the Netherlands Government had not yet enforced the system of import certificates because, to do so, it would have to alter a law. It had delayed doing so until it was able to insert the modifications made necessary by the Second Opium Conference.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the heading "List of States which have adopted the Import Certificates System" meant States which had accepted the system or which had put it into force.

Dame Rachel CROWDY explained that it was intended to mean the list of States which had put it into force.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that a number of States had adopted it but had not yet enforced it.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the meaning of the word " adopted " would imply that those States had accepted the system and put it into operation. If that were not so, the Secretary should tell the Committee definitely what the position was.

M. BRENIER thought that the word " adopted " did not necessarily mean " put into force ".

The CHAIRMAN said that the text was ambiguous and that the list should be corrected. The Secretariat had apparently thought that, when a State had written to say that it had adopted the system, it had meant that it had put it into force unless it had definitely stated that it had only accepted the principle of the import certificate system.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) reminded the Committee that in January 1923 he had stated that the Netherlands Government had accepted the principle of the import certificate system but had not yet enforced it.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that two years had elapsed since that statement.

Dame Rachel CROWDY explained that the list gave the names of the countries which had stated that they had adopted the system but which had not actually said that it had been put into force. In the majority of cases it was in force and in certain cases it had only been adopted. As regarded the Netherlands, M. Van Wettum's letter had stated that, for the present, the Netherlands Government had adopted the system, but was not able to put it into force until certain laws had been changed.

The CHAIRMAN thought it important to draw up a list of the States which had put the import certificate system into operation.

Dame Rachel CROWDY said that certain Governments had not stated whether the system was in force or not. They had merely said that it was adopted. Three lists, therefore, would have to be prepared, containing :

- (1) those countries in which it was enforced ;
- (2) those countries which had adopted it but had not stated that it was in force ;
- (3) those countries which had stated that the system was not in force.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in the revised version of the Secretary's progress report, two lists should be inserted : a list of States which had enforced the system and those which had accepted the system but had not yet put it into force.

The Committee adopted this proposal.

Annual Reports.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) explained that the annual report of the Netherlands Government had not yet been translated but that the Secretary would receive it in a few days.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretary to prepare a revised list for the years in question.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said he had not yet received a report for the year 1924 from his Government but that he possessed sufficient information to enable him to submit one before the end of the session.

M. BRENIER thought that in a general way it would be very difficult for certain colonies to send in their reports for the preceding year.

The CHAIRMAN agreed.

M. Van WETTUM pointed out that the date by which the reports from the colonies ought to be received was October 1st.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that, in reading the report prepared by the Secretary of the Committee on the work accomplished since the last session, he was impressed by the fact that the year under review had been marked by very important steps. A great event had occurred since the conclusion of the Hague Convention, namely : two Conferences had been held at Geneva during the four months of the preceding winter. Their task, in the opinion of many, had been unparalleled in the annals of the League. He would not recall the difficulties with which the Conferences had been confronted. They had succeeded in drawing up two agreements which contained certain important measures upon which the Conferences had been able to agree.

During the discussion, two of the Powers most concerned withdrew. In the opinion of the Japanese Government, the collaboration of these Powers was essential to the solution of the present problems. In the absence of their moral endorsement of the work of the Conferences, the Committee must realise that the task before it was very difficult.

Whatever the difficulties might be, the Japanese Government had determined to press forward the measures of control and would exert its best influence to fulfil its international and moral obligations in the interests of social solidarity and human welfare. As the Japanese representatives on the Conferences had affixed their signatures to the Agreement and Convention, they would in due course be ratified by the Government in the hope that thereby the work of the Conferences might not be in vain.

The Secretary's report also referred to the resolutions passed by the last Assembly concerning the new representatives on the Committee, and to-day Dr. Tsurumi was very happy to see the Swiss representative, Dr. Carrière, an eminent member of the Health Committee of the League, now a member of the Opium Committee. This collaboration would be very valuable.

Since the last session of the Committee a number of important disclosures had been made of illicit traffic carried on internationally and on a large scale. There were in existence syndicates which possessed a fleet of ships to transport the contraband cargo. It was said that their methods of sending the drugs were so skilful that it was only possible for persons with expert knowledge to detect the way in which they were concealed. As the measures of control became severer, the traffickers became even more dexterous. Because of her proximity to a great market for drugs and to a country which was not a signatory of the Hague Convention, Japan was faced with a very difficult task in endeavouring to prevent its nationals from following this nefarious trade, the more so when large quantities of the drugs were poured into the Far East from all parts of the world by persons of various nationalities. In the circumstances, what could be done? Japan looked forward to the establishment of the Central Board, which would effectively co-ordinate the efforts of the various countries, in order to regulate the international trade in opium and narcotic drugs.

The Japanese representatives on the Committee and also in the Assembly of the League had often declared that, in trying to control the illicit traffic in the Far East, Japan alone was not in a position to solve the problem. International collaboration was essential for its solution. Japan, in the past, had done her best, and she would continue to perfect the measures of the control in the future. In doing so, she expected the collaboration of the other Powers, which should bring their concerted action to bear in regulating the international traffic.

Finally, he wished to thank the Secretary and her staff for the manner in which they had discharged their duties in the somewhat delicate and difficult task of compiling the comprehensive report before the Committee.

Sir John JORDAN said that his attitude at past sessions of the Committee was well known. He was, however, very glad to hear the declaration made by the delegate for Japan. Everyone sympathised with Japan and realised that she alone could not carry out this big task; but, with all deference to the Japanese representative, he would like to reserve his opinion on the success attained until a later date. He thought that the Committee should not yet congratulate itself on any great progress it had made. He hoped that the two Conventions would have the results anticipated, but that remained to be seen. From a cursory perusal of the documents before the Committee, he believed that the illicit traffic was proceeding unabated. None could say confidently why it was continuing, almost in greater force than in the past, but he thought the fault lay with Europe. The traffic could never be stopped by intercepting smuggling here and there; it must be stopped at its source, and he hoped that the Central Board would do it more effectively than had been possible in the past. If the nations of Europe did their duty, this traffic could be stopped.

The Committee must admit that, so far as the suppression of opium-smoking was concerned, it had failed and could not do anything more. He need not state the reasons why the Committee had failed to reduce smoking to any appreciable extent. The whole movement, which had its inception twenty years ago in the suppression of smoking, had undergone a great change. The Committee was now dealing almost exclusively with narcotics, and he hoped that it would be able to achieve greater success than had been the case with the opium problem. The drug traffic could be controlled, and it would be the fault of Europe if that was not accomplished. He was glad that the Japanese Government had told the Committee that it was prepared to collaborate in the fullest possible measure.

He associated himself entirely with what the Japanese representative had said with regard to the work done by the Secretariat. Everyone appreciated the immense work done by Dame Rachel Crowdy and her assistants.

9. Importation of Dangerous Drugs : Procedure to be adopted by the Secretariat in dealing with Reports or Statistics received from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN gave an explanation of paragraph (a) of Item 4, which had been included in the agenda at his request.

All the members of the Committee had received from the Secretariat a paper containing certain statistics furnished by the Finnish Government. In the first version of that paper it appeared that Finland had imported a considerable quantity of prepared opium from Great Britain. When he had seen the statement he had written to the Secretariat for an explanation and had suggested that the Finnish Government should be approached. He had also expressed a little surprise that that had not been done before the paper had been distributed. He had received an explanation from the Secretariat to the effect that the omission to do so had been purely an inadvertence. This would be the ordinary procedure to adopt in such a case where an obvious mistake had been made, especially one which seemed to reflect some discredit on another Government.

So far as he was concerned, he was quite satisfied with that explanation and did not wish to press the matter any further. It might, however, perhaps be desirable, from the point of view of the Secretariat, to propose some kind of resolution to the effect that, in cases where a report or statistics furnished by a particular country contained some statement which was almost certainly erroneous or which appeared to reflect upon the conduct of any Power, the matter should be taken up by the Secretariat, either officially or unofficially, with the Power furnishing the report or statistics before that report or those statistics were distributed to the members of the Committee and to the Members of the League.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) was entirely in favour of the proposal of the Chairman.

M. BOURGOIS (France) accepted the principle of such a resolution but made a reservation in regard to the discussion of the text. This question had already given rise to discussion, but the principle itself was an excellent one.

The Committee decided to adopt at a later meeting a resolution on the lines proposed by the Chairman.

10. Relation between the Date of Meeting of the Committee and the Date of Despatch of the Annual Reports from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, at the last session, it had been decided that the examination of the annual reports of the Powers should be a standing item on the agenda. He had thought that it would be very desirable, if possible, so to arrange the date of the session that the Committee should always have before it the reports for the latest possible year. When the Committee had met in the spring of the year, the only reports it had been possible to obtain had been those of the year but one before the session, and it had seemed to him to be very desirable that the date of the session should in future be so arranged as to enable the Committee to have before it the reports, if possible, for the preceding year.

At one of the early sessions it had been agreed that the earliest dates at which the Committee could expect to receive the reports would be July 1st for European countries or countries within easy distance of Europe, and October 1st for the reports from the more distant countries. It was possible that those dates might be fixed a little earlier, but they certainly could not be fixed very much earlier. Even so, the experience of the Committee had been that those dates were not observed at present. Could the Committee suggest anything which would ensure that the reports were received more regularly on the agreed dates, and also would it consider whether it should fix the date of its annual session at a time when it should be able to have before it the reports of the preceding year?

In the report for 1924 from the Dominion of Canada a suggestion was made that the Committee might prepare a form on the basis of which the report should be drawn up, in order to simplify the work for the officials concerned in the different countries. That suggestion seemed to be well worth consideration.

M. BRENIER wished to know whether October 1st was the date on which the report was received or the date on which it should leave a colony. If it were the date of reception it would be perhaps somewhat difficult for certain colonies to send in their reports in time. If, however, a colony, whatever its distance from Switzerland, were allowed nine months in which to draw up and despatch its report, it had ample time in which to do so.

The CHAIRMAN had in mind the date of reception, but he thought that the problem might be very difficult in the case of certain colonies. Hong-Kong and the Straits Settlements both considered that they could send their reports to England so as to arrive by August 1st. These colonies, however, were more favourably situated than others. Even if the Committee fixed October 1st as the latest date on which reports might be sent, that would still allow the Secretariat time to include the information in the published document if the session were held early in January. It was desirable, of course, from the point of view of the Secretariat, that the reports should be received as early as possible.

M. BRENIER said that the matter was of the greatest concern to the Secretariat. If the Secretariat were ready to agree to receive reports from the colonies up to the beginning of November, when the Advisory Committee was to meet at the beginning of January, it would be preferable to decide that October 1st should be the date on which the report should be sent and not the date upon which it should be received. In any case, a colony could not be required to send out a report before September 1st.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the question had been discussed at great length at past sessions of the Committee, when it had been decided to fix October 1st as the date for despatching the reports. It was not desirable to put that date any earlier, as experience had proved, on the contrary, that certain colonies found it difficult to have the report ready even by that date.

Dame Rachel CROWDY said that four months were needed to finish the preparation of the summary from the time the last report arrived. If all the reports came in only one month before the session of the Committee, the Secretariat would have an almost impossible task, but if the Secretariat could be empowered not to accept any report arriving one month before

the meeting for inclusion in the summary, and if only two or three reports came in at the last moment, it could deal with the work.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone its decision until a later meeting in order to allow private discussion.

The proposal was adopted.

11. Question of a Standard Form for the Annual Reports from Governments : Proposal by the Canadian Government.

The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to discuss the suggestion in the Canadian report that a standard form on which the reports could be made should be prepared and distributed to the Governments.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the Central Board would ask for certain statistics and would establish a kind of form for the use of Governments. If that form were drawn up, many of the questions now asked in the Committee's annual report would be unnecessary. Would it not be better to wait until the Board had established its form for statistics ?

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) wished warmly to support the Canadian proposal. If a form for the preparation of the annual reports were sent to all Governments, the work of Government offices would be facilitated. Also the reports would be uniform and would not contain too many unnecessary details, and thus the work of the Secretariat would be lightened. M. Van Wettum had referred to the standard form to be furnished by the Central Board, but no one knew as yet the date upon which the Central Board would come into existence. It was better, therefore, to make a start by sending a standard form to all Governments immediately.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) quoted the proposal contained in the Canadian report (Document O. C. 297).

The Board would have to furnish Governments with some standard form, and if the Committee knew what kind of form the Board drew up it could then know what form to prepare for the annual report of the Advisory Committee.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with M. Van Wettum in thinking that the Canadian Government had not intended to suggest altering the forms. The annual reports had always been extremely interesting and very well drawn up. In his view, there was no necessity for a form. His experience was that, as a rule, such a practice tended to stereotype reports. Countries should be allowed latitude in these matters, and the Committee would deprive the reports of their interest if it sent out established forms. A question like prepared opium could not be dealt with on forms.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Sir John Jordan. The Secretariat could draw the attention of Governments to certain points when necessary, but Governments should be left free to send in their information in their own way.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) did not think it should be necessary to establish a standard form.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had indicated, in the year in which it had decided on the adoption of the system of annual reports, the points with which they were to deal. The Canadian Government, however, wanted a form on which it could make its report. The point was therefore whether it was desirable that the Committee should prepare and distribute to the Governments a form on which they would make their reports. The subjects or questions would be printed on that form, and all that would remain would be for the officials of the Government concerned to fill in the actual figures, information, etc., at the same time leaving space and opportunity for the general statement which Sir John Jordan — in his view, perfectly rightly — considered so desirable.

M. BRENIER thought that the Committee would be helping the Secretariat if it insisted that the headings of the chapters which had been agreed upon at a previous session were generally followed.

M. BLANCO (Assistant Secretary) said that the Canadian Government's proposal was probably intended to mean that the Governments should be supplied with a form on which each Government would put down the totals of the headings such as were at the moment abstracted in the summaries prepared by the Secretariat. At the moment, annual reports were received by the Secretariat containing a long list of preparations, as a result of the heading of the annual report: "In the case of preparations, etc., please state quantities in terms of the weight of the drug content". Instead of receiving one total, the Secretariat received a list of about 40 or 50 items containing very small quantities of preparations or pills or tinctures, and it had to work out the drug content without the percentage. This meant that sometimes it had to use a rate of conversion which might not be correct. As far as the Secretariat's statistics were concerned, they would be much easier to compile if only the summary or the total were sent.

M. BRENIER said that, if it were merely a question of simplifying a certain number of headings, he would agree with M. Blanco. Certain Governments would find it useful if the Secretariat communicated to them the probable morphine content of the various drugs. This

procedure would be preferable to one which compelled the Secretariat to make a series of calculations covering reports received from 50 Governments and concerned with 500 preparations. A list indicating the probable morphine content of each preparation should therefore be sent to each Government.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with M. Brenier. The system of simplifying statistics which was proposed would, in fact, make more difficult the work of those who prepared the statistics. Nevertheless, the Committee might perhaps recommend, without seeking to impose anything on Governments, that the statistics should take account of the percentage of the drug content.

Sir John JORDAN thought the question a very simple one. The Secretariat might alter the heading in question of the annual report.

The CHAIRMAN, in summing up the discussion, thought that the Committee was against the preparation of such a form as had been suggested and in favour of the Secretariat distributing to the Governments — through the Advisory Committee — a list of the points on which either the reports might be made more clear or more simple. The Secretariat should, if possible, prepare a list of these points before the close of the session, so that the Committee could formally pass them and authorise their distribution.

Sir John JORDAN considered that these points should not be numerous.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

THIRD MEETING

Held at Geneva on Tuesday, August 25th, 1925, at 10 a.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

12. Progress Report by the Secretary : Sale of Drugs to French Nationals in China.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had postponed consideration of one item in the Progress Report until the arrival of the French delegate. The point in question was a statement to the effect that "The French Government states that the sale and distribution of drugs is prohibited" in French leased territories or concessions in China.

It was asked whether the French nationals in China were not allowed to sell drugs for medical and scientific purposes.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he had not before him the text of the consular decrees promulgated at Shanghai, but he had asked for them by telegram and hoped that he would be able to put them before the Fifth Committee of the Assembly. They would certainly be available for the next session of the Advisory Committee, and he could at once give the following information :

"The consular decrees have dealt with this matter. They were based on French legislation as well as on the laws and customs of China. The measures enacted and put into force in our concessions are much more rigorous than those which were enacted and put into force in Chinese territory. Smoking divans are prohibited and in practice no longer exist. The sale and consumption of opium is strictly prohibited. In regard to penalties for infringement, the consular court applies in the case of French delinquents the French code, and the mixed court applies the provisions of the Chinese criminal code to Chinese delinquents. The suppression of the use of or of the traffic in opium and of narcotics is a matter of daily moment to our consular and municipal authorities, who are using their efforts to combat this evil in the most energetic manner. Thus, in 1923, in the French Concession at Shanghai, 643 cases of infractions of the law were judged by the mixed court, which inflicted in fines varying from 20 to 200 dollars a total sum of 35,000 dollars. In 1924, the fines amounted in the French Concession alone to 150,000 dollars or more than 1,600,000 francs.

"Our consular authorities are gravely perturbed at this state of affairs and are doing all in their power to suppress the evil. The total amount of the fines imposed shows the importance of the evil and the severity of its repression."

M. Bourgois added that the French report should read : "are only authorised to sell drugs required for medical purposes".

13. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to discuss the summary in two parts, prepared by the Secretariat, of the annual reports received (Annex 3). There were also available copies of the most important reports.

Commonwealth of Australia (1923).

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT quoted the following passage: "The main difficulty to complete suppression of opium-smoking is the smuggling of the drug from vessels arriving from other countries, principally the Far Eastern countries. Another difficulty is on account of the elaborate precautions taken by the Chinese conducting opium-dens to guard against surprise visits by the police.

"In order to effect complete suppression, the co-operation of countries where opium is produced is necessary in the direction of preventing export from those countries, especially by crews of vessels. So far as Australia is concerned, co-operation on the part of India, China and Portugal and the authorities of Singapore and Hong-Kong would go a long way towards minimising the trouble."

What check did the Government of India impose on opium going to Australia?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that the Committee was well aware of the general measures taken by the Government of India to prevent smuggling. To the best of his knowledge, there were no exports from India to Australia. Whatever Australia received came direct from England.

As regarded smuggling, the arrangements were, he thought, as complete as they could be made. All opium produced was most rigidly controlled by the Government. It was collected in the Government warehouse, and could only leave that warehouse under a proper certificate. The only possibility of smuggling from India direct was the smuggling of the small amounts which retail vendors could collect by falsifying their books. A retail vendor was compelled to keep an exact account of his sales. Undoubtedly, owing to the large amount of money which could be made by smuggling, some retail vendors did falsify their books. To take a concrete instance, a man would say that he had sold in the course of the year 100 pounds of opium, and he would make fictitious entries in his books writing up that amount. He might, in fact, have sold 70 pounds only, which would leave him a balance of 30 pounds. That would be available for smuggling out of India, but a smuggler would have to run the gauntlet of strict supervision by the local excise authorities, by the police before he could bring it to a port, and by the Customs authorities at the port. The Government was aware that a certain trade of this kind did exist, but it was believed to be small in amount. So far as his information went, the chief market for these small quantities was Burma, which was the nearest country. The price there was very much higher than in India; probably, the largest amount of profit with the least risk could be obtained by sending the smuggled opium to Burma. That had been one of the difficulties in exercising control in Burma.

He could recollect no complaint from the Australian Government regarding smuggled opium from India, and, of course, the Government of India was always most anxious to co-operate with any Government to prevent smuggling. There was always a certain amount of smuggling by ships' crews despite all the efforts of the Customs authorities, which went as far as a personal search of all seamen of suspected nationality or of suspected ships.

In order to render the control still stricter, the accounts and the trading operations of any suspected individual retailer of opium were subjected to close and continuous control; sometimes he was watched by secret service men. If his sales showed a considerable increase over a series of years, he was at once called upon to justify the increase. If he could not do so, or if his explanation were unsatisfactory, his total limit for sales during the year was reduced to a figure which the authorities regarded as suitable, and if they suspected that he was engaging in fraudulent traffic his licence was cancelled and he was precluded from receiving a new one.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought Sir John Campbell's explanation very interesting, but if the restriction were so complete why did Australia make this complaint?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that Australia had not complained.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT referred to the quotation she had just read.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply to Sir John Campbell, said that the summary and the original report agreed on the point. This report referred to the year 1923 and had been received in June 1924. The most recent information in his possession was to the effect that the authorities in Australia and the British authorities in Hong-Kong and China were in close touch with regard to these smuggling cases and that information was exchanged between them; therefore, a degree of co-operation had been established so far as those authorities were concerned.

Sir John JORDAN asked for figures. He supposed that the quantity smuggled was very small.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the seizures given by the Australian authorities were quite small.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the quantity was stated to be 437 lb.

In reply to Mrs. Hamilton Wright, he repeated that he knew of no complaint made by Australia with regard to smuggling from India. He quoted from Document O. C. 23 (j), 1, dated July 8th, 1925 (the Australian Report), to show that, when the Australian Government came down to details, the sources of supply of the smuggled opium did not include India. He had never heard of any smuggling from India to Australia, and was certain that, if such smuggling existed in any appreciable quantity, the Australian Government would naturally have brought the matter at once to the notice of the Government of India and would have asked it to assist in stopping it.

The total amount of opium seized was apparently $2\frac{1}{4}$ lb. per case on an average. That was an amount which any individual could conceal on his person.

14. Method of preparing the Summary of Annual Reports drawn up by the Secretariat.

Sir John JORDAN wished to make a general observation.

He missed from the report before the Committee the excellent comments which the Secretariat used to make and the interesting and suggestive comparisons which had been given previously as regarded the year under review and past years. He found no comparisons showing what the situation was in 1923 and 1924 as compared with previous years. He had always depended upon the summaries of the Secretariat, and, as these no longer appeared, he was unable to deal individually with the items in the report.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir John Jordan. The document before the Committee did not present the information in the most convenient form. For one thing, it was divided into two parts: the general comments were placed first and the statistics — which were not less interesting — were summarised in tables at the end. In previous years, information with regard to imports, exports, etc., had been inserted in the body of the report also. Could not the Committee consider in what way the summary should be prepared in future years? Perhaps a small sub-committee could consider the question of the form of the summary and the way in which the information should be dealt with.

The Committee postponed its decision in regard to this proposal until a later meeting.

15. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments (*continuation*).

British North Borneo (1924).

Sir John JORDAN observed that the imports for 1924 amounted to 6,108 kg. 480 gr. from India. Was it certain that no smuggled opium went to this country in transit?

The CHAIRMAN gave the following figures of the exports from India to British North Borneo, beginning with 1920:

| | | | | |
|--------|-----|-----------|---------------|-----|
| 1920 : | 176 | chests of | 140 lb. each. | |
| 1921 : | 240 | » | » | 140 |
| 1922 : | 60 | » | » | 140 |
| 1923 : | 84 | » | » | 140 |
| 1924 : | 84 | » | » | 140 |

Sir John JORDAN said that reference was made to coca plant grown in an experimental garden on the Japanese estate of the Kuhara Company, at Tawau, British North Borneo.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) explained that it was an experimental garden and thought that it would not compete with neighbouring territories. He did not know the business of the Kuhara Company.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the company was free to have an experimental garden if it so chose.

Sir John JORDAN agreed, but would not have thought that the League of Nations would view it with favour. British North Borneo was not a British colony; it was under a chartered company. If British North Borneo grew the coca plant in an experimental garden, it could be grown all over the Far East, and not only would the Dutch monopoly suffer considerably but the use of cocaine would spread. In the Ceylon report, mention was made of an experimental garden in Ceylon.

To safeguard the public and the Dutch monopoly he would suggest that such gardens should not be allowed. If the League of Nations were not going to take any notice of this kind of thing, the whole world would be swamped with cocaine, because, if British North Borneo started a plantation, other countries would do the same. Could not the Committee record its displeasure in some way?

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, when the Convention of the Second Opium Conference came into force, the evils referred to by Sir John Jordan would diminish automatically, because the import certificate system would then be in operation.

Sir John JORDAN did not have the same faith in the import certificate system as M. Van Wettum. He was afraid it had not been very effective in the Far East. Immense quantities of opium and smuggled narcotics were still finding their way to the Far East. In well-administered countries the import certificate might be satisfactory, but in the Far East the system had no effect at all. There had recently been a consignment of 180 chests of opium smuggled into China.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, there was no question at present in either of these gardens of production for manufacture. The Committee did not know what the object of this experimental garden was, but in Ceylon it was described as having been planted for botanical purposes. In most botanical gardens, specimens of many kinds of plants were grown for botanical research, but, if desired, enquiries could be made as to the purposes of the experimental gardens mentioned.

Sir John JORDAN said that cultivation by private individuals was prohibited in Ceylon and that these countries should be asked to confine the growth to botanical purposes. If the growth in British North Borneo were for botanical purposes, no complaint could be made, but this did not seem probable.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that a protest should be made. According to the *Indian Year-Book* of 1923, page 988, coca leaf was grown experimentally in the tea districts of Ceylon, Bengal and Southern India and had been found to produce a good quantity and quality of cocaine.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, at the Second Conference on Opium, it had been found that it was impossible to do more than to ask for import certificates. The cocaine from the Java leaves could only be extracted by means of intricate machinery. All the leaves from Java went to Europe or to Japan, to countries with an efficient administration, and thus it seemed to him that the import certificate system would be of very great use.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should ask what was the object of this experimental garden on the Japanese estate of the Kuhara Company in North Borneo, as it seemed to be a private company. There was no restriction on the discretion of any Government or country to grow the coca plant; every country had full liberty to produce this plant if it so desired. In the Second Conference no agreement had been reached regarding the limitation of the production of the coca plant. The idea of limiting the production to Java, Bolivia and Peru had been rejected.

M. BOURGOIS (France) quite agreed with the Chairman. He thought even that it was too much to ask for information. The company had the right to do what it had done. In view of the conclusions reached by the Conference and the long discussions which had taken place on the subject, there was no reason to ask the Kuhara Company why it was cultivating coca leaf. Further, from the practical point of view, such a procedure would be totally unproductive. If the evil were to be attacked, it was no use attacking coca plantations; the efforts of the Committee should rather be directed towards controlling the manufacture.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT did not agree with M. Bourgois. The production of coca leaf should be stopped in every direction. To take no notice would be to establish a very bad precedent. What was the Hague Convention for but "to pursue the progressive suppression of the use of opium, morphine and cocaine"? In India, which had such a wonderful administration, cocaine was grown in Bengal and Southern India; much money was being spent on something which would not yield any result.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed with M. Bourgois in so far that it would not serve any purpose to ask for information. All those countries were free to grow plantations, and if information were demanded from the North Borneo Company, it would have to be demanded from many other countries, the names of which were to be found in the memorandum of the Dutch Government presented to the Opium Preparatory Committee.

Sir John JORDAN asked if these experimental gardens were intended later on to become commercial enterprises. Was the League to do nothing at all or not to ask any questions about it? He thought that the Committee had been created to do its utmost to suppress the cultivation of opium and coca. From a practical point of view, was it desirable for this kind of thing to go on indefinitely without expressing any opinion about it? If these gardens were eventually intended for commercial ventures, he thought that the Committee should take some action. Otherwise a very grave situation might develop.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) wished to draw attention to one point. The Report of the Government of India for 1923 stated, on page 26, that "the coca plant is not grown in India".

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked how, in that case, the statement in the *India Year-Book* that coca leaf was grown experimentally in the tea districts of Ceylon, Bengal and Southern India, and was found to produce a good quantity and quality of cocaine, was to be explained.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the *India Year-Book* was an entirely non-official publication, for which the Government had no responsibility.

Sir John JORDAN did not wish to refer to Japan alone. North Borneo, Ceylon, Formosa and all places where experiments were being conducted should be warned. If it were merely an ornamental or scientific experiment, then there was no objection at all.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the Committee was discussing one of the most important problems which had been dealt with by the Second Opium Conference. A special committee of that Conference had been set up to investigate the question of cultivation. After months of discussion, it had decided that no restriction should be placed on cultivation. Consequently, to ask for explanations from the countries concerned was useless.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) added that, in connection with the world traffic, there was no export of coca leaves from any one of the many countries that grow coca for experimental purposes, and that at the Conference it was evident that the only country prepared to limit the export of coca leaves was Java. No other country could accept this condition, and it seemed to him therefore that the present discussion was useless.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the production of cocaine for medical and scientific purposes was recognised to be legitimate. The production of the coca leaf for the purpose of the manufacture of cocaine for medical and scientific purposes was therefore equally legitimate and recognised as such. It had been generally agreed at the Conference by all parties that it was impossible to limit the production of the coca leaf for medicinal and scientific purposes to any particular country or countries, and that every Government must have full discretion, if it so desired, to produce the coca leaf for medicinal and scientific purposes. That being so, it seemed that the present discussion was unfruitful. The only ground on which the Committee could intervene would be if the coca plant were being produced for commercial purposes in any country otherwise than under the conditions laid down in the Hague Convention or in the new Convention adopted by the Conference. There was no evidence that there was any intention in these countries — North Borneo, Ceylon, etc. — to produce the coca leaf for other than medicinal or scientific purposes, and he would therefore suggest that the discussion should be closed.

Sir John JORDAN was not so satisfied as the Chairman appeared to be that the British North Borneo Company was cultivating the plant for purely medicinal or scientific purposes. If that were so, he had no objection at all, but, on the evidence as it stood at the moment, he was not quite satisfied on this point. He would like to have an assurance that the cultivation of the plant by the British North Borneo Company was for purely medicinal or scientific purposes.

The CHAIRMAN felt that the British North Borneo Company would not object to the enquiry which he had suggested. He would not press that point, however, as objection had been made to it.

Canada.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was very interesting to note from the Canadian Government's report that, as a result of the direct licensing system which had been introduced, the quantity of drugs imported for use in Canada had very much diminished. The amount of cocaine imported into Canada had fallen from 12,000 oz. in 1919 and 7,000 oz. in 1920 to 1,500 oz. in 1924, and the quantity of morphine imported, including heroin, had fallen from 30,000 oz. in 1919 to 7,000 oz. in 1924.

Ceylon.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India), in answer to Sir John Jordan, said that he had no recent or precise information but he believed that there was a desire on the part of Ceylon to obtain her morphine direct from India instead of from the United Kingdom. The amount was very small, so far as he recollected. It was, he believed, merely a question of replacing the supply which was obtained formerly from England.

In reply to Mrs. Hamilton Wright, he explained that, according to the reports for recent years, India manufactured only a small quantity of morphia. It was made from the washings of the opium vats at the Ghazipur factory. All the details regarding the manufacture were given on page 18 of the Government of India's Report for 1923.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT enquired whether manufacture was increasing and if it was likely to become important.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that, according to his information, morphine was manufactured only from the washings of opium; the quantities were small. The quantity of morphine hydrochloride manufactured from November 1st, 1922, to October 31st, 1923, was 130 lb. 6 oz. He had no more recent information.

Chosen (1923).

The CHAIRMAN said that, on page 13 of the Japanese Report for 1923, the amount of raw opium used in manufacturing morphine was given as 1,638 kg. ; at the bottom of page 13, the

quantity of morphine hydrochloride manufactured was given as 43 kg. Could the Japanese representative give some explanation of the point? On an average morphine content of 10 per cent, 163 kg. and not 43 kg. would have been produced.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that he would answer the point at a later meeting.

Fiji.

Sir John JORDAN asked if the Advisory Committee endorsed the definition of "legitimate" given by Fiji. It appeared to him to be a very good one and he should like to see it adopted in practice. The definition read: "It has been taken to include the sale of opium to persons who have been habituated to its use, with the proviso that the quantity provided for such sale should be materially reduced each year".

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked if the definition of the Sub-Committee of the Health Committee had ever been accepted or discarded? She had thought it to be a most admirable definition.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) was ready to give Mrs. Hamilton Wright the information she desired. The definition of the Health Committee or of the Mixed Sub-Committee only meant, by the expression "legitimate needs", medicinal and scientific needs. Among these was comprised the delivery of morphia to morphiomaniacs, whose need for the drug was vital to their existence and work.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the habitués referred to in the Fijian Report were Indian immigrants.

Formosa.

The CHAIRMAN noted that in the Formosan Report it was stated that no opium had been used for the manufacture of morphine, medicinal opium or other medicinal preparations in 1923. At one time there was quite a considerable manufacture of morphine by the Government monopoly in Formosa. Was there no longer any production of crude morphine?

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) thought that there had been no manufacture since 1922.

As no mention had been made of it in the report, it might be assumed that the production of morphine had ceased.

Sir John JORDAN noted that, as regarded import certificates, the Formosan Government had no difficulty in carrying out this system. He was very glad to hear the declaration that Japan was determined to put a stop to illicit trading, but that she could not do this alone and was prepared to act internationally. From the last statement sent by the British Government he noted that a ship went from the Persian Gulf to Keelurg. What had happened to that ship? Could the Japanese Government, in collaboration with other Governments, do nothing in the matter at all? The import certificate was negligible in the Far East, except for imports to Japan.

The CHAIRMAN referred to page 25 of the Japanese Report for 1923, where were recorded the total imports into the port of Keelurg during that year, the country of origin and the quantity imported; from Persia 10,800 kg. were imported, from European Turkey 34,722 kg. That was for the use of the Government monopoly in Formosa, and probably included the consignment on the ship to which Sir John Jordan had referred.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the ship to which he had referred had been engaged in smuggling.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that the traffic with Formosa was not an illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Formosa had imported 23 kg. of heroin in 1923. That was, he thought, rather a large quantity for the population of an island the size of Formosa.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) explained that there were 3,655,000 persons in Formosa. He would investigate the whole question. Somewhat large quantities of cocaine and heroin were being used in Japan at the moment for medical purposes.

France.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government had not yet put into force the system of import certificates, which it hoped to apply very shortly as soon as it had ratified the new Convention.

The French Government was already employing this system with Great Britain. Further, when a consignment was sent to a Government applying a system of import licences — as, for example, Japan — the French trader took steps to assure himself that the purchaser possessed an import certificate and only sent the consignment on the production of that certificate. The French Government had thought the ratification of the Convention to be so imminent that it would be better to await such ratification before putting into force the licensing system. An Inter-Ministerial Committee which had been set up several months previously was now bringing its work to a close. This work had consisted in the preparation of such laws, regulations and decrees as would be necessary for the application of the new Convention. As soon as such laws had been submitted to the Chambers, the ratification of the Convention would be undertaken. M. Bourgois had found all competent authorities in favour of rapid ratification. He could

not give any official undertaking on the subject but he was personally convinced that the ratification of the French Government was imminent. Despite the unjust criticisms which had been levelled against the new Convention, he was persuaded that a decisive step forward had been taken and that, if the Permanent Central Board rightly understood the task which it had been called upon to fulfil, the greatest part of the evil would certainly disappear.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) noted that the report for France for 1923 mentioned the export of raw cocaine from the Netherlands. This was probably incorrect. As far as he was aware, there was no export of raw cocaine from the Netherlands, and the Report for the Netherlands for 1923 made no mention of it.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he would point out the matter to the Customs authorities. He would then write personally to M. Van Wettum and would, after an enquiry in which M. Van Wettum would participate, send a note on the subject to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Bourgois for explanations concerning one or two points connected with the export of morphine from France. In 1923, morphine was exported to Greece to the extent of 1,719 kg., which was an enormous quantity for a country of the size of Greece; in the same year, 719 kg. of morphine were exported to Cuba from France. This was also a very large quantity. In 1924, 280 kg. were exported to Cuba. There was some reason to think that Cuba was one of the centres of the contraband trade in the West Indies.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he also had been struck by the high figure of the exports of morphine from France to Greece and Cuba in 1923. The figure for exports to Greece for 1924 was not given because the one given by the Customs authorities had seemed to be incorrect. A request would be made for supplementary information, an enquiry would be carried out and, if the high figures revealed the existence of smuggling, the appropriate measures would be taken.

Great Britain.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) asked for explanations concerning a small amendment made in the report regarding the dispensing of doctors' prescriptions.

The CHAIRMAN said that the amendment referred to related to the British regulations according to which a chemist, before he could dispense a doctor's prescription, had to satisfy himself that the signature of the doctor was in fact a genuine signature. In the case of a prescription given on an official form under the National Health Insurance system, the fact that the prescription was on the official form was a guarantee that it was genuine.

Sir John JORDAN asked what were the exceptional reasons which led to considerable quantities of morphine and morphine salts being imported from the Indian Government.

The CHAIRMAN replied that it was the fact that was exceptional, and understood the explanation to be that there had been an accumulation of small quantities of morphine for several years, which the Indian Government had desired to dispose of. It had accordingly sent them to England for medical and scientific use.

Sir John JORDAN noted that the embargo on the firms of F. Hoffman-La-Roche and Co., Ltd., and C. H. Boehringer & Sohn had been maintained; how long had it been in existence?

The CHAIRMAN thought that the embargo on the Hoffmann-La-Roche Company had been in force for about two years and that on the Boehringer Company for about 18 months.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it was not necessary at the moment to maintain an embargo on the firm Boehringer & Sohn of Hamburg, which now deserved no censure.

The CHAIRMAN had considerable doubts as to whether this was so, but thought that it should be discussed when the Committee considered those items of its agenda concerning smuggling.

Hong-Kong.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) quoted the following passage from the report furnished by Hong-Kong:

"A few seizures were made of Indian opium but none of any magnitude, but from documents seized it was apparent that elaborate arrangements had been made to attempt to smuggle Indian opium into China. In two cases, involving 340 chests in all, Benares opium was exported from India to Persia and was exported thence as Persian opium, and so ultimately reached China. The Indian trade returns for 1924 mentioned the export of opium to Persia. Apparently most of this opium was at once shipped to China or Macao".

The export trade to Persia was of comparatively recent origin, and was, of course, subject to the usual stipulation that export was not permitted without the production of the customary official import certificates. As soon as the Government of India became aware of the facts cited in the Hong-Kong Report, indicating that opium exported from India to Persia was finding its way into illicit channels, they at once issued orders stopping all exports from

India to Persia. This supplied, he thought, a useful concrete instance of the manner in which the Government of India dealt with the question of the possible augmentation of the volume of the illicit trade, in so far as Indian sources of supply were concerned.

Sir John JORDAN was obliged to Sir John Campbell for his explanation but at the same time thought it disquieting to find that the Government of India should have exported opium to Persia at all, because the fact that Persia was engaged in this contraband trade was well known. It would not, however, be repeated. Sir John Campbell would remember that Sir John Jordan had often said that Indian opium was still being imported into China, though Sir John Campbell had maintained that this was impossible on account of the cheapness of Chinese opium.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the contention referred to was, he thought, substantially correct. It was made some time ago, and this trade was of comparatively recent origin.

The important point was that, as soon as evidence was obtained pointing to the fact that Indian exports to Persia were finding their way into illicit channels, these exports were at once stopped. India did not now export to Persia, whether import certificates from Persia requesting such exports were received or not.

Sir John JORDAN emphasised the fact that the cheapness of Chinese opium did not preclude the import of Persian or Indian opium into China if it could be obtained. The illicit trade would amply confirm that statement.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) informed the Committee that the Government of India had, in pursuance of the general policy he had explained, ordered that all export of opium to Macao should also cease.

In reply to Sir John Jordan, he stated that the old agreement between the Indian and Portuguese Governments had been denounced.

He gave a brief summary of the action taken after the treaty had been denounced, and pointed out that such action had always been based upon a most careful examination of all available evidence. When the Government of India was satisfied that opium from Macao was finding its way into illicit channels, the treaty was denounced. When it was thus free to deal with the situation, and when it was satisfied that adequate guarantees and safeguards did not exist precluding a portion of the Indian exports to Macao from going to swell the volume of the illicit traffic, it gave orders for stopping such exports. Here, as elsewhere, it exercised the right it had always asserted to go behind the official import certificates, when satisfied, on the evidence, that the opium covered by these certificates could not reasonably be regarded as in fact destined solely for legitimate purposes.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the statement of Sir John Campbell was one of the most important that had been made before the Committee, and personally he was very glad to know that the Government of India had taken steps to prevent supplies reaching Macao, and that it was no longer regarding the import certificate system as a sacrosanct document. He noticed that there was no report from Macao at all.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India), in reply to Sir John Jordan, said that the Indian Government had only prohibited export to Macao a few months previously.

FOURTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Tuesday, August 25th, 1925, at 3 p.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

16. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments (continuation).

Hong-Kong (continuation).

Sir John JORDAN raised one or two questions with regard to the 1924 Report.

On page 2 it was stated :

“Comparatively little Chinese raw opium was seized, but constant seizures were made of Chinese prepared opium originating in Kwong Chow Wan, Wuchow, Kongmoon, Amoy and elsewhere. Haiphong ceased to send Yunnan raw opium, but the trade was transferred to Tung Hing and the neighbouring French leased territory of Kwong Chow Wan, where the opium was boiled in numerous manufactories and despatched to Hong-Kong almost daily by the small steamers which ply between that port and Hong-Kong”.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government had on several occasions been informed by the British Government of an important smuggling trade carried on in the territory of Kwong Chow Wan. As a result of this information, enquiries had been undertaken by the French Government which showed that syndicates, composed of Chinese houses with consider-

able capital and with their headquarters elsewhere, were carrying on a wide smuggling trade in the neighbouring territory of Tonkin and through Kwong Chow Wan. The French Government had decided to take energetic steps to put an end to this trade. It was with this object that the First Opium Conference had decided that the Government departments concerned, especially the Customs administrations and the officials whose duty it was to suppress smuggling in the Far East, such as the French Customs officials of Indo-China and the English officials of Hong-Kong, should enter periodically into direct relations and, further, should hold conferences in order to decide on common measures against the illicit traffic.

In reply to a further question of Sir John JORDAN, M. BOURGOIS said that there was a passage in the French Report concerning Kwong Chow Wan.

Sir John JORDAN raised a second point in regard to the Hong-Kong Report. On page 4 it was said that :

“ The number of seizures of dangerous drugs during the year was eight, none of which was made on shore. No evidence was found during the year that there was any retail trade in dangerous drugs in the colony. No hypodermic syringes were found. Japan was the destination or the origin of many of the seizures, and considerable amounts of Turkish and Persian opium destined for well-known morphine manufacturers in Japan were noticed as they passed through the port.

“ The import of opium extract into Japan from Germany was noticed for the first time. ”

He would like the Japanese representative to throw some light on that statement.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) regretted that he was unable to give any information, but if necessary he would make an enquiry. At the same time, he thought that full information should be demanded from the Hong-Kong Government.

Sir John JORDAN agreed that there was not sufficient information to enable the Japanese Government to take action.

M. BOURGOIS (France), returning to the question of Kwong Chow Wan, said that in the official report the consumption of the territory was stated to be 41 tons of raw opium and 10 tons of prepared opium, i.e. an all-round consumption of 40 tons of prepared opium. Four or five years previously, the population of the territory had amounted to 350,000 inhabitants, which meant that 1 kg. of opium was consumed per 10 persons. Since the outbreak of civil war in China, however, the population had almost doubled and included a large floating population. The consumption of opium had consequently been reduced to 1 kg. per 20 persons, which was not a very high figure.

According to the experts attending the Conference, 1 gramme of opium was consumed in 4 pipes. The danger of becoming intoxicated only occurred after the smoking of 20 pipes, i.e. the consumption of 5 grammes of opium a day (nearly 2 kg. a year).

Sir John JORDAN said that, if it were true that there was a great excess of opium going into Kwong Chow Wan, not for the use of the population but for illicit transportation elsewhere, the matter should be thoroughly investigated.

M. BOURGOIS (France) explained that the French experts attending the First Conference had acknowledged that there was a contraband trade being carried on through Kwong Chow Wan. They had held numerous private conferences with the experts from Hong-Kong, and M. Bourgois could assure Sir John Jordan that everything had been done by the head of the *Régie* and by the Excise service, by the general Administration of Indo-China and by the Hong-Kong Government to take the necessary measures to combat and put an end to the illicit traffic. The question had been minutely examined at the First Conference, thanks to the fact that the experts had first met each other on that occasion. New and effective means would now be available for pursuing the campaign against the evil.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Article 1 of the Agreement concluded by the First Conference contained provisions aimed at this traffic which should do much to meet the evils to which Sir John Jordan had drawn attention.

The Report for Indo-China for 1923, including the figures relating to Kwong Chow Wan, would be distributed very shortly and the matter could be further discussed at a later stage.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) referred to the statement that Germany had exported opium extract to Japan. This was not surprising. Germany exported opium extract to Japan on receipt of import certificates, but the quantities exported were normal. Were they to prove excessive or were evidence of smuggling to be found, enquiries would undoubtedly be set on foot and efforts made to stop the illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would call the attention of the British Colonial Office to the need for further particulars regarding a statement of this kind.

Sir John JORDAN referred to the statement of M. Bourgois that 40 tons of opium were consumed in Kwong Chow Wan. In Hong-Kong, with a population of twice that of Kwong Chow Wan, there was a consumption of only 18 tons. He protested against Kwong Chow Wan opium going into Hong-Kong, seeing that the authorities there were doing their duty and had been doing so for some years. He desired to put on record that he could not agree that the measures arranged at the First Conference would be adequate to deal with the situation of Kwong Chow Wan.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that Sir John Jordan was in reality criticising the Chinese situation and not the situation in Indo-China. The population of Kwong Chow Wan had amounted to 350,000 three years previously, but as a result of the recent troubles in China it had largely increased and the territory also had an important floating population. The territory was Chinese in its civilisation and, as regarded the consumption of opium and the difficulties of repression, should be compared with the neighbouring Chinese provinces. In certain large cities, such as Hong-Kong, civilisation had changed as a result of contact with European civilisation, but this had not occurred in a territory populated by peasants, fishermen and smugglers. There was a large region entirely outside the civilising influences of European Powers.

The Chinese population of Hong-Kong lived in quite different conditions, and France could not be accused of allowing an excessive consumption of opium in the territory of Kwong Chow Wan because it was compared with the consumption of a city like Hong-Kong. Despite all the efforts of the French Government, the consumption in Kwong Chow Wan had remained about the same as it was in the neighbouring Chinese provinces.

The best method of combating the opium evil was not, as many persons, moved by humanitarian motives doubtless worthy of respect, maintained, to enact decrees which could not be enforced in practice but to raise the standard of living of the population. The standard of living of the population in Hong-Kong was entirely different from that of the fishermen and peasant population of Kwong Chow Wan. It was only as the result of long effort that an improvement in conditions could be effected in a territory such as Kwong Chow Wan.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) asked, with reference to the last paragraph of the summary regarding Hong-Kong, whether the Chinese text-books mentioned were specially used for the Chinese schools.

The CHAIRMAN explained that it referred to the action taken by the Hong-Kong Education Department with regard to the Chinese schools in Hong-Kong.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) thought this was a very interesting form of propaganda.

India.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the Secretariat had been supplied with the agreements made between India and the Dutch East Indies, the Straits Settlements and British North Borneo.

The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Committee should have before it a tabulated statement of the total exports to the Far Eastern colonies in order to ascertain whether they were decreasing or increasing.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said the agreements had been furnished to the Secretariat ; the objection the Government of India had had to furnishing copies immediately had been due to the fact that they were agreements with other Governments, and, on account of considerations of international courtesy, the Indian Government did not think it advisable to publish them until their sanction was received. Long previous to the receipt of the copies by the Secretariat, however, he had informed the Advisory Committee of the contents of these agreements. The agreements fixed a price and provided for the fixation of an annual quantity ; that quantity was not a minimum ; and it was specifically stated that the purchasing Governments were not bound to purchase a minimum quantity from the Government of India.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether they were restricted as regarded the purchase of Indian opium ?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that substantially the bulk of the opium was to be obtained from India. That provision had been inserted in order to afford the Government of India some means of control. But the restriction to Indian opium was not absolute. In the Straits Settlements, for example, the local authorities considered that Indian opium alone was not suitable for local requirements, and therefore the Straits Government imported opium from other sources also.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that in that case the Straits Settlements could import any amount of opium they desired.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that it would obviously be improper for the Government of India to attempt to limit the Straits Settlements. Their total imports were their concern, primarily at any rate. The agreements had been published, and their contents were known. The Government of India had to be informed of material variations of the quantity demanded, the principal reason being to enable it to make arrangements for the cultivation of the quantity necessary. It was obvious that a large increase or decrease in the demand would upset the Government of India's cultivation plans. Another reason was that the Government of India was enabled to exercise for its own purpose some check on the demand.

As regarded the exports, the figures were published annually ; they were communicated to the Committee as received.

The CHAIRMAN said that the figures for 1924 were : exported under direct sales, 5,124 chests ; exported under sale by auction at the Calcutta sales on League of Nations certificate, 2,423 chests — giving the total of 7,547 chests.

Sir John JORDAN asked how far Singapore imported Persian opium on its own account or how far under the authority of the Imperial Government.

The CHAIRMAN said that the amount of Persian opium imported by the Straits Settlements in 1923 was 2,432 kg. 276 gr.

Sir John JORDAN would have liked to see the amount sent to each place and not only the total amount received from India. These figures would, he thought, tell in favour of the Indian Government. For instance, the imports of Siam had fallen off to the extent of 200 chests.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that the figures were given in the report.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked what had been the reduction in the amount sent to British North Borneo since 1923.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that 84 chests had been sent in 1923.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that too much opium was sent to British North Borneo. The United States of America had difficulty in keeping smuggled opium out of the Philippines, and much of it came from British North Borneo. It was said that the consumption per head was 7,200 grains. If the Indian Government were stopping the export of opium to Macao, why should it not do the same in the case of British North Borneo ? That would be of considerable advantage to the Philippines.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) replied that the quantity of opium exported from India to British North Borneo had been settled after long discussions with the responsible authorities. The matter was carefully examined and the Government of India accepted the demand as reasonable as far as it was concerned. The Committee should maintain a sense of proportion. It could not forget that 15,000 tons of opium a year were being produced in China and that exports from China were practically uncontrolled. It was possible that there might be some smuggling from North Borneo ; but to state that North Borneo was responsible for the introduction of " enormous quantities " of opium into the Philippines, when there was an uncontrolled production of 15,000 tons next door to the Philippines and when India exported to North Borneo about five tons only, seemed to him to exceed the limits of fair criticism.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT had no desire to cast any aspersions on India but it should be remembered that India could exercise control, while China could not. Information from the Philippines showed that a lot of opium came from British North Borneo.

The CHAIRMAN enquired where Mrs. Hamilton Wright had obtained statistics for the Philippines.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT replied that they had come from the Philippines themselves and were also given in official reports.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether she referred to the present situation or to that of several years ago.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that the situation was a continuous one.

The CHAIRMAN wished emphatically to deny that statement.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT replied that it was to be found in the Philippine Report.

The CHAIRMAN said that not only had the Government of British North Borneo taken stringent measures to prevent smuggling but the statistics of the quantity of Indian opium imported into North Borneo — namely, 84 chests a year — made it impossible for any large quantity to be smuggled into the Philippines. Unless Mrs. Hamilton Wright could give statistics of seizures during 1923 or 1924, he thought that that allegation ought not to be put forward by her.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that she would lay the statistics before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the figures submitted to the First Opium Conference in regard to British North Borneo were not found to be excessive, as Mrs. Hamilton Wright appeared to suggest. Was Mrs. Hamilton Wright prepared to give the seizures of opium smuggled from British North Borneo during the years 1922, 1923 and 1924 ? Unless these statistics were available, the matter ought not to be made a subject of discussion. The point would be adjourned until the statistics were forthcoming.

Sir John JORDAN enquired whether the recent agreement with British North Borneo was a continuation of the previous one.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that the new agreement was substantially the same as the old.

Japan.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) called attention to certain misprints. The area of the land used for the cultivation of poppies was 37,494 ares, not acres, and the amount of opium produced amounted to 2,158 kg. 865 gr.

M. BRENIER said that this was one example of the necessity of putting the kilogrammes first and the grammes afterwards. It was impossible to check printed matter of this kind because a comma might be mistaken for a point.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Japanese representative to explain the following paragraph in the original report :

“ Whether a country enforces the system or not, import certificates (in English) are always required for importation. With regard to exportation, permits are granted after examination of authorisation given by the authorities of the country for which the consignments are destined. ”

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that, before import was allowed, the importer must secure a certificate from the Government. It amounted really to an import authorisation.

The CHAIRMAN noticed that in the statistics given the only exports from Japan during the year in question had been to Russia and China. Was that correct ?

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) replied in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Japanese Government required the production of the import authorisation of the Russian or Chinese Government.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that the expression “ the authority of the country concerned ” meant that the Japanese practitioners in China obtained a certificate from the Japanese Consul in their district. Unless that authority accompanied the application, no certificate was given.

The CHAIRMAN said that with regard to the figures for the production of morphine, he could not understand the statistics given on page 5 of the report (Doc. O. C. 23 (c). 1). There it was stated that 3,007 kg. of salts of morphine, equivalent to 2,281 kg. of the alkaloid, were manufactured. Then there followed a remark to the effect that “ for manufacturing salts of heroin, codeine and dionine, 2,586 kg. of salts of morphine were used ”. Was the figure 2,586 kg. of salts of morphine included in the above figure of salts of morphine manufactured ?

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) explained that, in the form of the annual report, Governments were required to furnish the figures for morphine and also for the salts of morphine. In order to furnish complete figures, the Japanese authorities always demanded statistics from the manufacturers both as regarded salts of morphine and also the weight of salts of morphine manufactured. Therefore the figure was given in terms of morphine weight.

He added that the salts of morphine manufactured amounted to 3,007.979 kg., of which 2,586.113 kg. were used for manufacturing heroin, etc.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in that case only about 400 kg. of morphine were left for the whole consumption of Japan.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) replied in the affirmative.

In reply to a question from M. BRENIER concerning the manufacture of heroin, he stated that the 1922 figure for heroin was very low and that the stock brought forward from previous years was included.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to page 3 of the report, said that 12,553 kg. of opium were used in the manufacture of morphine, heroin and codeine. Assuming, for the purposes of calculation, that the average percentage of morphine content was 10 per cent, that would produce only about 1,255 kg. of morphine alkaloid, but the actual production, according to the table on page 5 of the report, was 3,007 kg. of salts, with a morphine equivalent of 2,281 of alkaloid, That was far removed from what it might be expected to obtain from the 12,000 kg. of raw opium.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that the amount of morphine content of the raw opium was 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that during the year Japan had used 12,553 kg. of raw opium, from which she had manufactured 3,007 kg. of salts of morphine, equivalent to 2,281 kg. in terms of morphine weight. If both figures were correct, the opium must have a morphine content of over 18 per cent, which seemed impossible. There must, he thought, be some error in the figures. It was desirable to clear up the matter if possible.

Perhaps Dr. Tsurumi could furnish explanations at the next meeting and also make his observations on the large quantities of heroin, amounting to 1,723 kg. 680 in 1923, and cocaine, amounting to 3,313 kg. The quantities were obviously very large, and the Committee would be very grateful for explanations.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) undertook to furnish them. He then made the following statement on the general principles adopted by the Japanese Government :

“ In reviewing the statistics for Japan for the year 1923 we should keep in our mind two aspects of the question. One is the policy or line of the procedure which

has been adopted by the Japanese Government in regard to the control of opium and narcotic traffic ; and the other is the technical process by which this policy was to be put into execution. When the directive line of the Government is known, there remains the question of the administrative and technical measures upon which the success of the policy depends.

“ What has been the policy of the Japanese Government since it ratified the Hague Convention and put it into force in 1921 ? It was to regulate strictly import, export and manufacture. As to the consumption of opium and narcotic drugs, the Japanese Government has had no trouble in controlling them so as to prevent abuse of narcotics by the population.

“ As to the import of raw opium, it is the Government which buys the opium, and as to export, it is absolutely prohibited. You have seen the figures for Japan proper, which are very much limited for the year ; they are even below the figures which have been fixed by the League's Committee. There must be a certain variation of the amount of drugs manufactured from year to year according to the demand and the amount on hand during the preceding year, but the total of the raw material is fixed by the Government in the budget and no increase is possible during the year.

“ As to the import and manufacture of the alkaloids of opium, the Japanese Government has tightened the regulations in order to reduce the import, and the quantity manufactured is also reduced. There is a certain adjustment still necessary, but the Committee must realise the effort made by the Government of Japan in regard to the administrative side of the regulations.

“ As a result of adopting this definite policy of strict regulation, the Japanese Government found itself faced with a difficulty in regard to the quantities to be allotted to the manufacturers for the year 1923. In order to regulate the manufacture for the year 1923 the allotment should have been made during the preceding year, but no one had any definite idea in 1922 what would be the quantity needed for the country. In regard to cocaine, for example, the Japanese authorities in 1921 had estimated the need at about 1,800 kg. per year, and in order to grant permits to manufacture this quantity the authorities allowed so much for coca leaves at the rate of 0.35 per cent of cocaine content, and 45 per cent of cocaine for the crude cocaine. This low rate was due to the rather undeveloped stage of the cocaine manufacture in Japan at the time this allotment was decided upon. The difficulty of apportioning the raw material for this manufacture is due to the great variation of the cocaine content in the coca leaf according to the year's crop and the length of time elapsed after picking the leaf. However, all these technical matters will be adjusted as soon as the enquiry now in progress as to the consumption of the country is ended and a certain amount of definite experience gained by the manufacturers. In any case the Government of Japan will press the measure year by year in the hope that our control will be as effective as our measures of the control of consumption at home. ”

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) desired to raise two or three points of importance relative to the Japanese Report. He could find no mention in the reports for 1922 or for 1923 of the admittedly very large stocks of drugs (particularly of morphine) which were in the possession of Japan at the beginning of this period. Members of the Committee would probably recollect the long discussions which had taken place regarding this matter with M. Ariyoshi, and afterwards with Dr. Uchino. The conclusion generally accepted had been that Japan, at the end of that period, had in her possession stocks of morphine and other drugs which possibly amounted to something like a million ounces. The Committee had expressed its desire to know how these stocks were going to be disposed of. It had been the more anxious regarding this matter as it had received information to the effect that admissions had been made, in the Japanese Diet, to the effect that large quantities of drugs had been exported from Japan to an unknown destination, from bonded warehouses under the control of the Japanese authorities, but without any certificates or authorisation of any kind from those authorities. In view of this, the Committee emphasised the point that it would be necessary to know the ultimate disposal of these very large stocks of drugs. Neither of the reports, however, appeared to touch on that question at all, and it would, he thought, be very interesting for the Committee if that point were dealt with at the following meeting by Dr. Tsurumi.

The next point was that, in view of the fact that exports were in general either negligible or prohibited in Japan proper, the practical question was whether the drugs were kept in stock or used for local consumption. No data were supplied in the reports regarding local consumption. Were the quantities manufactured used and consumed for the normal requirements of Japan or were they being added to stock ?

Thirdly, as regarded cocaine, in the report the quantity of cocaine manufactured was given as 3,313 kg. This, he thought, was high. The drug was not exported from Japan, so that apparently the very large quantity of 3,313 kg. represented local consumption. Did it perhaps represent additions to stock ?

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) undertook to give in detail at the next meeting the information which Sir John Campbell required.

Kwan-tung.

The CHAIRMAN compared the figure given on page 28 of the Japanese Report for 1923 for the quantity of opium imported into Kwan-tung from Persia with the figures available for the exports from the Persian Gulf declared as destined for Kwan-tung. The figures of the actual imports into Kwan-tung, as given by the Japanese Government for 1923, were 12,310 kg. The amount of opium which left the Persian Gulf as declared for Kwan-tung during the same period was 72,873 kg. The difference threw a lurid light on the traffic between the Persian Gulf and the Far East.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that in 1924 the Japanese Government promulgated new regulations regarding the Government monopoly in Kwan-tung territory. These were said to have had immediate effect since their coming into force on September 1st.

Nigeria (1924).

The CHAIRMAN referred to the statement that the coca plant was grown as a hedge in the Cameroons and in Nigeria, in very much the same way, apparently, as it was grown in Java as a hedge.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that in Nigeria perhaps the cocaine might be extracted directly from the leaf, and it might therefore be possible to chew it, which could not be done with the Java leaf.

Poland (1923).

The CHAIRMAN called the attention of the Committee to a statement in the Polish Report in regard to the import certificate system. The report stated :

“ The figures given in this report are based on the importation certificates issued by the Ministry of Public Health and subsequently by the Ministry of the Interior (Public Health Department). Only consignments for the importation of which a certificate has been previously issued are admitted at the customs frontier. It has not, however, been possible to apply this system fully, since in 1923 consignments of opium, etc., were admitted to the territory of the Free City of Danzig without previous licence from the Polish Government and were thence freely introduced into Poland. ”

That passage was interesting, because it showed the difficulties which arose in connection with a free port like Danzig when a system of control such as had been provided for in the Convention of the Second General Conference was not in existence.

Straits Settlements (1924).

Sir John JORDAN did not understand the statement that “ the import certificate system was strictly adhered to in respect of all raw opium exported, the only difficulty experienced being on the side of applicants who could not procure certificates in strict accordance with the League's requirements and whose applications were refused in consequence ”. Did the Straits Settlements export raw opium ?

The CHAIRMAN understood that there was no export of raw opium except to the Malay States and Brunei. He would make enquiries as to the statement.

17. Absence of Annual Reports from Certain Governments.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) reminded the Committee that up to the moment the Swiss Government had not been able to submit a report because the federal legislation in regard to narcotics had not been put into force, and as a consequence the information which it possessed was not sufficiently accurate. This, however, would not be the case in future.

The federal law being entirely based upon a licensing system both in regard to manufacture, sale, import and export, it had now become possible to exercise complete and accurate control.

Switzerland could, therefore, furnish reports containing all the necessary information. The federal law had entered into force on August 1st, 1925, and the first report would therefore contain information regarding the last five months of that year.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that Japan would send the report for 1924 by October 1st.

Luang Sri VISARVAJA (Siam) explained the delay on the part of the Siamese Government in sending the report for 1923. Its reports had hitherto been made according to the Buddhist year, and, in response to the request of the Secretariat that reports should be made for the European year, and in order to facilitate the work of the Committee in checking the statistics, it had attempted to make a report for the European year. That involved a great deal of work, as it meant changing all the statistics and systems of keeping them, and it was for this reason that the report for 1923 had been delayed. It was being sent to the Secretariat but was too late to be incorporated in the summary before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there seemed to have been no German report received for the last two or three years since 1921.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that he was not authorised by his Government to make any declaration. The Minister for Foreign Affairs would send a note to the Secretary-General. Personally, he desired to point out that the question was in a certain sense a political one in view of the western Customs frontier of Germany.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he was engaged at the moment in drawing up a report from information which he had received.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee decided* to note in its report the fact that certain countries had not sent in reports for 1923 and previous years.

18. Annual Report for 1924 from the Netherlands Government.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) explained that the report of the Netherlands had not yet been submitted to the Committee because it had to be translated and was not yet ready. He gave, however, the figures of consumption during the year 1924.

The consumption of raw opium, including morphine, codeine, heroin, dionin and its salts and preparations, in the Netherlands was 2,464 kg. That meant a consumption of 0.35 grammes per head of the population. The consumption of cocaine and its salts was only 38 kg., which, calculated per head of the population, was 0.0054 grammes.

FIFTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Wednesday, August 26th, 1925, at 10 a.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

19. Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments : Resumption of the Discussion on the Report from Japan.

The CHAIRMAN called on the representative of Japan to reply to the various points raised at the last meeting in connection with the report from the Japanese Government.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that the cocaine content, according to the information furnished to him, of coca leaves manufactured in Japan was 0.35 per cent. Of course, this figure would increase as experience was gained in manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, when compiling the tables of the world's requirements, it had taken 0.6 per cent or 0.7 per cent as an average cocaine content.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the cocaine content of Java leaves varied, but that the average for 1923 was 1.46 per cent. As an average, 0.7 per cent could be extracted. The figure mentioned was not the percentage of cocaine as such but the total amount of alkaloids from which cocaine could be manufactured.

Sir John JORDAN asked how long the manufacture of cocaine in Japan had been going on. He had gathered from the Japanese representative's statement at a previous meeting that it was only in the experimental stage.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that Japan had begun to manufacture cocaine in 1917.

Sir John JORDAN asked why, if Japan did not require it previous to 1917, she was now beginning to manufacture it.

Dr. TSURUMI explained that the cocaine now manufactured was used for internal consumption and for the legitimate trade. Previously cocaine had been imported for this purpose. The method of manufacture of cocaine in Japan was now perfected.

The CHAIRMAN did not think that the Committee could question the right of any Government to manufacture drugs required for its own use.

Sir John JORDAN said that he would refer to the matter later when illicit traffic was being discussed. The whole question of the illicit traffic concerned not only the people who were smuggling but also the producers.

The Committee decided that the Japanese representative should be asked to circulate in writing his replies to the points raised at the previous meeting.

20. **Form of the Summary of Annual Reports : Appointment of a Sub-Committee.**

The CHAIRMAN considered that in future it would be possible to frame the summary in a more convenient manner.

He put before the Committee four different suggestions made by Sir John Jordan for the alteration of the summary : (1) that the interesting comments of the Secretariat be renewed ; (2) that a comparative statement of imports to and exports from each country should be included ; (3) that particulars of the exports from India to each country should be included ; (4) that when a reference was made to a document, such as the Direct Sales Agreements of the Indian Government, particulars should be given in the summary.

These suggestions were worthy of consideration, and it was in order to give Sir John Jordan satisfaction and to meet the views of other members of the Committee that he had suggested setting up a small sub-committee to consider the whole matter and to report.

The Committee adopted this proposal and appointed the following members to serve on the Sub-Committee : M. BOURGOIS (France), M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), Sir John CAMPBELL (India) and M. BRENIER.

21. **List of Offices in Various Countries competent to deal with Export Authorisation or Diversion Certificates : Request of the British Government.**

The CHAIRMAN put before the Committee a letter from the British Foreign Office dated May 7th, 1925.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed in principle with the letter ; as, however, the different countries had not yet ratified the Convention adopted by the Second Conference, it seemed impossible to establish a list at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the intention of the British Government was not to suggest that the list should be issued at once — before the Convention was in force — but to settle the matter in advance, so that when the new Convention came into force the new procedure could at once be applied.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, before coming into effect, the Convention must be ratified by ten Powers, seven of which must be Members of the Council.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government only intended that the Committee should make a recommendation as regarded the list ; then, when the Convention came into force, the Council of the League could notify the Governments concerned that this was the procedure recommended.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) wondered whether it would not be advisable, immediately and without waiting for the coming into force of the 1925 Convention, to furnish those Governments that had adopted and applied the system of import and export licences, with the list of authorities issuing such licences in their respective countries. In cases of disputes or claims, it would indeed be of the greatest use if the responsible authorities knew to whom they could apply.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Secretariat had already issued a list of the departments which were authorised to issue certificates of importation. That list was dated May 14th, 1924, and ought to be kept up to date, because the system of import certificates was already in force. If the Secretariat were to re-issue that list brought up to date, that would meet, he thought, Dr. Carrière's views.

M. BRENIER supported the Chairman's proposal.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, up to the moment, diplomatic channels had been always used in France. Thus, as regarded Japan, since that country required a certificate, the French Consul at Kobe telegraphed asking the French Government to inform the seller through the Japanese Legation that the necessary authority had been given. This system had worked satisfactorily, and, while he had no objection in principle to another system, he thought it would be preferable to specify simply that the communication could be made direct without making it compulsory to do so.

M. BRENIER was under the impression that there was a slight misunderstanding. He had thought that the proposal was merely to draw up a list of authorities whose duty it was to deliver certificates in order that each country might know the name of the authority responsible. In one country it was the Ministry of Commerce ; in another it was the Ministry of Finance, etc.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British letter referred particularly to the provision in Article 13 of the new Convention that a Government issuing an export authorisation should send a copy to the importing country. There was also a similar provision in Article 15 with regard to the diversion certificates. The only question was whether the copy of the export authorisation should be sent through the diplomatic or consular channel or, for instance, direct by the department in France, which issued the authorisation to the corresponding department in Japan, which did the same kind of work.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that it would perhaps be simpler to use diplomatic channels. For instance, in the case quoted by the Chairman it would be sufficient to send the authorisation to the Japanese Consulate in Paris. This method of procedure would be more convenient for everyone. On the other hand, the communication might be carried out in a semi-diplomatic manner, that was to say that the Ministry delivering the authorisation (in France, at the moment, the Ministry of Finance) might send it directly to the Consulate of Japan in Paris, without making use of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. He made no objection in principle to the method outlined by the Chairman.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) pointed out that paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the 1925 Convention laid down that a copy of the export authorisation should accompany the consignment. It might therefore be presumed that this copy would reach the competent authority automatically, so to speak. In these circumstances, he thought the second copy, which was the subject of the present discussion, might be forwarded through the diplomatic channel.

The CHAIRMAN said that the copy which accompanied the consignment was for the use of the Customs authorities *en route*. It was possible that where consignments were diverted for illegitimate purposes the copy would never reach its destination. The object of sending a copy was to ensure that the Government of the importing country would know that the consignment had been despatched and would be able to inform the exporting country if the consignment did not reach its destination. The Committee could not reverse what had been decided at the Second Opium Conference and inserted in the Convention.

Sir John JORDAN did not think it was a matter that concerned Government consuls at all. There were grave objections to dealing with consuls. Consuls were not always incorruptible, as his experience in the Far East showed.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the proposal of the British Government attacked the principle which was the common practice of all States. No ministerial office corresponded with the representatives of a Government except through the intermediary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. It was only in exceptional cases, for example, in the cases of traffic in women, when it was necessary to pursue the criminals without the slightest loss of time — that direct communication between the authorities concerned was in order.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) did not think the point was one of very much practical importance. Would it not meet the views of members of the Committee if the Secretariat issued a letter calling the attention of Governments to the obligation which was or would be assumed, asking them to consider the question and saying that two methods had been suggested: (1) the method in the letter of the British Government; (2) the diplomatic method. As soon as the obligation devolved upon them they could be asked to communicate their decision to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it was of practical importance that these documents should reach their destination at the earliest possible moment. The Committee had already made an inroad on the principle of communications through the Foreign Offices in connection with the communication of information in regard to contraband cases and persons engaged in contraband trade. Direct communication had been established between the corresponding authorities in the different countries. The First Opium Conference had definitely embodied a recommendation to that effect in the Agreement.

There was, of course, nothing obligatory in the suggestion which the British Government had put forward. Every Government had the right to decide by what channels it would communicate its documents, and all that the Committee was asked to do at the moment was to consider whether it should make a recommendation similar to that concerning the communication of information regarding seizures. Neither the Committee nor the Council of the League had any power to impose an obligation. He would be strongly in favour of the direct communication of these documents between the authorities specially concerned. No diplomatic questions could, he thought, possibly arise.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he could not agree with Sir John Campbell, at least as far as the question of principle, which was one of great importance, was concerned. He had shown a certain hesitation in accepting the certificate system because he was somewhat uneasy at the difficulties which might arise when applying it. He agreed with what the Chairman had just said, to the effect that the Committee should merely draw the attention of Governments to the fact that communication could be made direct, but that Governments should not be obliged to do so.

Sir John JORDAN pointed out that communication through a consul was not regarded as passing through a diplomatic channel.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee could state that it was in favour of direct communication between the authorities specially concerned, unless any Government thought it desirable to communicate through diplomatic channels. There was little objection to the method mentioned by M. Bourgois. If a French department which issued the authorisation preferred to send it to the French Consul at Tokio, for instance, who would then hand it over to the proper department of the Japanese Government, this would only constitute one delay and not a very serious one. What the Committee aimed at was that the communication should not have to go round by way of both Foreign Offices before it reached the responsible department in the importing country.

The Committee authorised the Chairman to draft a proposal meeting the points of view expressed.

22. Report on the Steps taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention drawn up by the Second Opium Conference.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the provisional list of drugs falling under the provisions of the Convention was quite incomplete. A certain number of special preparations which were all of a dangerous character had been omitted. It only contained the names of well-known preparations, but those which were called by fancy names not generally known had not been included in it. There were at least a hundred of such preparations containing morphia, cocaine and heroin.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that nevertheless the list might be of use. The regulations established by the British Government at Singapore and Hong-Kong exempted a whole list of drugs with fancy names. It seemed to him that the list in question might be of some use to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN questioned the statement that the British Government had exempted a whole list of drugs with fancy names.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that in the regulations for Singapore, Burma and Hong-Kong there was a whole list of remedies exempted from the regulations as such.

The CHAIRMAN stated that from the British list there were exempted about ten or twelve remedies on the ground that they were so compounded as not to prove dangerous.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India), in reply to a question, said there was a list in India, prepared by the medical authorities, giving a long catalogue of preparations which contained very small quantities of drugs. It was quite true that, if 20 lb. or so of such drugs were imported, an appreciable quantity of cocaine, for instance, might be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN desired to point out that preparations which contained drugs in infinitesimal quantities were not, of course, covered by the Hague Convention at all, and that the list to which Sir John Campbell had referred was not a list of exemptions but a list drawn up by the Customs to differentiate between the drugs which fell under the Hague Convention and those which did not.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the information would be useful for the Secretariat. In the list for the Dutch East Indies, for instance, all these remedies were included, because there were no exemptions on the ground that the morphine and cocaine contents were infinitesimally small. Every remedy was reported and the Secretariat would be able to see from this list what the drug content of each remedy was.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the list would need a very great deal of revision. For example, on page 4, under the heading "Morphine", "cocaine muriate", which presumably had nothing to do with morphine at all, had been inserted. There were various preparations of codeine which ought not to come under the heading "Morphine" because it was not morphine, though it was derived from it. There were also various preparations of heroin which ought to come under the section devoted to heroin. In a great many cases, the content was not stated because it was not known, so, from that point of view, the list would not serve the purpose mentioned by M. Van Wettum. In its present form it was almost useless.

He suggested that Dr. Anselmino, Dr. Carrière and Dr. Tsurumi, who were recognised experts on these matters, should give their assistance to the Secretariat in connection with the revision of this list.

The Committee agreed to postpone further consideration of the list until the next session and to ask Dr. ANSELMINO, Dr. CARRIÈRE and Dr. TSURUMI to assist in its revision.

23. Question of the Simplification of Statistics.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that as far as the simplifying of statistics was concerned he would prefer that the statistics asked for from Governments should not be altered at the moment because, if the Committee recasted the statistics at the present juncture, and if next

year the Central Board drew up its own statistics, Governments would be unnecessarily burdened.

As regarded the statistics prepared by the Secretariat, it was within the scope of the Sub-Committee just appointed to deal with these, and the matter might be referred to that Sub-Committee.

The proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN referred to the mode of expressing the decimal point. In the documents received from the Secretariat sometimes the decimal point was expressed by a comma and sometimes by a full stop. This had led to very great confusion and difficulty in understanding the figures, and several members had suggested that in all cases the decimal should be expressed in the ordinary manner by a full stop. A resolution to a similar effect had been adopted about three years previously, which unfortunately had not been strictly followed.

M. BRENIER suggested that, when the figures were inserted in the text itself, it would be better to use the system employed in France, which was that, instead of making use of the decimal point or the comma in front of decimal figures, the abbreviation for the unit of measure should be used. For example, 1,543.525 might be written 1,543 kg. 525. This would greatly simplify the correction of proofs.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that this would be a great improvement but the difficulty did not arise only in connection with the figures of kilogrammes and grammes. Supposing, for example, a report stated a percentage content to be 5.25 ; if a comma were used for the decimal point, it was uncertain whether that meant 525 or 5.25.

The Sub-Committee appointed to draw up the revised form of the summary would take note of the opinions expressed and would deal with the matter in its recommendations.

24. Question of the Issue of Licences for the Import of Dangerous Drugs from Countries which have not ratified and put into force the Hague Convention nor adopted the Import and Export Certificate System : Resolution II of the Assembly of 1922.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed that the Committee should not discuss this question again since it had been discussed at great length at the Second Conference and the Committee had adopted the following resolution at its sixth session on the matter :

“ The Advisory Committee considers that, in view of the suggested measures of control to be submitted to the Second International Conference and of the fact that the whole situation will be considered by that Conference, it would be better to postpone until next year the further consideration of the second resolution adopted by the Assembly of 1922. ”

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) agreed with M. van Wettum.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had postponed the discussion until the present year.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with M. Van Wettum that it was unnecessary for the Committee to discuss measures to be taken against States which had not ratified the Hague Convention or which did not use the import and export certificate system. It would be preferable to await the entry into force of the new Convention before discussing any future measures which might have to be taken.

Sir John JORDAN claimed the right as an assessor to examine and discuss any question that was settled at any conference. He had taken no part in the Conferences, and he did not admit, as an assessor of the Committee, that he was precluded in any way from raising questions which had been decided at either of them. He did not wish to raise the question at the moment and agreed with what had been said, but as a point of principle he claimed that as an assessor he had the right to reopen and discuss any of those questions.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that that was a question which had been referred to it by the Assembly and the Council of the League. It had therefore to make some report to those bodies. Was the Committee in agreement with the suggestion that it should recommend the postponement of any further discussion of this question until the new Convention had come into force and until some experience had been gained as to its workings ?

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that that question had been discussed during the Conference. In his opinion it would be better to rest content with what had been decided at the Conference, at any rate for the moment, in view of the fact that not only all members of the Committee had agreed to it but also because most of the countries which had attended the Conference had also agreed to the decision which had been taken.

It seemed inadvisable to discuss again in the Committee questions which had been settled by forty-one countries which had attended the Second Opium Conference, unless, of course, new facts came to light.

The Committee agreed.

25. Indian Hemp (Annex 4).

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that since the last session this question had come under the consideration of the Second International Conference. Though it was not included in the agenda of the Conference, it was unanimously agreed that it should be considered, and provisions relating to the control of the traffic in Indian hemp were agreed upon by the Conference and inserted in the new Convention. That being the case, the Committee would perhaps not think it necessary to pursue the consideration of the matter further at the moment.

M. BOURGOIS (France) supported the proposal of the Chairman.

Luang Sri VISARVAJA (Siam) made the following statement :

“ I should like to make a statement explaining the attitude of my Government in regard to Indian hemp. This subject was discussed at the Second Opium Conference. It did not figure originally on the agenda of the Conference but was added on the proposal of the Egyptian delegate. Provisions with regard to it figure in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the Convention adopted by the Conference. Owing to the fact that this subject was not included in the original agenda submitted to Governments, the Siamese delegation to the Second Opium Conference were without instructions in regard to it and consequently they made a reservation regarding it in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the Convention.

“ The Siamese Government has now had time to consider this subject. It recognises the harmful habit-forming property of drugs manufactured from Indian hemp, and it is contemplating the inclusion of all galenical preparations of this kind in the Harmful Habit-Forming Drugs Law of 1922, so as to bring them under the same control as other narcotic drugs (a copy of this law has already been communicated to the Secretariat). With regard, therefore, to Chapter III of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference, it is the intention of the Siamese Government to withdraw its reservation.

“ With regard to Chapters IV and V of the same Convention, in regard to the control of the international trade in Indian hemp, I may mention that the export of Indian hemp was prohibited by a decree issued in 1915, but the decree did not specifically prohibit the resin obtained from Indian hemp or the ordinary preparations of which such resin forms the base.

“ However, it does not appear that resin and preparations made from it were left out intentionally. The Siamese Government is now giving the matter its very careful consideration and it is hoping that, after studying the matter in fuller detail, it will be possible to withdraw also the reservation in regard to Indian hemp in Chapters IV and V of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference.

“ Perhaps it may be of interest to the Committee if I were to quote the figures in regard to the value of crops of Indian hemp produced in Siam. These figures were transmitted to me by telegram and must be accepted subject to mistakes in telegraphic transmission.

“ In 1907 the value of the crop was 86,300 Tcs. and in 1911 151,984 Tcs., after which there was a decline yearly to 45,759 Tcs. in 1914. The duty paid was 10 per cent *ad valorem*.

“ As I have already mentioned, the decree of prohibition of export was promulgated in 1915. The value of the crop increased in 1918 to 67,526 Tcs. and again declined in 1921 to 28,354 Tcs., the duty paid to the Government still remaining at 10 per cent *ad valorem*. ”

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed with the proposal to adjourn the discussion, but with regard to what the Chairman had said to the effect that it had been unanimously agreed at the Conference that the question of Indian hemp would be considered, he pointed out that he was the only representative of the Powers present at the Conference to remark that he had received no instructions on the point.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) entirely agreed with the proposal. As the Committee was meeting in public, it seemed advisable to explain that, although India had the doubtful honour of having given its name to this drug, it was one which grew all over the world. It was found, for example, in Bulgaria, Greece, Brazil, Africa, China, India, Siam and many other countries. The most potent form of the drug was produced chiefly, he believed, in Chinese Turkestan. This form was not produced in India, but was all imported.

The traffic was at one time, he understood, an important one between Greece and Egypt. He referred to this matter simply to dispel any possible impression that Indian hemp was a drug for which India was solely responsible.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

SIXTH MEETING

Held in Geneva on Wednesday, August 26th, 1925, at 4 p.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain).

26. **Welcome to M. Nicolas Petrovitch, Representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.**

The CHAIRMAN welcomed M. Petrovitch, the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

27. **Consideration of the Annual Reports from Governments : Resumption of the Discussion of the Report from Japan (continued).**

The CHAIRMAN placed before the Committee two statements circulated by Dr. Tsurumi (Annex 5 and Annex 5 a).

So far as the Chairman was concerned, he was quite satisfied with the undertaking which Dr. Tsurumi had given in regard to the first and second points — the relation of the quantities of raw opium used in the manufacture of morphine and heroin to the amounts produced. Dr. Tsurumi had undertaken to ask the Japanese Government to furnish accurate data, to be communicated either during the present session or, if they arrived too late, to the Secretariat.

The figures for the manufacture of cocaine and heroin in 1923, as contained in the report of the Japanese Government, were also dealt with to a certain extent by Dr. Tsurumi in his memoranda.

What the Committee desired to know was what had become of the large quantities of cocaine and heroin manufactured during 1923 and the still larger quantity of cocaine manufactured in 1922. In regard to cocaine, it was stated that 3,313 kg. were manufactured in 1923, and, in the 1922 report, that the amount manufactured in 1922 was 3,680 kg. That meant that approximately 7,000 kg. of cocaine were manufactured in Japan in 1922 and 1923, which was a very large quantity, as reference to the table submitted to the Second Opium Conference (Document O. D. C. I., p. 53) would show. That table set out the estimated requirements of the principal countries of the world in kilogrammes. The most prominent figure in it was that of the United States of America, which gave its requirements as 1,785 kg. If that were compared with the production in Japan for either of those years, it would be found that the quantity manufactured in Japan was double the estimate for the whole of the United States of America for a year. Dr. Tsurumi would, he hoped, agree that, making every allowance for the medical practice of Japan and the special use of these drugs, there must have been a very large quantity of cocaine remaining over from the large quantities manufactured.

The report also stated that there was practically no export of cocaine authorised by the Government, so that the conclusion would be that a very large portion (half or more) of the cocaine manufactured in Japan during those two years was not consumed in the medical practice of the country but remained as balance. What had happened to that balance ?

Large quantities of narcotic drugs were finding their way into the illicit traffic of the world, and, so far, Governments had not been able to ascertain the source of the traffic. Therefore any light which could be thrown on the question by the examination of the reports from Governments was a very important part of the Committee's work.

What measures were taken in Japan to control the sale of these drugs by the wholesaler and retailer after they had left the manufacturer ? From previous reports it appeared that a very strict control was exercised by the Japanese Government over the manufacture of these drugs, but the Committee had not, he thought, had full information as to the control and supervision over the sale of them when they passed into the hands of the wholesaler and retailer.

He felt confident, however, that the Japanese laws provided for that.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that provision for the control of drugs in the hands of wholesale and retail dealers had been made.

As regarded the quantity of cocaine manufactured during 1922, the quantity was, he thought, 3,675 kg. and in 1923, 3,313 kg. If those figures were compared with the figure for 1921, it would be seen that a reduction had occurred.

The quantity of cocaine for home consumption had been reduced, but he could not give exact figures. In 1922 and 1923 the Japanese Government had not known the quantity necessary *per capita* per annum. The quantity required for home consumption was about to be ascertained. Stocks were undoubtedly held by medical practitioners, but definite figures were not available at the moment.

M. KUSAMA (Japan) said that, as regarded the supervision of retailers and wholesalers, an ordinance had been passed in 1921, in accordance with the provisions of the Hague Convention, providing for the regulation of the manufacture, sale and distribution of morphine, cocaine and all the alkaloids which came under the control of Articles 9 to 14 of that Convention.

The ordinance adopted by the Japanese Government provided that the retailers who obtained a permit to keep the alkaloids which came under the classification of the heading poisonous and dangerous drugs were required to keep their books in a uniform manner so that the inspectors of the Central Government could make the surveillance as close as possible. Any large quantity which was reported to be in the hands of the retailers either for retailing or for stock could be immediately investigated by the police or by the prefecture officer. Dr. Tsurumi had given the figures for narcotics allowed to be stocked. In round numbers, there would be approximately 75,500 places where such stocks were stored and even if, for example, each place held two ounces of alkaloid, the amount of the stock in the country would be quite large. The Government did not know the average or the absolute quantity of alkaloid in the hands of retailers, medical practitioners and hospitals, not to mention wholesalers and manufacturers. The control over these various processes of retailing was in the hands of the local Government. The local Government had been approached by the Central Government in regard to the inspection of stocks. In 1922, out of 75,500 places, nearly 40 per cent had been inspected, which, considering the difficulties, was a satisfactory achievement. The number of persons punished for violation of the ordinance in 1922 was 388, which was the latest figure available. The amount granted to wholesale dealers depended on the allotment of the raw material, and, as they were obliged to keep a strict account of the movement of these drugs, the Government could trace immediately any transference from one place to another. That was also the duty of the local prefecture. In each prefecture there was a regular inspector of medicines, whose business it was to give his entire time to tracing all the intricate machinery of regulating the drug sales in the prefecture. In order to perfect the machinery, the Central Government very often sent out from Tokio to the various prefectures requests for all the information in the prefecture, not only asking the inspectors for details regarding the movement of the drugs, but often instructing them to take the officials of the Central Government into the different districts and to summon wholesalers and retailers to the police station with their books. Certain difficulties were always encountered because the names in the books did not always tally. During the last two years the officials of the Central Government when they went to the different districts made it a practice to summon not only one individual but four or five at one time, to see if their books corresponded with each other. If the books did not show sufficient agreement the police would take the case in hand and investigate the whole situation. The only complaint he had received from the inspector had been that he had been unable to visit more than 40 per cent of the places. It was obviously impossible for one or two inspectors to visit 75,000 places in a year in order to ensure that the rigorous measures which the Central Government wished to enforce were being carried out. The Report of the Central Bureau of the Home Department, published annually, giving detailed figures regarding the number of inspections, the number of convictions and the number of prohibited medicines, was available.

The CHAIRMAN asked what was the amount of cocaine and the amount of heroin in stock at the end of 1923, either in the hands of manufacturers or wholesalers.

M. KUSAMA (Japan) replied that no figures had been supplied and that he could not give the information from his own knowledge.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan), in reply to the observations of the representative of India made at a previous meeting, informed the Committee that the Japanese Government would like to find the Convention regulating the traffic in opium and other narcotics speedily put into execution, and the whole question of the traffic regulated by stricter measures, in concert with the other Powers.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he had correctly understood Dr. Tsurumi, it was the policy of the Japanese Government to restrict the manufacture of cocaine and heroin to the medical and scientific requirements of the country. That was a very important declaration.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that this restriction applied not only to home consumption but also to legitimate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether it was not the policy of the Japanese Government at the present time to prohibit export except to Japanese subjects in Japanese territories.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) did not think this to be the case.

28. Propaganda : Resolution of the Council dated December 8th, 1924¹.

The CHAIRMAN submitted the following letters from the Foreign Policy Association of the United States of America and the Treasury Department, Bureau of Public Health Service, Washington :

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION.

9, East Forty-Fifth Street, New York City.

August 26th, 1925.

In view of the question regarding propaganda on the agenda of this afternoon, I am bringing to your attention a letter explaining the attitude of the Treasury Department of the United States regarding the present methods of anti-narcotic propaganda now in use in the United States.

I am including various examples of material prepared by different associations on this subject for your information.

May I inform you that the American Medical Association has passed a resolution in June 1925 appointing a committee to consider the best method of presenting authentic facts regarding addiction and its dangers to the people of the United States, as well as facts regarding the efforts now made under the Treaty of 1912 to combat this evil internationally.

I realise, of course, that the organisation I represent has no standing from the point of view of the Advisory Committee, and that no communication from our Research Committee can be dealt with officially.

However, I venture to bring this material to your notice, for you to use in any way possible.

(Signed) Helen Howell MOORHEAD,

Secretary of the Research Committee on Opium,
Foreign Policy Association.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Washington, July 31st, 1925.

My dear Mrs. Moorhead,

In the absence of the Surgeon-General I beg leave to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 21st, 1925, concerning propaganda with respect to the use of narcotic drugs.

The Public Health Service has not issued any publication or instructions designed to acquaint the masses with the consequences of using narcotic drugs. There would appear to be some question as to the desirability of at least some of the propaganda that has been proposed in this connection.

I am forwarding to you under separate cover a copy of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Printing relative to a resolution to print fifty million additional copies of an article entitled "The Peril of Narcotics — A Warning to the People of America", by the International Narcotics Education Association. In this you will note that some thoughtful men questioned whether enough good would be accomplished to outweigh the possible harm that might be done by such efforts at propaganda as were under consideration by the Committee. These efforts probably represent about what may be expected from propaganda organisations at the present time.

(Signed) M. J. WHITE,

Acting Surgeon-General.

¹ The resolution reads as follows :

"The Council of the League of Nations requests the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs to study, at its next session, and report to the Council on, the question whether it is desirable and expedient that the work undertaken by the League of Nations in connection with the traffic in opium under Article 23 of the Covenant should be completed by the preparation of a scheme of propaganda to acquaint the masses with the terrible consequences resulting from the use of dangerous drugs, and thereby to restrict the consumption of such drugs."

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) said that the question of propaganda against narcotics had been investigated by the Health Committee of the League, which had taken as a basis the resolution of the fifth Assembly. After investigation, the Health Committee had reached the following conclusion, to be found in the minutes of its meeting of September 30th, 1924:

“ Your Opium Committee believes that a propaganda campaign amongst the masses — probably by means of lectures, conferences and films — as suggested in M. Sokal's resolution, might prove dangerous and achieve results exactly contrary to those desired by the author of the resolution. For there would be a risk of exciting unhealthy curiosity and of leading people who had not perhaps so far thought of it to cocainomania and morphinomania.

“ A campaign of this nature must not be compared with those which have been carried out, for instance, against tuberculosis and venereal diseases; the conditions are entirely different. With regard to tuberculosis and venereal diseases, it is solely necessary to emphasise the risk of illnesses, which have no attractive aspect as such. With regard to cocainomania and morphinomania, the matter is quite different. It would, indeed, be very difficult to point out the dangers without also alluding to the aspect which attracts the victims and at the same time exciting the unhealthy curiosity to which we have alluded above. We think, therefore, that the propaganda referred to in M. Sokal's resolution should be avoided. If anything was to be done in this field, in the first place the medical profession should be consulted. ”

He wished to maintain the importance of the conclusions reached by the Health Committee and to point out that the Opium Committee would have to decide whether the advantages resulting from propaganda could be balanced by the risks involved.

The Health Committee considered that propaganda in medical circles should be conducted and the danger of the abuse of narcotics pointed out, so that the medical profession could be induced to reduce the quantities of narcotic drugs used to a minimum.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Dr. Carrière. The special literature on the subject and medical enquiries showed that the origin or cause of drug-taking was pernicious literature, snobbishness and unhealthy curiosity. A newly published book, of which the author was a doctor attached to the Special Infirmary of the Prefecture of Paris, and who had been able to come across many examples of drug-taking, stated that from 40 to 50 per cent of drug-takers were of the medical profession or connected therewith, including chemists, midwives, nurses of both sexes, etc. Despite the fact that these persons were in a better position than anyone else to know the harmful nature of the drugs, they were unable to resist their feelings of curiosity or their desire for a passing satisfaction of it. At the beginning, a drug-taker was always sure that he could stop in time, but experience had proved the contrary. If it were true that there was so large a proportion of drug-takers in the medical profession or connected with medical circles, it was much to be feared that any propaganda conducted by the Committee would have a result opposite to that which was intended. While being in no sense able to guarantee the figures which he had quoted, he reminded the Committee that it was universally admitted that no one became a drug-taker of set purpose. Nearly all drug-takers had begun to take drugs with the conviction that they would be able to leave off when they so desired.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that public opinion could often be influenced by propaganda. With regard to Germany, however, he could not support any proposal to carry out official propaganda. He fully agreed with the Health Committee on this subject. Such propaganda would only result in increasing the number of addicts.

M. BRENIER agreed with M. Bourgois. There was a special danger due to the fact that the propaganda would be carried on by means of lectures, which were often attended by young persons, whose curiosity was notorious. Thus the effect of propaganda might be entirely opposite to that which was desired. Except, therefore, perhaps in very special cases — for example, in a country in which the evil was particularly prevalent — he thought it dangerous to agree to the proposal to adopt the principle of propaganda.

He would like to know what were the results of the teaching in the schools in Hong-Kong where school-books were used emphasising the danger of narcotic drugs.

Sir John JORDAN, while agreeing with what had been said, thought that the discussion should have taken a wider range. It had been a discussion limited in scope and had taken no account of the problem as a whole, which was that these drugs were produced in Europe and sent to the Far East. He would have had the question considered in regard not only to the masses but to the producers. If any propaganda was to be conducted it ought to be addressed to the producers as well as to the masses, and also the Governments in Europe should be made to realise that these drugs were produced far in excess of their requirements. It would, for instance, be sheer hypocrisy for the League of Nations to address propaganda to China. He could conceive how the Chinese would receive it while vast quantities of narcotic drugs were being smuggled to China from Europe and while foreign ships were taking tons of opium from the Persian Gulf to the Far East. They would ask why it was sent to China. Propaganda would, therefore, be useless in that country because it would draw the very obvious retort that such drugs should not be sent to these places at all.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) recalled the fact that this question had been discussed at the First Conference and that considerable pressure had then been brought to bear in order to secure the acceptance of the principle of compulsory propaganda. At that time he had had no opportunity of obtaining definite information as to the point of view of the Indian Govern-

ment, but he had now obtained instructions to the following effect. The Government of India had no objections whatever in principle to propaganda being undertaken by the local Governments. It preferred not to go beyond this statement at present pending the receipt of replies from these Governments to an enquiry which had already been addressed to them on the subject. The matter was clearly within the sphere of these Governments and not of the Government of India.

The attitude of the Government of India was that it was prepared to accept propaganda if propaganda would be useful, just as it was prepared to accept any other weapon with which to combat the abuse of the opium traffic. The question resolved itself into a question of practical administration. Was propaganda going to be successful or not? When the matter was discussed before the First Conference he had referred in some detail to the experience in India in regard to plague, and he had then pointed out that in India, and probably in most Oriental countries, propaganda undertaken by Governments usually produced the contrary effect to that desired. His personal opinion was that exactly the same thing would happen if official propaganda against the use of opium and drugs were adopted. The general opinion now seemed to be that that course involved many serious disadvantages and that it was preferable not to embark upon such an undertaking. He fully agreed with that view. The Government of India, however, would have no objection to propaganda being undertaken if the local Governments considered it would be useful.

M. Van WETUM (Netherlands) agreed with what had been said by Dr. Carrière and M. Bourgois. So far as the Netherlands were concerned the Government would in his opinion never be prepared to undertake propaganda work, as cocainomaniacs did not exist in the country and the abuse of morphine was confined to physicians, nurses, etc.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had consulted the British Health Department on the question and had received a letter from it of which the general conclusion was that the department considered that the statement of the Health Committee on the subject summed up in an admirable manner the views which it held itself.

The Committee authorised the Chairman to draft a resolution on the subject of propaganda, of which the terms should be in accordance with the views of the Health Committee.

29. Opium Situation in Mandated Territories.

M. BOURGOIS (France) desired to give certain information in regard to the regulation of the traffic in drugs in Syria.

Ordinance No. 844 of May 10th, 1921, had prohibited the import into mandated territories of opium, hashish and cocaine, as well as their derivatives. The regulations concerning the manufacture of and internal trade in narcotics were contained in various Turkish regulations, the provisions of which it had been necessary to codify and define. This was done in Ordinance No. 1207 of January 14th, 1923.

This ordinance prohibited in principle the import, export, holding, delivering, sale or transformation of the following substances: raw and medicinal opium, extract of opium, morphia and its salts, diacetyl-morphine and its salts, alkaloids of opium (except codeine) with their salts and derivatives, cocaine with its salts and derivatives, hashish and its preparations.

Exceptions to these prohibitive measures might be allowed upon requests addressed to the qualified administrative authorities. The sale or delivery of narcotic substances was permitted to persons in possession of prescriptions given by a doctor or a dentist. The application of these regulations was ensured by health inspectors with the collaboration of the police.

Breaches of the regulations were punished by seizure of the substances, and reports were forwarded to the judicial authorities, who were instructed to apply the penal sanctions.

Further, the control of druggists and chemists was exercised in each State by an inspector of chemists instructed to ascertain whether the regulations were observed for the delivery of poisonous and narcotic substances given in accordance with medical prescriptions. The prohibitions were not applicable to the heads of laboratories and teaching establishments which were provided with an authorisation from the chief of police and which were using such substances for scientific purposes.

The import of narcotics was allowed only upon presentation of an authorisation addressed to the Customs by the appropriate administrative authority. The substances were admitted under an *acquiel à caution*, which the importer was bound to present to the Customs service within a maximum period of two months, accompanied by a certificate delivered by the administrative authority to the effect that the substances had arrived at their destination.

Upon the export of such substances, the Customs service gave an export certificate.

Finally, the sale or cession within the country and any transformation of the prohibited substances was noted in a special register kept by authorised persons, checked and initialed in advance by the authorities.

The provisions of Ordinance No. 1207 also prescribed the conditions attached to the use of narcotics by doctors and chemists, the delivery of prescriptions, the keeping and the checking of the registers in which the quantities of narcotics were entered. The decree provided severe penalties of imprisonment or fines in the event of a breach of the regulations, in addition to the confiscation of the prohibited substances.

The French Government would examine the possibility of adhering on behalf of Syria to the Convention of 1925 when a decision had been taken on the subject of the ratification of this Convention by France.

The question of opium and narcotics in Togoland and the Cameroons had been dealt with in the annual report of the French Government. All the necessary measures of supervision had been issued.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Tuck whether the statistics for the United States of America had been communicated to the Netherlands Government.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) could not give this information.

In reply to a question from Dr. ANSELMINO in regard to exports of morphia from Great Britain to Palestine, the CHAIRMAN said that an import certificate would, he thought, be required.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that his Government had adopted regulations in 1923 concerning the handling of medicinal opium, morphine, cocaine and salts in the South Seas Bureau Hospitals regulating the import. Details were to be found in the Annual Report on the Japanese Mandated Territory prepared by the Japanese Government for the year 1923 (page 20).

30. Opium Situation in China.

In reply to M. BRENIER, who had asked that, on account of the extreme importance of China as a producer of raw opium, an unofficial summary of the situation in that country should be prepared each year, the CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary would inform the Committee before the end of the session if such a procedure were possible.

Sir John JORDAN was quite in sympathy with the proposal of M. Brenier about China. He felt, however, that it would impose an impossible task on the Secretariat. He did not see how anybody could reduce the information about China to moderate proportions and make it intelligible. The whole question of China was in utter confusion; opium was being cultivated everywhere. At a previous meeting he had expressed the view that the Committee had failed as regarded opium-smoking. The Committee might as well at once admit that it was confronted with a situation in which it was impossible to do anything. After many years' work on this question, he had come to the conclusion with great reluctance that it was impossible to do anything further at the present time except to guard China against narcotic drugs, against the enormous smuggling that was going on, which he hoped would be dealt with more successfully than the question of opium-smoking, and should prove to be a far simpler question.

He could not see that anything more could be done in this matter. The Chinese authorities were in every way encouraging the cultivation of opium and were in many places doing all they could to bring in foreign opium. The whole country, so far as this question was concerned, seemed to have gone astray. He did not see how the Secretariat could prepare any report which would be more helpful than the present report, which dealt with each province, though it was not in any way authentic. It was impossible to get full details of the situation in China: the Chinese authorities were sending their gunboats to convoy opium; instead of seizing it, they were guaranteeing its transport into China.

He had come to the conclusion that there was no way at all of assisting China, except by preventing all this Persian opium from getting into China and the drugs manufactured in great excess in Europe from being smuggled into that country.

The Chinese Government had been most sincere at one time in trying to put down opium. Most of the men dealing with the question at that time had, however, passed away; there was a new generation in China and the whole situation was changed. At present, so far as her actual cultivation was concerned and the smoking of opium in China, he saw no prospect of being able to give any assistance to that country.

M. BRENIER had not intended to ask the Secretariat to draw up a detailed picture of the situation in each province of China. He had merely asked whether it would not be possible for the Secretariat to make a summary of the unofficial information which it might be able to collect. He considered this as extremely important for the future.

The CHAIRMAN said he would consult the Secretary of the Committee and see whether it was possible.

Sir John JORDAN said he was quite in agreement with M. Brenier that, when possible, any information of that kind should be put into a proper form.

The CHAIRMAN thought the feeling of the Committee generally was that this matter had been very fully examined at the First Opium Conference and that there was not very much — in fact, probably nothing — further to say upon the subject. The Committee might therefore pass on to the next item.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the Conference had come to any conclusions.

The CHAIRMAN said it had not been able to come to any conclusions.

Sir John JORDAN said he would like to know the attitude of the Advisory Committee in regard to this matter; had it any practical suggestions at all to make with regard to China?

The CHAIRMAN said that the matter had been discussed at very considerable length during the First Opium Conference. His own feeling — and he imagined the feeling of most of his colleagues present at that Conference — was that, as the First Conference had been unable to arrive at a conclusion, it was unlikely that the Committee would be able to do so. There were no fresh facts, except that the situation was, if anything, more confused than it was a few months previously.

Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT had no suggestion to make but did not think it was a hopeless situation. China had once accomplished a miracle and could do it again. There was a good deal of exaggeration about the opium smuggled into other countries from China. According to the information of her own Government, the Chinese opium smuggled into the United States was negligible, most of the drugs smuggled being salts and derivative, such as morphine and heroin.

Sir John JORDAN said he had referred to the long and sustained effort made by the Chinese Government and Chinese authorities generally to get rid of opium, and he would like to emphasise this point. For a long time — for ten years — there had been a very strong and sincere movement, and he would like the Chinese people to understand that, in offering his present criticisms, he did not for a moment forget the great work that had been done in those ten years.

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government had continued to communicate to the Secretariat, for the information of the Committee, extracts from the reports received from the British consular officers on the situation in China. The British Government would continue to communicate this information, but it was not in a position to make any suggestion on the matter.

Sir John JORDAN presumed that the extracts from these reports would be incorporated in the report which the Secretariat would draw up.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Brenier's suggestion was to that effect.

31. Treaty between Canada and the United States of America making Offences against Narcotic Laws punishable by Extradition.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Tuck if he could give any information on this subject.

Mr. S. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said that the negotiations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada had resulted in the conclusion of a Treaty and a Convention. The Treaty was described as a "Treaty for the Suppression of Smuggling Operations along the International Boundaries between the Dominion of Canada and the United States and Assisting in the Arrest and Prosecution of Persons Violating the Narcotic Laws of either Government and for Kindred Purposes". The exact title of the Convention was "Convention between his Britannic Majesty, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, and the United States concerning the Extradition of Offenders against the Narcotic Laws".

He was informed by his Government that the ratifications of both the Treaty and Convention had been exchanged only on July 17th, 1925, and sufficient time had not therefore yet elapsed for the Governments to determine accurately whether or not the Treaty or Convention would operate successfully. In its general connection, it might be of interest to the members of the Advisory Committee to know that, in the Treaty for the Suppression of Smuggling Operations, only Articles 4 and 6 referred to narcotics and dealt with the matter of the exchange of information and the transfer of prisoners between points in the United States across Canadian territory. The Convention added to the general extradition laws between Canada and the United States and to the crimes or offences against the laws for the suppression of the traffic in narcotics.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question before the Committee was the possibility and desirability of similar treaties being made between other Powers. Had any member of the Committee any observations to make on the subject?

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he did not fully understand the meaning of this Treaty. Article 6 stated: "The following offences are added to the list of offences numbered 1 to 3 in Article 1 of the Treaty concluded between Great Britain and the United States on May 18th, 1908, with reference to reciprocal rights for Canada and the United States in the matters of conveyance of prisoners and wrecking and salvage, that is to say: . . .". What was the real meaning of this article?

The CHAIRMAN said there were two sets of provisions before the Committee. The first text referred to the transfer of prisoners, which was not an extradition matter, strictly speaking. The other text related to an extradition proposal in the ordinary sense. If an offender against the narcotic laws of the United States fled into Canada, the United States Government, under this Treaty, was able to apply to the Canadian Government for the extradition of the offender: namely, the handing-over of the offender to the United States authorities for trial in the United States Courts.

That was a very common procedure with regard to a great many offences. Most countries had extradition treaties with one another in regard to a fairly long list of important offences, and he understood that the Governments of the United States and Canada had considered offences against the narcotic drug laws of the two countries as being of sufficient importance to warrant the extension of the extradition procedure to those offences.

The question before the Committee was whether it considered these offences to be sufficiently grave and of sufficient importance, both from the national and the international point of view, to warrant its recommending that similar treaties should, if the Governments saw fit, be concluded between other Powers. The question had already been raised as between Great Britain and the United States and was under consideration by the British Government at the moment. So far as the matter had gone, the opinion of the British Government was entirely favourable to a proposal of that kind.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the recent Convention of 1925 had not contained any provision for extradition. It was perhaps regrettable that the question had not been examined at the moment when that Convention was being discussed. The procedure for extradition for offences against the drug laws could not now in any case be regulated by any other means than by special conventions between States. The Committee would therefore be obliged to confine itself to some recommendations.

Sir John JORDAN asked the Chairman whether, in his experience, many cases had occurred where extradition would have proved useful in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN could not recall many cases. There had been one case in which a citizen of the United States, having committed some infraction of the narcotic laws of that country, had come to England and so had escaped punishment, but he could not be certain without refreshing his memory regarding the details. He did not think that these cases were very numerous.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) suggested that, before issuing a recommendation to Governments, it would be well to ask the opinions of Governments on this subject.

M. BOURGOIS (France) would like to make an observation similar to that of M. Van Wettum. The procedure for extradition was exceptional. He well understood why the United States and Canada had adopted it, in view of the extent of the evil and because of their common frontier.

Such a treaty was an indispensable means of self-defence for those countries. Circumstances, however, were not exactly the same in the other countries, and he did not know whether all countries would be disposed to resort to this exceptional procedure. It was to the interest of the Committee only to make such recommendations as had a fair chance of being accepted, and it seemed desirable previously to consult Governments — a procedure recommended by M. Van Wettum.

He would remind the Committee that it was a technical body and that, if it desired to maintain its authority with Governments, it should only make proposals which were thoroughly well considered and examined under all their aspects. The Committee should be sure that it was aware of all the consequences which might follow from such recommendations and the possibility of their adoption by Governments. He thought that there would be a great advantage from this point of view in adopting the procedure indicated by M. Van Wettum before taking any decision and engaging the responsibility of the Committee. The question was not so urgent as to need an immediate solution.

The CHAIRMAN proposed a formula to the effect that the Committee, having had its attention called to the Treaty recently concluded between the United States and Canada, and being impressed with the gravity of many of the offences committed in respect of dangerous drugs, suggested to the Council that the attention of Governments might be called to the conclusion of this Treaty and that Governments might be requested to take the matter into consideration, with a view to a possible conclusion of similar treaties.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) referred to Article 29 of the Convention of the Second Opium Conference, which read :

“ The Contracting Parties will examine in the most favourable spirit the possibility of taking legislative measures to render punishable acts committed within their jurisdiction for the purpose of procuring or assisting the commission in any place outside their jurisdiction of any act which constitutes an offence against the laws of that place relating to the matters dealt with in the present Convention. ”

He doubted whether it was necessary for his Government to make such a treaty. He did not remember any case where such a treaty would have been necessary and maintained that it would be preferable to ask the opinion of Governments first.

M. BOURGOIS (France) again supported the proposal of M. Van Wettum.

The CHAIRMAN said that his formula was intended to raise the question in as mild a form as possible. The Committee was entitled to ask the Council to draw the attention of Governments to this Treaty and to ask them to examine the desirability of the conclusion of similar treaties.

M. BRENIER said that the views of the Chairman appeared to be quite acceptable, since he was not proposing to recommend States to adopt similar treaties to that made between the United States and Canada, but merely to draw their attention to the subject.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was his intention.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, in view of this explanation, he quite agreed.

The Committee adopted the proposal of the Chairman.

SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Thursday, August 27th, 1925, at 10 a.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

32. Traffic in Opium in the Persian Gulf.

The CHAIRMAN said that two memoranda (Appendix 4 to Annex 8) had been prepared and circulated to the Committee in explanation of the question which had been put on the agenda at the request of the British representative. The first memorandum stated the position as plainly as the British Government had been able to do and disclosed a situation which deserved the very serious consideration of the Committee.

In addition to these two memoranda, previous memoranda bearing on the same question had been either circulated to the members of the Committee or to the Opium Conference.

Sir John JORDAN concluded that all the items under A in Appendix 4 were illegitimate transactions.

The CHAIRMAN explained, in answer to Sir John Jordan, that the transactions marked A were presumed to be smuggled transactions and those marked B legitimate transactions.

The British regulations referred to had not come into force until January 1925. Consequently, up till that date the British consular authorities in the Persian Gulf had had no power to take action.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) was glad to note that, according to the documents before the Committee, the vessels engaged in the illegitimate trade did not call any longer at the port of Sabang. This fact he ascribed to the measures taken by the Government of the Dutch Indies. He desired to ask two questions : (1) What was the amount of the bond required by the British regulations ? (2) Would it not be possible for other Governments to take similar measures in the Persian Gulf ?

The CHAIRMAN said that the British Government had not yet received a report on the working of the regulations and would not do so until the end of the year. According to the regulations, the amount of the bond was left to the discretion of the consular officers, but they would, he thought, require a bond according to the value of the cargo of opium on board the ship. The only case of which he knew was that in which the master of the vessel, on being questioned as to the destination of the cargo, had been unable to give satisfactory replies and the clearance of the vessel had been refused by the consular officer ; thus the question of a bond had not actually arisen.

Sir John JORDAN thought that M. Van Wettum had raised a pertinent point. Excluding one Chinese and one French ship, these transactions had been carried on under the Japanese or British flag. Although the British Government had taken steps to control trade as far as possible, the regulations were not, in his view, strong enough. Japanese vessels had been engaged a great deal in this illegitimate trade, and it seemed to him to rest with the Japanese Government to put an end to that trade. Something must be done to stop it if the Committee were to attack the problem honestly. It was a disgrace to see what was happening in China and all around the Chinese coast. In this case the import certificate system seemed to have done more harm than good. These import certificates issued at Vladivostock had been accepted by the Japanese and others and endorsed by consuls in Vladivostock. The Committee knew his opinion of such consular transactions. 180 tons of opium had been sent to Shanghai, then a large amount had been sent on a Japanese ship which lay off the coast for days. Thus, ships specially chartered for the express purpose of carrying on organised smuggling along the coast of China were in commission, and unless drastic steps were taken by the Committee it would have to confess failure. It had failed as regarded the cultivation of opium for smoking purposes, but there was still something left with which to redeem its reputation. These ships must be controlled. It would be impossible in many cases to enforce the bonds, and he did not think that the import certificate system had done all that was expected of it. The Indian Government no longer regarded an import certificate as a sacred document in practice, and he hoped that all other Governments would follow the example of the Indian Government and reserve the right to go behind the import certificate system and to see that such certificate was an honest one.

At previous sessions Sir John Campbell had maintained that foreign opium could not be imported into China. The fresh evidence before the Committee dispelled that illusion altogether. 180 tons had arrived in one day, and in the list marked A there were 4,000 cases of Persian opium recorded as exported to China. Therefore, in spite of the cheapness of Chinese opium, there was still an immense amount of illicit opium going into China from Persia.

The CHAIRMAN raised two points : (1) the question of the adoption of regulations similar to those adopted by the British Government ; (2) the question of the transfer of ships from one flag to another in order to avoid those regulations. Sir John Jordan had said that only two flags were concerned : the Japanese and the British — excluding the Chinese — but the Portuguese flag had been resorted to for the same purpose. The British Government had asked the Chinese Government for its observations. What had happened in these two cases might also happen in others.

With reference to Sir John Jordan's remarks regarding the import certificates, especially the Vladivostock certificates, it was only right to state that, according to the most recent information which the British Government had received from its consular officer at Vladivostock, the present Soviet Government there was exercising a much stricter control. The Vladivostock certificates of which the Committee had so often heard as being used for the purposes of this illicit trade were, it appeared, issued by the Merkulov or " rebel " Government before the present Soviet authorities had taken charge. The British Government had put a specific question to its consular officer in Vladivostock, and he had said that the import certificates referred to were issued by the rebel Government and that the present Soviet authorities were not responsible for them.

In a despatch dated June 30th, 1924, Mr. Paton, the British representative at that time, had stated that the only import of opium during the first half-year of 1924 was about 5 lb., received by Messrs. Kunst and Albers, this amount being for legitimate purposes.

He had also made a suggestion, which the present consular officer had confirmed, that large quantities of opium consigned nominally to Vladivostock were diverted *en route*. It was now a well-established fact that opium in considerable quantities was stated on bills of lading to be destined for this port but was taken away near Shanghai by a combine which had suborned certain Chinese naval and military officials to assist in this nefarious business.

The Central Soviet Government, moreover, issued in December last a law, in amplification of paragraph 140 of the Penal Code, in which the preparation, storing and sale of morphine, opium, ether, cocaine and other narcotics was made punishable with three years' imprisonment, followed by interdiction of residence in Moscow, Leningrad, frontier districts and maritime ports. The keeping of drug dens was punishable with three years' solitary confinement, loss of civil rights and similar prohibition of residence ; in both cases the guilty party's property might be confiscated, either in part or entirely.

The above law was strictly enforced if he could believe the statement made to the consul by local smugglers (of various goods), who complained bitterly of loss of trade owing to the close watch kept on the Manchurian border (Russian side) and the severity of the courts towards smugglers taken with drugs on them.

That was an interesting statement and threw a good deal of light on the situation under discussion ; it was to be hoped that when these import certificates had been used up there would be much greater difficulty in shipping cargoes of opium from the Persian Gulf to Vladivostock, if only the different Governments would put into force measures similar to those which the British Government had already adopted.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that there were many Japanese steamers carrying opium sailing from Persia to Vladivostock without touching any port in Japan. He had already called the attention of his Government to this and had forwarded to it the British regulations. This question was of great interest to Japan, but it was difficult to control shipments which did not touch any of the Japanese ports. He would be glad to receive the regulations of the other Governments on the question, which he would transmit to his own. Since January 1922, the Japanese Government had taken measures to prohibit the export or transhipment of opium, so that the trade carried on by ships plying between Japan and Vladivostock was strictly controlled.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that since the previous year the German Government had applied the import certificate system to consignments despatched to the Far East. Since the previous July the system had been adopted for Japan and Siam, while at the beginning of 1925 Germany had come to a special arrangement with China on the subject. For the Republic of Eastern Siberia and Manchuria, Germany had agreed that each legitimate import into Russia could only be made by the Government itself, which had a kind of monopoly on import certificates. The despatches from Germany to Eastern Russia were made only under import certificates given by the commercial delegation and under special ordinance of the Government.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America), in answer to a question from the Chairman, remarked that, in his experience while at Vladivostock in 1922 and 1923, the reasons for the restrictions placed by the so-called Soviet Government on contraband were partially due to the steps it had taken in granting virtual monopolies, such as that previously granted to the Siberian Opium Monopoly Bureau. Personally, he did not consider the Customs statistics reliable.

Sir John JORDAN was interested to hear what had been said regarding the present situation. He understood the policy of the Soviet Government had somewhat changed matters. One of the members of the Committee had, during the previous August, argued most strongly that all the Powers were perfectly at liberty to export these drugs to Vladivostock and that they could not refuse to accept import certificates. Opium monopolies had been granted to certain foreign subjects in Vladivostock, large sums of money paid, and the certificates spread all over the world, with the result that, instead of being a protection, the certificates had encouraged illicit trade. He noted that the British authorities had refused to recognise the certificates in Vladivostock but that some other consular authorities had acted differently. With regard to Japanese ships, he noticed that certain names occurred frequently, such as the "Kamagata Maru", and he thought that the Japanese Government should have taken up the case at once and taken action against that ship.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) thought that the Japanese Government was still pursuing the enquiry.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) considered the evil due not to the import certificate system but to the administration at Vladivostock.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) asked if the Secretariat had any information as to the attitude which the Government of Persia was going to take in connection with the new Convention now open for signature and ratification.

Dame Rachel CROWDY (Secretary) replied that the Secretariat had heard nothing as to its ratification, either officially or unofficially.

Sir John JORDAN was uncertain what steps the Committee should take, but one should be to suggest that all Governments should adopt regulations similar to those established by Great Britain. The British Government seemed to have made an honest effort to deal with the matter, though the regulations were perhaps a little weak. All the Governments controlling shipping in the Persian Gulf should adopt similar regulations in order to put a stop to this infamous traffic, which had assumed gigantic proportions. The Far East had practically gone back, so far as smuggling was concerned, to the position of sixty years previously.

M. KUSAMA (Japan) desired to know whether the British regulations were mere consular regulations; were they under the control of the political authority in Persia? In the case of Japan, for instance, there was no consular service in Persia.

Sir John JORDAN answered that they were King's regulations which the British Government made for China and places of that kind; they were carried out by the highest British authority on the spot. It was a British law, applied by British courts to British subjects in countries where Great Britain possessed extra-territorial rights.

M. KUSAMA (Japan) pointed out that, while Great Britain had the legal right to apply that law in Persia, Japan had no such right.

The CHAIRMAN explained that these British regulations were made by the authority of the British Government and applied on the spot by the British consular officers. It was quite correct that they had to be executed locally. The master of a British ship leaving the port of Bushire, for example, with a cargo of opium must obtain a clearance from the British consular officer. Under these regulations the British consular officer was not allowed to give a clearance unless the conditions of the regulations were satisfied. If the machinery for working this system did not exist in the case of other countries, that did not mean that it was not possible to arrive at the same end by different means.

M. BRENIER thanked the Chairman for the details given of the working of the system by Great Britain.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the fundamental problem — that of uncontrolled exports from certain producing countries — was once more before the Committee, which had always realised its importance. At the moment, Persia, as many members had maintained from the beginning, was threatening to break up the whole of the control arrangements — or a considerable portion of the control arrangements — for stamping out the illicit traffic. There were three ways of attacking the problem.

The first was to bring as much moral pressure as possible to bear on the Persian Government and demand that it should control its exports. Such action had, he thought, been taken by Great Britain, but, so far as he knew, Great Britain stood alone in this respect. No action had been taken by the League of Nations or by other countries. Persia should be asked to prevent the export of opium from Persia to illicit destinations. Much assistance in this might possibly be derived from the fact that the opium traffic in Persia was, he believed, controlled by an American expert serving with the Government of Persia.

As regarded India, she had stopped all exports of opium to Persia, because she was satisfied that these exports, if continued, might go to swell the volume of opium available for the illicit traffic.

The second method would seem to be assistance such as had been given by the Netherlands — in connection with transshipment at Sabang. The arrangements made there, as the papers before the Committee showed, appeared to have been effective.

The last method was that which had been adopted by the British Government. If the principle which lay behind that method were applied by all the interested Governments to-day the opium problem would be solved to-morrow. Given honesty and efficiency on the part of the Governments concerned, the traffic could be stopped at once. This was, to his mind, the practical condition to be drawn from the Committee's long labours. Possibly the new situation created by the recent Conference might help. The obligations imposed upon the various nations had been materially strengthened and tightened by the Convention drawn up at that Conference, and he had no doubt that all the nations concerned would recognise the additional responsibilities which that Convention imposed on them.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said that Persia was making an effort to decrease her production. She had received a letter on the subject from the American financial adviser to whom Sir John Campbell had referred. It dealt with the commission of enquiry discussed at the recent Conference, which was to proceed to these very countries (Turkey and Persia) for the purpose of studying the situation on the spot and of advising what really could be done. A cable recently published in an American paper had stated : " The Persian Premier has ordered the immediate dismissal of all Government officials who use opium. The number of officials addicted to the drug is large, and it includes men in the highest places. The Premier's edict has caused a sensation, and it threatens to paralyse the War Office and other departments. The Premier has been allowed by the ' highest authority ' to delay the execution of his order, to give the addicts time to take a cure. Then, if they are not cured, it is proposed that they be replaced by those who do not use the drug ".

She would be glad to lay before the Committee the information supplied to her by the Persian financial adviser.

Sir John JORDAN thought that Sir John Campbell and Mrs. Hamilton Wright were too optimistic. The profits of the trade were too great a temptation to a country like Persia — a poor country which derived an immense amount of revenue from this trade. It was very unlikely that an appeal to Persia would have any practical effect.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that he had only pointed out that, as far as he was aware, no representations had been made — except by the British Government — to Persia on the matter. It seemed to him therefore that the first and obvious thing to do was to approach the Persian Government and ask it to set right a very bad situation. He had not said that he had expected any results, and, as a matter of fact, he did not expect any.

Sir John JORDAN noted that, as no appeal to Persia was likely to have any practical effect in the immediate future, the first proposal was hardly worth considering at the moment. It was, of course, right to give the Persian Government an opportunity and to make an appeal to it through the League of Nations, but that did not carry the Committee very far. The real danger was that these ships would be transferred to other flags. It was a most baffling question, and the first thing was to try to get all Governments to make some regulations. He was sure that the Japanese Government must be able to exercise some control over these ships. A Japanese Consul in China could have as great a power as the British consul, and if there were no Japanese consuls there at the moment they could be established. If the Japanese Government would follow the example of the British Government, it would have a great effect, and he appealed to it earnestly to take up this question seriously and see what it could do in the matter of the control of ships, because that was the best means of defence.

As regarded what the Dutch Government had done, that was very good indeed, as far as it went, but in this case the opium was not as a rule transhipped.

The situation in North Borneo would require reconsideration. It appeared that British North Borneo was not confining itself to Indian opium but was also taking in Persian opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that it imported only small quantities of Persian opium.

Sir John JORDAN thought that 75 chests of opium for a population of 35,000 people could not be considered a small quantity. The importance of the question was so serious that he felt it right to draw attention to the fact that British North Borneo not only obtained 84 chests of opium from India but was apparently getting what opium it liked from Persia.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that it would be useful to draw the attention of the Committee to Recommendation II in the Final Act of the Second Conference, which read as follows :

“ The Conference recommends that each Government should consider the possibility of forbidding the conveyance in any ship sailing under its flag of any consignment of the substances covered by the Convention :

“ (1) Unless an export authorisation has been issued in respect of such consignment in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, and the consignment is accompanied by an official copy of such authorisation, or of any diversion certificate which may be issued :

“ (2) To any destination other than the destination mentioned in the export authorisation or diversion certificate.”

Sir John JORDAN agreed with what Sir John Campbell had said about addressing an appeal to the Persian Government and about making the enquiries suggested by him, though he did not think they would have very much effect.

As regarded the second point, he suggested that all Governments which were agreed to prevent transshipment should follow the example of the Dutch Government at Sabang and not allow transshipment.

As regarded the third point, he suggested that all Governments represented on the Committee should take action on lines parallel to those adopted by the British Government, *mutatis mutandis*, to control their shipping from the Persian Gulf to the Far East.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the measures taken by the British Government as regarded the Persian Gulf were similar to those required by the provisions of the Final Act of the Second Convention.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) reiterated that the Japanese Government would co-operate with other Powers to control the illicit traffic. He was ready to transmit to his Government any resolution which the Committee might adopt.

Sir John JORDAN thanked Dr. Tsurumi for his undertaking. He asked that the three suggestions he had made should be embodied in a resolution.

The CHAIRMAN repeated the suggestions : (1) to make a representation to the Persian Government ; (2) control of transshipment ; (3) regulations on the lines of the resolutions adopted at the Second Conference. Could M. Van Wettum explain in what the nature of the control of transshipment exercised at Sabang consisted ?

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the measures taken at Sabang were that import certificates were required. There were also other administrative measures regarding sending information to Hong-Kong and other places in China about vessels calling at Sabang. Consequently vessels now avoided coming to that port.

Sir John JORDAN explained that he had never objected to the import certificate as such but had objected strongly to the import certificate being considered as a sacrosanct document which could not be enquired into. He was glad to see that the Government of India had now adopted that point of view and hoped the Dutch Government would do the same.

The CHAIRMAN said that the first part of the resolution — a recommendation to the Persian Government — was quite clear. It would be made on the recommendation of the Council of the League.

There would be no great difficulty on the third point, which was already covered by the resolution in the Final Act of the Second Conference. As regarded the second point, Article 15 of the Convention adopted by the Second Conference in regard to transit and transshipment of opium was to the effect that :

“ No consignment of any of the substances covered by the present Convention which is exported from one country to another country shall be permitted to pass through a third country, whether or not it is removed from the ship or conveyance in which it is being conveyed, unless the copy of the export authorisation (or the diversion certificate if such a certificate has been issued in pursuance of the following paragraph) which accompanies the consignment is produced to the competent authorities of that country ”.

This provision had been unanimously adopted at the Second Conference. If the provision were applied to exports from the Persian Gulf, what would be required would be a production to the authorities at, for example, Sabang of an export authorisation from the Persian Government. Whether or not such authorisation would be available for production would depend on whether the Persian Government ratified or not the Convention adopted by the Second Conference. If it did so, and if such export authorisation were actually issued by the Persian Government on the production of the corresponding import certificate from the importing country, then the full control which the Committee and the Second Opium Conference had desired would be attained.

This system differed slightly from that in force at Sabang, but the Committee ought not to make a recommendation on different lines from that inserted in the Convention of the Second Conference. The question was whether a provision should be adopted which would take effect if that Convention were not ratified by the Persian Government. The Committee might propose that places through which the cargoes passed, either by way of transit or transshipment, should require the production of a proper import certificate from the Government of the importing country. He took as an example the case of the "Kamagata Maru", which sailed with a cargo of opium from the Persian Gulf for Vladivostock. The cargo arrived at Sabang. It was not declared by the master of the vessel, who was accordingly prosecuted and fined by the authorities of the Dutch East Indies. The authorities, however, were not able to prevent the cargo of opium from proceeding to its destination, because they had no power to prevent it, as there was no evidence that it was to be smuggled into Dutch territory. According to the proposal before the Committee in a similar case in future, the Sabang authorities would require the production of a proper import certificate before allowing the cargo to proceed.

Sir John JORDAN agreed with this point of view.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the ship would only call at the port of Sabang, and that there would be no transshipment at all. Recommendation II of the Final Act of the Second Conference already covered the case, and he saw no necessity to adopt a recommendation already passed at the Second Conference.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was dealing not with the action of the authorities of the country under whose flag the ship was sailing but with the action of the authority of the ports at which it touched *en route*; not with the control exercised by the British or other authorities in the Persian Gulf before the ship sailed but with the control which should be exercised over these cargoes when they arrived at some port *en route*, for instance, at Sabang, and the cargo was found to be an illegitimate one, carrying no import certificate or export authorisation.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that much could be done to prevent the illicit traffic if transshipment facilities were refused, unless the authorities of the country where the transshipment took place were satisfied by the production of the evidence which accompanied the consignment that that consignment was, in fact, a legitimate one. A consignment arriving at a port of transshipment would ordinarily be accompanied by the copies of the documents guaranteeing its authenticity. Unless these documents were produced, the authorities of the port where transshipment took place could refuse to allow the facilities of their port to be used for dealing with a consignment which appeared to be illicit. The Committee could not go further than the mature recommendation of the Second Conference, because there would be no chance of success.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that the Committee should have the views of the financial adviser to the Persian Government.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the financial adviser in Persia was a servant of the Persian Government.

The existence in Persia of a financial adviser who was an American and who was *au courant* with all the details of the opium trade might be of assistance in obtaining a solution of this question. The Committee, however, had no right whatever to enter into direct communication with a servant of the Persian Government, nor had the financial adviser any right to go behind the Persian Government. Being an American citizen, however, and being familiar with the opium question in its wider aspects, he might be of practical assistance in obtaining a satisfactory solution of the question.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mrs. Hamilton Wright could read the letter from the Persian financial adviser at the following meeting.

The recommendation of the Second Conference in regard to transshipment was before the Committee and it was a question whether it should be satisfied with that provision or whether, in view of the very special circumstances of this Persian traffic, it should suggest something more stringent. As the Committee was aware, there was a very stringent provision in force in Hong-Kong. There was the Hong-Kong Opium Ordinance of December 1923, which enabled the Hong-Kong authorities to exercise the closest possible control over every cargo of opium which went into the port of Hong-Kong either in transit or transshipment. Did the Committee consider the situation so grave that it felt it should recommend something stronger than the provisions of Article 15 in the Second Opium Convention or should it be content for the present to rely on that article and await further experience?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that, under the Convention drawn up by the Second Conference, the question would be regulated in the manner described, but that until the ratifications had taken place there would be an interval to be covered. He suggested therefore that the countries concerned might be asked to apply immediately the provisions contained in the Second Convention; that would cover the interval between the present time and the time when the Convention entered into effective force.

In his view it would probably not be wise at the moment to ask for any measures in excess of those contemplated by the Second Convention.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Sir John Campbell. Both from the psychological and the diplomatic point of view he attached great importance to the second point which Sir John Campbell had raised.

Sir John JORDAN would have preferred to have the procedure in use in Hong-Kong adopted, but was quite in agreement with what Sir John Campbell and M. Bourgois had said. It would be sufficient for the present at any rate. He proposed that the Chairman, Sir John Campbell and M. Van Wettum should form the members of a Sub-Committee to draw up a resolution on the question.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) quite agreed with what had been said by Sir John Campbell and M. Bourgois to the effect that the Committee must not go any further than the provisions of the Second Conference, but he failed to see the use of making any recommendation at the moment. His own Government would enact laws according to the provisions of Article 15 of the Convention of the Second Conference and would eventually ratify that Convention, so that it would not expedite matters to make a recommendation at the moment.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) explained that, before Governments in general ratified the Convention, they had to examine all its numerous provisions. For this question, which was of pressing and immediate importance, a recommendation might be, as it were, detached from the Convention. If Governments accepted it, they could put in force at once the recommendations contained in the Convention as regarded this particular matter, without prejudicing themselves in any way regarding the ratification of the Convention as a whole.

EIGHTH MEETING

Held in Geneva on Thursday, August 27th, 1925, at 3 p.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain).

33. Traffic in Opium in the Persian Gulf (*continuation*).

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT communicated the following letter to the Committee :

“ Washington, June 18th, 1925.

“ My dear Mrs. Wright,

“ In our conversation on June 16th, you asked my opinion concerning the proposal of the recent Opium Conference in Geneva to send a commission of enquiry to visit certain opium-producing countries of the Near East in order to study the difficulties connected with the limitation of opium production, also my ideas as to the organisation and work of such a commission.

“ As you are aware, the facts of the Persian opium situation were fully set forth in a memorandum prepared by the Financial Administration. This memorandum included our tentative views and a statement of the policy of the Persian Government regarding the economic measures necessary for the practicable and effective restriction of opium cultivation in Persia. I am informed that the Persian Government is in favour of restricting the cultivation of opium as soon and as rapidly as this can be done without serious injury to the financial and economic welfare of the country.

“ It seems to me that the most satisfactory way to confirm our conclusions regarding the facts, possibilities and requirements of the opium situation in Persia is for some authoritative body to send a competent commission to Persia to study the conditions on the ground. I am informed that the Persian Government will cordially welcome such a commission.

“ I do not think I am too optimistic in saying that within ten years a substitution of crops and a readjustment of the budget is possible. The Persian Government has already taken steps for substituting other crops for opium. It has recently ordered the dismissal of all Government officials who use opium. Persia is therefore in hearty accord with any movement that would help her eradicate an evil to the seriousness of which she is thoroughly alive.

(Signed) A. C. MILLIPAUGH,
Administrator-General of the Finances
of Persia.”

34. Question of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs : General Discussion.

The CHAIRMAN said that probably more information on the subject of illicit traffic had been accumulated last year than during the whole of the previous existence of the Committee. Some very important seizures had been made which had thrown a great deal of light on the extent of the illicit traffic, the people who were engaged in it and the methods by which they carried it on.

The Committee had before it an account of the very important discovery made at Shanghai earlier in the year by the police of the municipal settlement. The investigations which were made by the Shanghai municipal police and the documents discovered on the premises of the people engaged in the traffic were of great importance. The Hong-Kong authorities had also made several important discoveries. The investigations made had brought to light a great deal of fresh information on the subject of the illicit traffic in the Far East. He paid a tribute to the energy and the acuteness of the preventive service at Hong-Kong in connection with the investigations.

Disclosures had also recently been made in connection with David Sansanovitch and Jacob Midler, an account of whose activities was before the Committee. Those disclosures had led to seizures at Cuba, Singapore and Hong-Kong, and also at Dairen by the Japanese authorities. The Committee should examine these documents very carefully and exchange views as to the measures being taken for the prevention of this traffic. It should consider what suggestions could be made to the Council on these points. It might be desirable, when discussing what measures should be taken for preventing the illicit traffic, that this matter should be considered by the Committee in private, as it could have no wish to bring to the knowledge of the people engaged in the traffic the methods proposed for defeating them.

Sir John JORDAN did not think the Committee, the Council or the Assembly was a detective service which could cope with this gigantic system of smuggling. The traffickers were well organised and had huge finances at their disposal, in addition to which they resorted to every means to conceal their methods. He would begin with production. There were some thirty factories in all in existence, where the drugs were produced. The Governments should stop excessive production, which they could do perfectly well if they were honest and efficient. For the moment control depended only on the honesty of the Governments which possessed those factories, and the Committee should address itself to the control of the factories in the first instance. It was well that this matter was being discussed in public. It was through the instrumentality of Mrs. Hamilton Wright and himself that the meetings of the Committee were made public, and he would make the papers on the question of the illicit traffic public. When the Central Board was established some good would be done but that would require time, and if its powers were restricted it would be of little use. It should be a kind of criminal investigation board to keep the countries in order. Each country should be made to do its duty in controlling the traffic. This was the supreme test of the League of Nations in this question. The Committee had failed as regarded opium-smoking through circumstances over which it had had little control, but it still had an opportunity of redeeming its reputation. It had received an assurance from the Japanese Government that that Government would act in co-operation with Europe, and he was sure that if the Japanese Government assumed an obligation it would fulfil it.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) had been very much impressed by the work done in detecting and preventing abuses connected with the opium traffic in the course of last year, and particularly with the extremely good work accomplished in the Far East, notably at Hong-Kong. It seemed to him a most encouraging thing that so much should have been discovered. The results obtained were, he thought, very satisfactory. He shared Sir John Jordan's view that the proper way to deal with the traffic was to control the factories. This view had also been repeatedly expressed by M. Van Wettum and M. Brenier. The Hague Convention as it stood even now provided all the necessary powers to stop the traffic. If the Powers would apply the restrictions provided for in that Convention, the traffic would be ended. He had pointed that out in 1921, and it was as true now as then. No one could accuse him of being unduly optimistic regarding the probable action of some Governments, but he thought the results obtained had in general been satisfactory and that the improvement effected since the traffic came under the control and supervision of the League had been very great. The position in India was better; the figures for Great Britain showed a striking diminution of the quantity of drugs manufactured and dealt with; M. Van Wettum had supplied statistics regarding the position in the Netherlands East Indies which were very encouraging. The figures for America showed startling reductions. The whole position of the trade had in fact changed since 1919. Formerly, it had been full of black spots; now they had been materially limited. To refuse to recognise the progress achieved would be unfair to the League, to the Convention and to the Committee. The situation in China, as Sir John Jordan had said, was as bad as it could be, but, apart from China, the situation in the East was distinctly better than it had been before, though the improvement there was nothing like as great as it had been in Europe and America.

As regarded the question of publicity, he had understood the Chairman's proposal to be that the proceedings were to be in public, but that, when the Committee came to discuss the actual details of the detective measures, that matter would be dealt with in private session.

M. BRENIER was completely in agreement with Sir John Jordan on the importance of supervising the manufacture of drugs. On that point he had always insisted on the necessity for the control of the manufacturers, which was essential.

Putting China aside, whose position could not at the moment be remedied, it was possible to say that the figures for the Far East marked in general an undeniable progress. He had noticed, after having examined the latest figures of consumption given for the Straits Settlements, the Federated and Non-Federated Malay States taken together, that an appreciable improvement had taken place as compared with preceding years. The same was true for North Borneo. China excepted, the position in the Far East was on the whole better so far as official consumption was concerned. The Hague Convention of 1912 was an instrument which, although imperfect, could be used by Governments advantageously. He wished to refer to the lowered consumption of the drugs in America and Canada. The later Conventions, in his opinion, were on several points a real improvement on the former state of things, were it only because all States were now in agreement on the subject of import certificates. Finally, he desired once more to urge the importance of an efficacious control of the manufacture of the different drugs.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the question before it was the question of the illicit traffic in the Far East. Sir John Jordan had raised a general question as to whether or not the real remedy was the limitation of production. M. Brenier and himself believed that, in fact, the whole Committee had advocated that procedure, and it was for that reason that the Committee had recommended to the Council that an international conference should be summoned to arrive at an agreement for a definite limitation of the production of these drugs. That Conference had been held and a Convention had been produced, which, although it did not go as far as some would have wished, was thought by those who took part in the framing of it to be likely to have a considerable effect in stopping the traffic in drugs. The full effect of that Convention, however, would not be felt for some, perhaps many, years. Meanwhile, the Committee was faced with the problem of illicit traffic, which had never been more acute and serious than at the present juncture.

M. BRENIER pointed out that there was clear evidence that progress had been effected in certain cases.

The CHAIRMAN said that that might be due in part to the fact that more was known about the subject and about the persons engaged in the traffic. Further, the control which the authorities were exercising was closer. At the moment, so far as could be judged, illicit traffic was a more serious problem than ever. Therefore he thought that the Committee should use all the means at its disposal for examining the question and suggesting such methods as seemed to be useful for dealing with it.

It would be a great pity if the Committee did not avail itself of the opportunity of considering whether the methods could be improved and of exchanging views and experiences. In spite of the fact that the illicit traffic could never be stopped by a service of prevention, yet a great deal could be done to check and discourage it. The action taken in recent years by Governments had gone a long way to discourage traffickers. They were, however, well organised, with huge financial resources at their disposal. Despite their ability, they could be met by closer organisation. After serious consideration the Committee might be in a position to make some recommendation to Governments.

Sir John JORDAN was not disposed to leave China out of consideration. It constituted practically the whole Far Eastern problem. So far as narcotic drugs were concerned, the Committee could do a great deal for China and it was its absolute duty to do so. He had lived in China when there was no such thing as morphine or cocaine, and China even now manufactured none of these drugs. The history of the morphine trade in China was well known. During the war an immense amount of morphine had reached the country illicitly. At one time it was estimated at 800,000 oz. annually. It was still very high, as shown by the seizures which were an infinitesimal proportion of the whole traffic. Never had the situation generally been worse than at the present moment. 180 chests of opium had found their way into Shanghai in one day, and over 4,000 chests had been sent from Persia. He did not deprecate the efforts suggested to check the trade in narcotics, but no preventive service would be much good unless it were reinforced by effective action in controlling the production. Sir John Campbell had told the Committee that it could not depend upon the honesty and efficiency of some Governments in Europe. He hoped it might be possible to compel these Governments by public opinion to be honest, and for that purpose the Press was a far greater weapon than any Central Board.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT referred to the wish she had already expressed that the Indian Government would stop the huge amount of opium being shipped to certain colonies of the Far East, particularly to North Borneo. It was hard to believe that the average consumption based on the Chinese population in that territory could legitimately be as much as — she thought — 7,000 grains — a figure obtained from the author of "British North Borneo" — Mr. Owen Rutter.

Taking the recent figure of 84 chests (which was the amount given by Sir John Campbell for the past year) and dividing it by the Chinese population of 38,000, a smaller figure — 2,166 grains per head — was obtained. It was to be remembered that the Health Committee of the League of Nations allowed ten grains of opium *per capita* for European consumption. The *per capita* consumption in India was given as 26 grains. Could anyone honestly believe that the Chinamen in North Borneo could consume 2,166 grains *per capita* with impunity? ¹

However, exception had been taken to her statement that much of this opium inevitably went to the Philippines, despite the fact that for many years past British North Borneo had been accepted as a recognised source of infection by the highest authorities in the Philippines. Sir John Campbell's own figures showed that the export of opium had dropped from 240 chests in 1921 to 84 in 1924. If she had used out-of-date figures she was sorry. The report from the Philippines dated December 1923 was now in her possession.

It was a most unsatisfactory report, as it was not sufficiently explicit, and while it stated that direct smuggling from China had practically been stopped, it did not state from what quarter the smuggling did come, and mentioned only that the illicit trade was leaking through certain ports and places in the district outside Ilo-ilo. She had cabled to the authorities in Manila asking for the most recent and more explicit information. When it arrived she would circulate it to the Committee.

In the meanwhile, it this great excess of opium in North Borneo was not going to the Philippines, where was it going?

It seemed to her that the places she had mentioned must be centres of such traffic. These colonies — British North Borneo and others — were under the control of the most efficient and enlightened nations of the world. Did it show a very great effort on their part to put into effect Chapter II of the Hague Convention — which called for the progressive and effective suppression of opium smoking?

She could not agree that there were two distinct problems to deal with: one for the East and one for the West. They were inseparably connected.

The extraordinary concern shown for the addict in the West and the dire punishment meted out to the wretched vendor of drugs in Europe and America failed to arouse great enthusiasm when it was remembered that the addict in the East was encouraged in every way to continue the abuse and that the vendors — who were the great nations of Europe — went unrebuked.

While she had the greatest admiration and respect for the efficiency and hard work of the members of the Committee, and their desire to perfect the machinery with which to control certain phases of the traffic, she did not believe — and the Committee knew that the United States Government did not believe — that the control of consumption alone would lead to the solution of this problem. The Committee must try to restrict the evil at its source, which was production. In dealing with opium, the commodity was human life itself — whether of the unhappy addict in the West or the poor Chinaman in the East, who laboured for the upkeep of Western colonies and paid for the privilege with his life.

The CHAIRMAN did not think the Committee should discuss the question of the smuggling into the Philippines until it had the facts before it.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that if he had only referred to two separate problems, one in the Far East concerning opium and the other in Europe concerning drugs, it was from the point of view of propaganda. This would be dangerous in Europe but, on the other hand, it might be very useful in the Far East. He protested, however, against the accusation made against the Committee of having two moral codes, one for the Far East and the other for the West.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) wished to make a short statement before the Committee went into secret session.

In a document submitted to the Committee, mention was made of Swiss firms which were found to be implicated in various affairs of illicit traffic in narcotics in the Far East.

He wished to make it clear that, up to the moment when Swiss legislation for narcotics had come into force, these firms did not fall under the control of the Federal authorities. Their trade was, in fact, free, and from the point of view of Federal legislation, the actions attributed to them could not be considered as violating any law. Conditions were now changed: control existed, manufacture was supervised, exports submitted to the formality of permits, and it was hoped that these measures would create a normal situation in Switzerland and that thus she would contribute her part towards the suppression of the abuse.

Sir John JORDAN asked whether the documents on the question of illicit traffic would be published.

The CHAIRMAN thought this to be a question for the Committee to decide before it rose.

Sir John JORDAN was strongly in favour of publication.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) read the following statement:

“ In order to control the illicit traffic, for which purpose the system of mutual exchange has been designed, it is the opinion of the Japanese authorities that the

¹ Basing the consumption of opium in North Borneo on the adult Chinese male population of 20,700 (figures given at the First Opium Conference) instead of 2,166 grains consumption *per capita*, the figure 3,976 grains *per capita* would be obtained. If the 75 chests of Persian opium which were going to North Borneo were added to this, the average consumption of opium by the adult male population in North Borneo would be 7,527 grains *per capita*.

present method falls short of the original design. First of all, the real object in this plan should be not only to detect the individual smuggler who carries on his person a small quantity of the prohibited article but also to discover from such seizures the big traffickers who organise the international illicit trade on a large scale.

“ For this purpose the information on the seizures must be very thorough and must give all the details of the persons involved, the movement of the conveyances, as well as the origin of the seized article and the method by which the contraband traffic is discovered. In order to secure all the details of these facts it is thought desirable by the Japanese Government that the seizures may be immediately communicated to the diplomatic or consular agents of the countries concerned (in the case of China, Customs and consular officials). By this method the facts may be immediately transmitted to their Governments in order to secure evidence for conviction and punishment.

“ As to the publication of the information, it would be very useful if the simultaneous investigations of the various Governments into seizures of any magnitude were to be co-ordinated by the Secretariat and circulated for the information of the Committee. They should also be published so that the recurrence of such traffic may be made impossible. Up to the present we have seen that numerous reports were issued without any detail of the seizures and the Governments are therefore entirely at a loss to proceed even with the preliminary enquiry. In agreeing entirely with the proposal of the British representative on the agenda, it is the desire of the Japanese Government to do all that it can in order to enlist the co-operation of all the Governments concerned in the seizures. ”

The Committee went into private session.

NINTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Friday, August 28th, 1925, at 5 p.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain).

35. Relation between the Date of Meeting of the Committee and the Date of Despatch of the Annual Reports from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to confirm a decision provisionally taken at a previous meeting to the effect that it should ask for the reports from Governments to be despatched at latest in the case of the nearer countries by July 1st and in that of the far distant countries by October 1st. The Secretariat would then receive them all not later than the first week of November. In that case perhaps the best date for the annual meeting of the Committee would be early in January.

It was, of course, always open to the Council to summon a special meeting of the Committee in the interval if any matter arose on which it desired the advice of the Committee.

M. BRENIER thought that the beginning of January was too early, as the Secretariat would not have time to prepare the summary.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat considered early in January a suitable date.

Sir JOHN CAMPBELL (India) stated that possibly the creation of the Central Board would make a great difference. Was it necessary to change the date of meeting when probably the detailed examination of the reports would be taken over by a new body ?

The CHAIRMAN thought that the annual reports of Governments would always be an important item of the agenda, even when the statistics were detached from them and sent to the Central Board. There would always be many questions connected with the execution of the Convention.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) said that, as regarded the date of the annual meeting of the Committee, he hoped that the end of January would be fixed and that the date for annual reports from the Far East would be October 1st.

The Committee agreed that the final date for the dispatch of annual reports should be October 1st and that a date in January should be fixed for the annual meeting of the Committee.

36. **Flag Transference in connection with the Illicit Traffic.**

The CHAIRMAN explained that, owing to the absence of the head of the Transit Section, it would not be possible for the Committee to obtain his views on the question of flag transference.

Sir John JORDAN said that the Committee was faced with a very difficult situation in connection with flag transferences from ship to ship. There was a registry of shipping at Shanghai, which was conducted on British lines. In China, ships very often changed their registry for particular reasons. The Chinese merchant fleet had at times transferred its ships to some other flag, as, for instance, during the war. In Chinese waters, Chinese-owned vessels sometimes transferred their flags to other Powers in order to gain protection against their own authorities. He had never before known, however, the case of a British ship being transferred to a Chinese flag. Probably it was done for a special reason — namely, smuggling — and the question was how to guard against this procedure, which augmented the contraband trade in the Far East. There should be some understanding amongst the nations in order to guard against these fictitious transfers. There were not, he thought, any Chinese capable of navigating a ship from China to the Persian Gulf; Chinese ships were almost certain to be commanded by officers of other nationalities. Governments could therefore do something to grapple with the situation. There were agreements with many nations by which British officers and seamen on all kinds of foreign ships were amenable to the jurisdiction of the ship so far as discipline was concerned, but for any criminal act (and smuggling opium could be made one) the British Government would have jurisdiction over its own nationals, and the same procedure could be followed by other Governments as regarded their nationals.

It would be well for the whole matter to be brought to the attention of the Council so that a ruling on it might be obtained. The Committee could perhaps suggest that, when a ship had been transferred from the British or other flag for the obvious purpose of smuggling, the other country should be warned that this should not occur and that there should be some understanding to prevent it. In the case of a Chinese ship the Chinese Government should be officially informed by the Power concerned and should be warned that the whole responsibility would be thrown upon them.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee could not do more than call the attention of the Council to the matter and ask it to instruct the appropriate department of the Secretariat to examine the question to see if any steps could be taken in the matter. The Secretariat might perhaps circulate to the Governments concerned a list of the ships which were known to be carrying on this traffic.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

37. **Annual Report from the Portuguese Government concerning Macao (Document O. C. 23. Y. 1).**

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) spoke as follows :

“ The report which I have had the honour to present to you, and which is now before you, only furnishes, I admit, incomplete material for forming a judgment in regard to the subject with which we are dealing.

“ To make possible a comparative study, this report should be accompanied by other reports covering the years 1922 and 1923.

“ If, however, reference is made to the verbal information which I have on many occasions furnished to the Commission, and to information furnished by the Portuguese delegation at the meeting of the First Opium Conference, this gap in the evidence would be filled.

“ As I have said, the result which it is desirable to attain in the campaign against opium is the progressive decrease of the traffic in this drug. This decrease can easily be proved, so far as we are concerned, from the figures which I have had the honour to present to you on other occasions. Permit me briefly to insist on this point. It is my duty to do so, for a mere reading of the figures clearly shows that our efforts have had a salutary effect.

“ It is, I repeat, my duty to insist on this point. Macao is the victim of a legend which is difficult to destroy since it is encouraged with a touching devotion. Macao is, so to speak, the scapegoat for all, or at least for a large part of, the transactions in opium which are taking place on the coasts of China. I am far from claiming that we are not to blame in the matter, but who can conscientiously claim the right to cast stones at us? In any case, rightly or wrongly, it would not be charitable, in dealing with a humanitarian question, to concentrate upon Macao all the hostile batteries in view of the fact that our country is showing its good will and its determination to achieve by successive stages practical results in the campaign against opium.

“ We are no doubt suffering from a past which no long continues, and for which we are only in part responsible. But though the situation has changed, people persist in loading us with all the sins of Israel. From a former commerce which amounted to some 33,000 cases, and which towards 1911 amounted to about 2,000 cases, we dropped to a trade of 500 cases after the Treaty signed with Great Britain in 1913, and subsequently to 360 cases, of which 120 were for export.

“ In the last contract which we signed with the concessionaire, we contemplated a decrease from 360 to 300 cases in the space of three years dating from 1925. This decrease is more important than it seems. For the estimate of the 500 cases which we imported under the provisions of the Agreement of 1913 with Great Britain to which I have just alluded, we were reckoning on the basis of a population of 75,000 inhabitants, whereas at present we have a population

of at least 120,000 inhabitants, without counting the floating population, which is not less than one million.

" Basing our calculations on these figures, we are far from being as responsible as critics desire to prove by attributing to us figures of consumption higher than the actual reality. I protested against these figures in the session of our Committee held at Geneva from May 24th to June 7th, 1923. These figures gave a consumption of 147.297 milligrammes per head — a figure which appears marvellously exact. Subsequently, however, the truth showed for a moment from the bottom of the well, and it was seen that elsewhere rather more opium was actually consumed than in Macao. I do not put this forward in order to seem to criticise the action of the other countries but merely with the object of defending my own from possible accusations.

" But even if I made such criticisms they would be none the less justified. As a member of the Advisory Committee I have the right to defend the interests of my country, but it is also true that it is my duty to view from an international and humanitarian point of view all that comes within the field of the question of the traffic in opium. Permit me, acting solely in accordance with this conception of my duty, to inform you that it seems to me that measures taken with respect to Macao, which would tend to hasten the rate of the decrease in the traffic in opium, appear to me illogical and almost in contradiction with the object which we have in view.

" To begin with, such action would be a refusal to recognise such practical measures as have hitherto been taken by Portugal. Secondly, it would tend to encourage illicit traffic, which is the great danger. Measures too strict and too precipitate are always followed by an increase in illicit traffic. This fact was fully recognised at the meeting of the First Opium Conference.

All that touches Macao is subject to a considerable amount of illusion. The general public, in its interest in humanitarian questions like that of opium, allows itself easily to be moved from the sentimental point of view when certain measures are taken, but this public does not see to the bottom of the question. We must not blame the public for its failure to do so. Do not forget, however, that the question of opium at Macao forms a negligible part of the world-wide question of narcotic drugs. In a statement which I had the honour to make before the First Opium Conference, I repeated the phrase which I had heard uttered by a very competent expert in the opium question: " Macao is like a little fish by the side of a whale ". This sentence sums up with synthetic clarity my point of view.

" Those who are conscientiously interested in the study of this question will recognise as a result of what I have said that the method which we are following is one which will certainly lead to the goal which we have in view. This method lies in the constant and progressive reduction of our trade in agreement and acting simultaneously with the countries which are more or less in the same situation as our own."

M. BOURGOIS (France), referring to the statistics of imports furnished by M. Ferreira, pointed out that, in addition to the 100 chests coming from India and the 120 coming from Bushire, 41 chests were stated to have come from Kwong Chow Wan. The French authorities were about to enquire into this matter and the supervision would be strengthened. The Committee could be assured that the French Government would never allow anything to be done contrary not only to the letter but to the spirit of the international engagements which it had signed.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to two points.

The first concerned the item of 120 cases imported from Bushire on the " Gorjistan ". The Committee would be able to compare that item with the note appended to the document on the export of opium from the Persian Gulf (Appendix 4, Annex 8), where the full story of that export was stated. According to this information, the " Gorjistan " had left on that voyage with 996 cases, 210 of which were compressed into 120 packages and the remaining 786 into 189 packages, making 309 packages in all. This item of 120 cases, therefore, referred, he thought, not to cases but to packages. The Committee, however, had all the information before it, and a comparison of the two statements would throw some light on the transaction.

The second point referred to the statement of the exports to Paraguay on the " Sekino Maru ". The proceedings of this vessel were extremely interesting. There were two instances in which the " Sekino Maru " had made a voyage from Macao with opium declared for the destination of Paraguay. In November of 1923 the official Macao opium returns reported that the " Sekino Maru " had left on November 1st with 111 packets of Persian opium and 16 chests of Bengal opium declared for Paraguay. This ship had cleared from Hong-Kong on October 30th for Foochow in ballast and returned on November 18th from Foochow, Tamsui and Keelung without any opium on board. The " Sekino Maru " had never got to Paraguay with this opium. The captain, when questioned, told a long story as to what had become of the opium, for the truth of which the Chairman could not vouch.

The second voyage was, he thought, the one referred to in the Portuguese report. From the official opium report for Macao for April, this vessel left with 7 cases of prepared opium, containing 23,683 taels, destined for Paraguay. The ship cleared from Hong-Kong for Tamsui on April 16th and arrived back on April 18th from Keelung, so that here again the inference was that the opium did not arrive at Paraguay.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that in theory the Portuguese Administration of Macao had the right to export opium to Paraguay. Consignments had been accompanied by documents furnished by the consuls of that country and were therefore legitimate. He desired to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that these exports had been referred to in his report

of April 17th. On November 10th, 1924, he had submitted to the First Opium Conference a document containing the following passage :

“ The Government, having ascertained from an authoritative source that, under cover of this permit, which was in conformity with the provisions of the Convention, abuses had occurred, since on occasion opium despatched to a certain destination did not reach it, proposed to allow no export which appeared doubtful to take place in the future ”.

38. Publication of Documents submitted to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would remember that it was the usual practice to append to the reports all the documents which were submitted to it, but the mass of documents was very large and it was quite obvious that they ought not all to be published, if only on the grounds of expense. The Progress Report of the Secretariat should be annexed, together with the corrections and additions which the Committee had approved. Did the Committee think it desirable to publish the summary of the annual reports ?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) would omit the summary of the reports.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was the only document which gave the general public any information as to the Annual Reports of the Governments. It could, of course, be published separately.

Dame Rachel CROWDY said that the summary had always been published.

Sir John JORDAN thought it ought always to be published.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) had no objection. The summary was, however, long and not very interesting, as it related to a period now long since past.

M. BRENIER pointed out that it had always been published and that such a practice should be continued.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that this report was published as one document and the Minutes of its proceedings with all the appendices as a second document. It was as annexes to the Minutes that all these documents had been published in the past. If the Committee examined the report for last year, it would see that the only annexes to the report were a few of the most important documents, all the rest of the documents being published as appendices to the Minutes. The question he asked the Committee to decide was as to publication generally and not a question whether a particular document should be appended to the report or the Minutes.

M. BRENIER thought it sufficient if documents were published as annexes to the Minutes.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that what the Committee would have to decide was whether the summary should be published as an annex to its report to the Council or as an annex to the Minutes or not published.

M. BRENIER repeated that he was in favour of publication. There was no reason to refuse to publish it since it gave a general idea of the situation.

Sir John JORDAN said that the summary ought to be published. It might not on this occasion have been particularly interesting but it might be more interesting next year and in subsequent years. A very good idea of the whole situation was obtained from the summary prepared by the Secretary.

M. BOURGOIS (France) had no objection.

The Committee agreed that the summary should be published as an annex to the Minutes, as in previous years. The Progress Report would also be published as an annex to the Minutes in its revised form.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee decided* that Doc. O.C. 327 (letter from the Finnish Government) ; Doc. O.C. 298 (letter from the British Government) ; Doc. O.C. 289 (report on the steps taken by the Health Committee) ; Doc. O.C. 290 (provisional list of drugs) ; Doc. O.C. 204 (letter from M. Van Wettum to the Secretariat) ; Doc. O.C. 299 (Council resolution on the subject of propaganda) ; Doc. O.C. 293 (drug question in mandated territories) ; Doc. 305 (extracts from the Chinese Maritime Customs Report on the Trade of China for 1924) ; Doc. O.C. 296 (Extradition) ; documents relating to Vladivostock 1922-1924, should not be published.

The Committee decided that Doc. O.C. 291 (Indian hemp), Doc. O.C. 292 and O.C. 292a (Annex 8, Appendix 4) (British memorandum concerning exports from the Persian Gulf) should be published, together with the document concerning the question of falsification of labels (Annex 6).

39. Report of the Sub-Committee on the Form of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments.

The report of the Sub-Committee on the form of the summary of the Annual Reports was considered. After an exchange of views, *it was agreed* that in future a list of the names of the factories in which the drugs were manufactured should be added to the summary.

Sir John JORDAN thought that the Secretariat should always be allowed to furnish the Committee with such comments and references to important developments as it deemed suitable in order to prevent the report from developing into a purely statistical document.

The CHAIRMAN said that the body which criticised the report was the Advisory Committee. The work of the Secretariat consisted in the preparation of the documents for the Committee. It would be remembered that on one or two previous occasions, when comments of the kind to which Sir John JORDAN referred were made in the summary, they had given rise to controversy and strong objection and that in some cases they had not been found to be well founded.

From the point of view of the Secretariat, it was important that their work should be impartial, and criticism and comment were therefore very dangerous. To call attention to special points which appeared in the report, however, was another matter, but for the Secretariat to embark on any comment or criticism would be highly dangerous.

Sir John JORDAN did not ask for any criticisms but only for references to important developments.

Dame Rachel CROWDY, Secretary, pointed out that the Secretariat would now make comparative conclusions on the annual reports of the last three or four years.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Secretariat had been instructed to insert in the report everything which was of interest to the Committee.

Sir John JORDAN expressed himself as satisfied with that procedure.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it would not be possible, for example, for him to give statistics for the quantity of morphia transformed into drugs not falling under the Convention.

M. BRENIER pointed out that the Sub-Committee had drafted its report with a view to changing in as small a degree as possible the practice of Governments which gave information. Dr. Anselmino would recognise that the method of procedure hitherto employed facilitated the work of the Secretariat. This obviously did not mean that these drugs fell under the terms of the Convention, but if a new circular was sent to Governments confusion might arise.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Governments were not asked to give information either as regarded dionin or codeine at the moment. Only a few Governments had given such information. He agreed with Dr. Anselmino in thinking that Table 5, Dionin; Table 6, Codeine; and Table 7, Alkaloids of Opium not specifically mentioned, ought to be omitted from the summary.

Governments were not asked to give this information. Many of them did not do so and many could not. Great Britain could not give any figures as regarded the imports of codeine, because it did not come under her law, and Germany was in the same position.

Tables 5, 6 and 7 were omitted.

The report was adopted as a whole with the amendments agreed to (Annex 7).

TENTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Monday, August 31st, 1925, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

40. Consideration of the Report of the Committee to the Council.

(i) Preamble.

At the request of Mr. Pinkney Tuck (United States of America), the reference in the report to himself as attending the meeting in the capacity of observer was amended to read: "who was appointed by his Government to attend in an unofficial capacity".

(ii) *Annual Reports furnished by the Governments.*

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) referred to the list which had been prepared of various countries which had not sent in their reports. He pointed out that this report was not, in fact, due from Far-Eastern countries until October. It would give a misleading impression if the report for 1924 was shown as not having been received in the case of countries which were under no obligation to send a report at that time.

The CHAIRMAN said a suitable footnote would be added to the effect that the report was not, in fact, due until October 1st.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) quoted the following sentence of the report : " The representative of India informed the Committee that the Indian Government had decided to cease any exports of opium in future to Persia and Macao ". He would prefer this sentence to conclude with the words " had decided to stop exports of opium to Persia and Macao ". The Government of India had taken certain action to meet existing conditions. If these conditions ceased to exist in the future, the necessity for that action would also cease, and he did not wish to make any binding statement as regarded the future.

The amendment was adopted.

(iii) *Propaganda.*

This portion of the report was adopted without amendment¹.

(iv) *China.*

M. BRENIER proposed to add at the end of this section a sentence to the effect that the Committee considered that its work would be made of no effect and that public opinion would be misled if no information were forthcoming from one of the countries which was one of the chief producers of raw opium.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) objected to any reference being made in this connection to public opinion.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that public opinion attached importance to the annual report of the Committee, which furnished information with regard to the opium and drug situation. If nothing was said concerning China in the annual report, it might seem as though the Committee did not attach any importance to the subject. In this way public opinion was likely to be misled.

M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) insisted that the Committee, in making its report, was under no necessity to refer explicitly to public opinion. He was glad to see that public opinion took so much interest in the problem, but the Committee, as a working Committee of the League, wanted to obtain information about China because, without it, it could not work satisfactorily. Public opinion had nothing to do with the matter.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with M. Van Wettum. He did not think that it was necessary to make quite so express a reference to public opinion in the report. It might be stated that, if no reference were made to China, the report would not give an exact idea of the position, and that the position might, therefore, be wrongly interpreted.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT thought that public opinion should be taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the following formula :

" Being of opinion that an important part of its work would be incomplete and a misleading view of the opium situation would be given if no information were supplied in regard to the country which is at present the chief producer of raw opium. "

This formula was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the following sentence should be deleted : " The procedure in connection with the important seizure at Shanghai earlier in the year, of which a summary is appended to this report, illustrates its importance ". He had referred to the memorandum on the Shanghai case and noted that this particular point was not fully dealt with. If the sentence were retained in the report persons might refer to the memorandum for an explanation and they would not find one.

It was agreed that the sentence should be omitted.

(v) *Exports of Opium from the Persian Gulf.*

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that the statement " It may be stated positively that *practically the whole* of these exports were destined for the illicit traffic " was put in somewhat too positive a form.

¹ Dr. Carrière (Switzerland), who was not present when the report was adopted, asked that the following explanation might be inserted in order that all misunderstanding might be avoided with regard to the meaning of the sentence concerning the Health Committee's opinion about propaganda :

" It (the Health Committee) considered that it was of primary importance that a request should be made to doctors and medical students asking them not to prescribe narcotics too freely and only to administer them in strictly necessary doses, since it has been proved that many addicts only become so as the result of a medical treatment during which narcotics have been prescribed. "

The CHAIRMAN suggested : " It may be stated that *nearly the whole* of these exports ", etc. In addition, he thought that mention should be made of the fact that its mission at Vladivostock had informed the British Government that the law relating to the sale of opium was being strictly enforced by the Soviet authorities.

M. BRENIER considered this to be a very delicate question. He would like a formula a little less positive in tone.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as the Committee had on previous occasions stated that import certificates issued at Vladivostock were being used to cover illicit traffic, it seemed only fair to say that it now had information to the effect that this was no longer the case.

M. BOURGOIS (France) did not wish to involve the responsibility of the Committee. While it might very well be true that the Soviet authorities were doing everything possible to enforce control, it was obvious that the evil could not disappear in the twinkling of an eye.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee finally decided that* the paragraph should read : " It should be mentioned that the latest information received by the British Government from Vladivostock is to the effect that the Soviet authorities appear to be doing their best to prevent the illicit traffic in narcotics ".

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that the phrase " any manufacturer or dealer possessing the licence or authorisation of his Government to manufacture . . . who is discovered to be supplying drugs . . . for the purpose of illicit traffic *should be dealt with . . . by the withdrawal of his licence or authorisation* " should read : " *may be dealt with by the withdrawal of his licence or authorisation* ". In many cases Governments had no power to withdraw the licence. A case had been quoted on the previous day in the Swiss Press in which such a thing had occurred. For example, when a chemist delivered a small quantity of morphine to a morphinomaniac who importuned him for the drug, his licence could not generally be immediately withdrawn but he was usually simply subjected to supervision.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the paragraph had not been drafted with the object of dealing with trifling offences but to deal with people who supplied the drugs for the purpose of illicit traffic. All members of the Committee were, he thought, unanimous that withdrawal of the licence was the manner in which to deal with such cases whether the offender was prosecuted or not.

M. BOURGOIS (France) accepted this explanation, provided that the word " knowingly " was inserted in the sentence in question : " manufacturer knowingly supplying drugs or procuring them ", etc.

On the proposal of M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands) *the Committee agreed to insert a reference to Article 26 of the Convention of the Second Opium Conference, as well as to Article 18.*

(vi) *Date of the Annual Meeting of the Committee.*

The CHAIRMAN said, as regarded the date of the future annual meetings, that the next annual meeting would be held in January 1927 unless any special business arose necessitating an earlier meeting.

In reply to M. Van WETTUM (Netherlands), M. BRENIER thought that it was unnecessary for there to be a meeting in January 1926, as there would be no reports from Governments to discuss.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought a meeting would, however, be necessary, since the Committee would have to send some kind of a report to the Assembly. When, however, the Central Board was constituted, the whole position would be altered.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that the Committee should not bind its future action. At the moment it did not seem necessary for the Committee to meet in 1926, but it would be wiser to leave the Chairman quite free to take a decision on this question.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee decided to insert the sentence* : " It is decided that, starting from the year 1927, the annual meeting shall be held some time during the month of January ".

After a further exchange of views, *the Committee decided that, should a meeting be necessary in 1926, it should be held some time towards the end of May.*

(vii) *Resolutions attached to the Report.*

The Committee adopted the text of the resolutions attached to the report, with certain formal amendments. The text of Resolution III was adopted in the following form :

"The Committee asks the Council to represent to the States Members of the League or parties to the Convention the importance for the work of the Committee of the annual reports relating to the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs being

despatched in no case later than October 1st following the year to which the reports relate in the case of the Far Eastern States, or July 1st in the case of other States".

The report as a whole, as amended, was adopted (Annex 8).

41. Memorandum on Persian Opium submitted by the Persian Delegation to the Second Opium Conference.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT asked whether the following statement contained in this memorandum had been discussed by the Committee :

"The transhipments of Indian opium at Bushire in 1923-24 were as follows :

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| For China | 1,000 batmans | 6,500 pounds; |
| For France | 243 " | 1,579 " ; |
| For Hungary | 9,196 " | 59,774 " ; |

If the declarations represented the actual destinations, there was little doubt that they were illicit transactions.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that this passage was incorrect. It was quite obvious that there could be no licit transshipment from India at Bushire in the case of China, France or Hungary. The report from India for 1923 showed no export to France at all, and he had never heard of exports of opium from India to France or Hungary. There had been, of course, no exports to China since 1913.

Before India could send opium to France or Hungary, it would have to get a certificate from those countries guaranteeing the legitimacy of the imports. The statement was, he thought, entirely incorrect.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT was unable to understand what this statement meant.

The CHAIRMAN agreed in thinking that it was obscure.

42. Adoption of the Minutes of the Session.

The Minutes of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth meetings were adopted, with certain amendments and additions.

In regard to the reference in the second meeting to the reservations made by France on the subject of quarterly statistics, M. BOURGOIS (France) stated that France had made reservations with respect to colonies, protectorates and mandated territories under her authority in regard to the impossibility of furnishing quarterly statistics regularly within the very limited period. This was, however, a purely formal reservation, because, as an actual fact, no traffic in drugs existed in these colonies.

Further, the reason why France had not signed the Protocol of the First Conference had been because it was not a producing country.

With reference to the Minutes of the fourth meeting, Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) referred to the statement made by Sir John Campbell that large quantities of drugs had been exported from Japan for an unknown destination from bonded warehouses under the control of the Japanese authorities.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne had, at the fifth session of the Committee, referred to a large amount of *opium* which had been removed from the bonded warehouses in Japan. These two statements, if they referred to the same incident, appeared to be contradictory. The evidence furnished by Sir Malcolm Delevingne at the fifth session had been based on a translation of the record of the Japanese Diet, but this had no reference to the removal of drugs to which Sir John Campbell had referred. He accordingly asked on which evidence Sir John Campbell based his assertion that it had been admitted in the Japanese Diet that large quantities of drugs had been exported from Japan.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that he had first made this statement at the fifth session of the Advisory Committee, and as that had taken place some time ago, he could not now say with absolute precision whether the reference in the Japanese Diet had been to opium or to drugs, but from the general impression produced there could be little doubt that there had been clear admissions in the Japanese Diet that large quantities of drugs — and morphia was specially mentioned — had left Japan without authority for unknown destinations. The statement had not been challenged at the time he made it, or since. If a reference to the actual papers should indicate that the admission in the Japanese Diet related solely to opium and not to drugs, then he would certainly correct his statement.

Dr. TSURUMI (Japan) did not desire to enter into a discussion and was prepared to accept the assurance of Sir John Campbell on that point.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Geneva on Monday, August 31st, 1925, at 3 p.m.

Chairman : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

43. Adoption of the Minutes of the Session (*continuation*).

The minutes of the seventh, eighth and ninth meetings were adopted, with certain amendments.

44. Smuggling of Opium from British North Borneo to the Philippines : Statement by Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT reminded the Committee that during the session she had commented on the excessive amount of opium despatched to British North Borneo and had expressed her opinion that much of it was being smuggled to the Philippine Islands. This had been the case for many years, but she had not realised that lately the imports of opium through British North Borneo had fallen considerably. She had now received a telegram from the Governor-General of the Philippines to the effect that only a very small amount of opium had been smuggled into those islands.

She was accordingly sorry unwittingly to have exaggerated the situation, but she was glad that the truth was now before the Committee, since it showed that the attempt of the American authorities to suppress the use of opium in the Philippines was not a failure and that the United States had been successful in putting into practice Chapter II of the Hague Convention.

If, however, the opium smuggled from North Borneo was not going to the Philippines, it would be interesting to know what its destination was. The total amount imported from India and Persia appeared to be 159 chests (32,400 lbs.), which gave an average consumption of 7,533 grains per head of the adult Chinese population. This seemed to be a most excessive consumption.

She submitted for circulation the legislation passed by the United States Government for the restriction of the use of opium in the Philippines.

M. BRENIER pointed out that, if the figures were correct, 7,000 grains *per capita* consumption argued a very high consumption in British North Borneo.

The CHAIRMAN said that he did not deny the figure of 75 chests stated by Mrs. Hamilton Wright as having been imported from Persia, but there was no information before the Committee as to the period covered by that importation.

While thanking Mrs. Hamilton Wright for communicating the information in regard to the Philippines, the Chairman deprecated her reference to immense quantities of opium being smuggled from British North Borneo. The use of such a phrase at the very end of the Committee's session was unfortunate, because it was impossible to prolong the meeting in order to make a detailed examination of the figures. The question had been discussed two years previously on the basis of the official statistics for imports, and the figures for British North Borneo were no worse than for other possessions.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that if the information furnished by Mrs. Hamilton Wright were correct, the consumption of Macao was very small in comparison with that of its neighbour.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the only duty of his Government in the matter was to satisfy itself that the exports from India to British North Borneo were not clearly undesirable. On that point the Government had satisfied itself. In the reply of the Governor-General of the Philippines it was stated that the quantity of opium received was very small indeed. Did that statement refer to the quantities from British North Borneo only or to all the illicit imports into the Philippines ?

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT said the telegram referred to British North Borneo. She would forward the reports of the Philippine Islands as soon as she obtained them.

45. Statement by Mr. Pinkney Tuck.

Mr. Pinkney Tuck (United States of America) expressed to the Committee his pleasure at having attended its meetings in an unofficial capacity. He desired also to thank M. van Wettum for his kind words of welcome at the opening of the session, and to express to all members of the Committee and the Secretariat his appreciation of the kindness extended to him, which had enabled him to arrive at a better understanding of the questions discussed.

If any significance were to be attached to his unofficial presence on the Committee, he hoped it should certainly be interpreted as the desire on the part of the United States to continue to collaborate at all times with other nations, on the basis of the Hague Convention of 1912, for the suppression of the illicit traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was a great pleasure for the Committee to have had Mr. Pinkney Tuck present during the session. He hoped that Mr. Tuck would be present at the next session.

46. Close of the Session.

M. BOURGOIS (France) moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman for the manner in which he had conducted the discussions and for the very important contribution he had made to the work of the session.

The vote of thanks was unanimously passed.

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking the Committee for the manner in which it had supported him and for the close attention of members to business, paid a tribute to the staff of the Secretariat and especially of the Opium Section, for the assistance which they had given to the Committee.

Mrs. Hamilton WRIGHT desired to pay a special tribute to Dame Rachel Crowdy for her indefatigable work.

LIST OF ANNEXES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Agenda of the Session | 62 |
| 2. Report by the Secretary on the Work accomplished since the last Session | 62 |
| 3. Summary of Annual Reports | 69 |
| 4. Report by the Secretariat on Indian Hemp | 90 |
| 5. Memorandum by Dr. Tsurumi on the Policy of the Japanese Government as regards the Control of Opium Traffic | 92 |
| 5a. Second Memorandum by Dr. Tsurumi on the Policy of the Japanese Government as regards the Control of Opium Traffic | 93 |
| 6. Memorandum by Dr. Anselmino on the Falsification of Labels | 93 |
| 7. Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to study the Question of the Form of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments | 94 |
| 8. Report to the Council on the Work of the Seventh Session | 96 |

ANNEX 1.

AGENDA OF THE SESSION

adopted by the Committee on August 24th, 1925.

1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.
2. Adoption of Agenda.
3. Progress Report by the Secretary.
4. Annual Reports :
 - (a) To call attention to the statement respecting the importation of prepared opium from Great Britain into Finland which appears in Secretariat Document O. C. 23 (e). 1, and to discuss whether any recommendation can be made as to the action to be taken by the Secretariat in such cases in the future. Proposed by the delegate of Great Britain.
 - (b) To call attention to the dates on which the annual reports from Governments are received. Proposed by the delegate of Great Britain.
 - (c) General discussion.
5. List of Offices in various countries competent to deal with export authorisation or diversion certificates : Request of British Government.
6. Report on steps taken by Health Committee to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Second Opium Conference Convention.
7. Simplified statistics : Proposal by the delegate of the Netherlands.
8. Resolution No. II of the Assembly of 1922. See also Resolution III of the Report of the Advisory Committee to the Council, 1924.
9. Indian Hemp : Proposal of the Government of South Africa. Resolution IV of the Report of the Advisory Committee to the Council, 1924, and Summary.
10. Propaganda : Council Resolution No. 2, December 1924, Thirty-second Session.
11. To call attention to the export of opium from the Persian Gulf and to the regulations made by the British Government in regard to exports from the Persian Gulf on British ships. Proposed by the delegate of Great Britain.
12. Opium situation in Mandated Territories : Memorandum by the Secretariat.
13. Opium situation in China : Reports on recrudescence of poppy planting, etc.
14. Illicit Traffic :
 - (a) Smuggling of drugs into Vladivostock and the Far East.
 - (b) Reports of seizures of opium and drugs.
 - (c) Steps taken by Governments when informed of seizures in which their nationals are involved.
 - (d) To call attention to the recommendation made by the Committee at its second session for the communication of information respecting seizures of smuggled drugs to the Governments of the countries concerned and to suggest that, in order to make this recommendation more effective, the Secretariat be asked to send a circular to the Governments indicating the particulars which should be communicated to the Governments to enable them to trace back the smuggled drugs to their source. Proposed by the delegate of Great Britain.
 - (e) Falsification of labels : Proposal by the delegate of Germany.
15. Canadian-American Treaty making offences against narcotic laws punishable by extradition : Possibility of international adoption of similar measures.
16. Consideration of the question of what special qualifications will be required in future to enable assessors most effectively to assist the Committee in carrying out its work. (See Council Resolution of June 8th, 1925.)
17. Date of the Annual Meeting of the Committee : Proposal by the delegate of Great Britain.
18. Other matters.

ANNEX 2.

O.C. 288.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY ON THE WORK ACCOMPLISHED
SINCE THE LAST SESSION

submitted to the Committee on August 24th, 1925.

The report and resolutions of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs, submitted by that Committee, during its last session in August 1924, to the Council and Assembly, were adopted unanimously by the Council on August 29th, 1924, and by the Assembly on September 20th, 1924.

SIGNATURES AND RATIFICATIONS OF THE AGREEMENT AND CONVENTION
DRAWN UP BY THE FIRST AND SECOND CONFERENCES.

The two Opium Conferences proposed by the Advisory Committee in May 1923, and unanimously agreed to by the Council and Assembly in that year, were held from November 3rd, 1924, to February 19th, 1925.

An Agreement was concluded by the First Conference, together with a Protocol and Final Act. The signatures and ratifications of this Agreement up to the present date are as follows :

| SIGNATURES. | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>Agreement</i> | <i>Protocol</i> | <i>Final Act</i> |
| France | France | France |
| Great Britain | Great Britain | Great Britain |
| India | India | India |
| Japan | Japan | Japan |
| Netherlands | Netherlands | Netherlands |
| Portugal ¹ | Portugal | Portugal |
| Siam ¹ | Siam | Siam |

No ratifications have been received as yet.

The Second Conference drew up a Convention, Protocol and Final Act. The signatures are as follows :

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

No ratifications have been received as yet.

The Council of the League of Nations, on March 10th, 1925, adopted the following resolution with reference to the First Conference :

“ The Council of the League of Nations takes note of the letter, dated February 20th, 1925, from the President of the First Opium Conference and of the Agreement, the Protocol and the Final Act of the Conference dated February 11th, 1925. ”

With regard to the Second Conference, a resolution was adopted by the Council on March 14th, 1925, as follows :

“ The Council authorises the Secretary-General to make the necessary communications provided for in Articles 33 and 35 of the Convention, so as to enable the competent authorities to sign or to accede to the Convention on behalf of the following countries or the necessary measures to be taken for the application of the Convention in these countries :

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|------------------------|
| “ Afghanistan. | Iceland | San Marino |
| Andorra | Lichtenstein | Sudan |
| Ecuador | Mexico | Union of the Socialist |
| Hedjaz | Monaco | Soviet Republics” |

¹ With a reservation.

A letter (C. L. 7) was communicated to these countries on April 9th, 1925, forwarding copies of the Convention, Protocol and Final Act of the Second Conference, and quoting Articles 33 and 35 of the Convention. The Convention and Protocol have since been signed by the Sudan, but no other replies have been received.

The Final Act of the Second Opium Conference contains the following resolution :

“ The Conference asks the Council of the League of Nations to examine the suggestion which has been made in the course of its proceedings — in particular, by the Persian delegate — that a Commission should be appointed to visit certain opium-producing countries should those countries so desire, for the purpose of making a careful study, in collaboration with the Governments of those countries, of the difficulties connected with the limitation of the production of opium in these countries and advising as to the measures which could be taken to make it possible to limit the production of opium in those countries to the quantities required for medical and scientific purposes. ”

This resolution was incorporated in the report presented to the Council by M. Uden at its meeting held on March 14th, 1925, and it was agreed that the full consideration of the questions involved should be postponed until a later meeting. This resolution will be considered at the coming meeting of the Council.

The following resolution was also passed by the Council on March 14th and the Health Committee has been approached on the subject (see Document O.C. 289) :

“ The Council asks the Health Committee of the League of Nations to consider immediately whether it would be expedient to consult the Office international d'Hygiène publique regarding the products mentioned in Articles 8 and 10 of the International Opium Convention of 1925, in order that, if so, a decision concerning preparations which cannot give rise to the drug habit and a recommendation concerning all other drugs which might come under the provisions of the Convention may be notified immediately upon the entry into force of the said Convention. ”

RESOLUTIONS REQUIRING ACTION PASSED AT THE LAST MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN AUGUST 1924.

Extra-territorial Rights in China.

Resolution II of the Advisory Committee (Document C. 397. M. 146. 1924, page 110).

“ The Advisory Committee recommends that Powers having extra-territorial rights in China should, if they have not already done so, make regulations, the breach of which shall be punishable by adequate penalties, to control the carrying on by their nationals in China of any trade in the drugs to which Chapter III of the Opium Convention applies. The Committee further recommends that copies of such regulations be communicated to the Secretariat of the League. ”

The Council, at its meeting on August 29th, 1924, instructed the Secretary-General to communicate with the Governments on this subject and a letter was forwarded to all Powers having extra-territorial rights in China on November 28th, 1924 (C. L. 171).

To this communication the following replies have been received :

Belgium. — This Government states that the matter has been referred to the competent authorities.

France. — This Government states that the sale and distribution of drugs is prohibited. The French penal code is used by the “ Tribunal consulaire ” and the Chinese penal code by the “ Cour mixte ”. Large fines were exacted for infractions of the law by both courts in 1923 and 1924.

Great Britain. — Sends copies of “ Narcotics Prohibition Regulations, 1924 ”¹.

Japan. — This Government states that the regulations in force are in agreement with Chapter III of the Hague Convention and refers to the reply to the questionnaire of 1921¹.

Netherlands. — This Government refers to the reply to the questionnaire of 1921. No change in the legislation is expected. Regulations enclosed¹.

Norway. — Sends regulations in force¹.

Sweden. — This Government states that, on April 8th, 1925, a Royal Swedish Ordinance was promulgated, forbidding everybody subjected to the jurisdiction of the Swedish Consular Court in China to import into that country, to manufacture or to trade in China in opium or other narcotics contrary to the regulations which have been issued or may henceforth be issued by China and approved by the Swedish Government under the International Opium Convention of January 23rd, 1912, and also to import into China hypodermic syringes and arms and ammunition in contravention of the Revised Import Tariff of China with appended Rules of 1922.

¹ These laws are in the archives of the Library of the League of Nations and can be consulted.

The Ordinance authorises the following penalties in case of offences, viz., a fine and/or imprisonment for not more than six months and confiscation of goods and articles involved.

The Ordinance entered into force on May 23rd, 1925.

To this communication no replies have been received from :

| | | |
|---------|----------|--------------------------|
| Brazil | Mexico | Spain |
| Denmark | Peru | Switzerland |
| Italy | Portugal | United States of America |

At the request of the British Government, a letter was addressed to all Treaty Powers with China on November 8th, 1923, requesting them to supply information with regard to the measures taken by the various Governments concerned to control the traffic in drugs by their nationals into China and in China, with special reference to the coming into force of the revised Customs Tariff of 1922.

Replies of some Governments were published in the Secretary's Progress Report for the last session of the Advisory Committee ; the only communication received since then is from Denmark, asking for copies of China's laws and for information concerning the measures taken by Great Britain. (Letters reminding Governments of these two communications have been forwarded to all States which have not as yet replied.)

The Chinese Government presented to the Second Opium Conference a Memorandum containing proposals on this subject. (See Document O. D. C. 39.)

REPRESENTATION OF SWITZERLAND ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

Assembly Resolution No. 3.

The Fifth Assembly, at its meeting on September 20th, 1924, adopted the following resolution :

" The Assembly, taking note of the measures adopted by the Swiss Federal Council and legislative powers for ratifying and giving effect to the provisions of the Hague Convention, and bearing in mind the importance of Switzerland as a manufacturer of the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies, expresses the hope that, as soon as the necessary steps have been taken to put into actual effect in Switzerland the provisions of the Convention, the Council will invite the Federal Council to nominate a representative to take part in the work of the Advisory Committee " ;

and on December 8th, 1924, the Council passed the following resolution with reference to the representation of Switzerland on the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs :

" The Council of the League of Nations, being in complete agreement with the Assembly as to the importance of Switzerland as a manufacturer of those drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies, instructs the Secretary-General, as soon as the instrument of ratification of the International Opium Convention of 1912 has been deposited at The Hague by the Swiss Federal Government, to invite, on behalf of the Council, that Government to nominate a representative to serve on the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs. "

The Swiss Government has been communicated with and has nominated Dr. H. Carrière, Directeur du Service fédéral de l'Hygiène publique.

REPRESENTATION OF ONE OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

Assembly Resolution No. 6.

The Fifth Assembly, at its meeting on September 20th, 1924, adopted the following resolution :

" The Assembly, in the interest of the work of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs and in order to make this work more effective, expresses a wish that the Council may take the necessary steps to ensure that a member belonging to one of the Latin-American countries be appointed to this Committee " ;

and the Council, at its meeting on December 10th, 1924, adopted the proposal of the representative of Sweden that the Government of Bolivia should be asked to nominate a representative on the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs.

A letter was despatched to the Government of Bolivia on January 3rd, 1925, communicating this resolution. A reply was received on May 25th, appointing Dr. Manuel Cuellar as the representative of the Government of Bolivia.

MANUFACTURE OF HEROIN.

It will be remembered that, at the last meeting of the Advisory Committee, it was decided to refer the question of the manufacture of heroin back to certain Governments, which, owing to the somewhat ambiguous terms of the resolution adopted at the previous meeting of the Advisory Committee, had misunderstood its meaning and had not given any information as to whether they considered that the total prohibition of the manufacture of heroin was advisable or if they agreed to its production only for medical needs.

The following Governments were therefore communicated with :

Albania, Australia, Haiti.

Answers have been received from Australia and Haiti. No reply has been received from Albania, but a letter of reminder has been sent.

The following is a complete list of replies received from Governments. The replies are divided into three groups as follows :

1. Those States in favour of the limitation of the manufacture of heroin ;
2. Those States in favour of its total prohibition ;
3. Replies which cannot be said to come under either of the previous headings.

Group 1.

| | | |
|----------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Austria | Czechoslovakia | Germany |
| Belgium | Denmark | Great Britain |
| Bulgaria | Dominican Republic | Japan |
| China | Finland | Monaco |
| | | Union of South Africa. |

Group 2.

| | |
|--------|---|
| Brazil | Sweden |
| Canada | United States of America |
| Norway | (No answer has been received from this Government, but a Bill to prohibit the import of opium or heroin manufacture has been passed.) |
| Poland | |

Group 3.

(a) *Australia.* — This Government considers that the use of heroin in medical practice is essential and that it is not desirable to dispense with it or to restrict its use.

India. — States that there is no manufacture and therefore it has no observations to make.

Netherlands. — This Government does not consider that the prohibition of the manufacture of heroin or the restriction of its production should be recommended. It is of the opinion that the abuse of this drug should be suppressed by imposing very strict regulations on the trade.

(b) The replies received from the Governments of Haiti, Italy, Panama and Peru were to the effect that the matter had been referred to the competent authorities and that replies would be sent later. As no replies have yet been received, a further communication has been sent to these four Governments.

With regard to the Government of Argentine, a formal acknowledgment only of the letter from the Secretariat has been received. This Government has therefore been communicated with again on the subject.

RATIFICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1912.

Since the last meeting of the Advisory Committee the following signatures and ratifications of the Opium Convention of 1912 have been deposited at The Hague :

Members of the League.

Albania. — Has signed and ratified the Convention.

Costa Rica. — Has also signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force.

The notification has been received from the Netherlands Government to the effect that the instrument of ratification has been lodged at The Hague. (See note on page 70 of the Minutes of the Sixth Session.)

Switzerland. — Has ratified the Convention and signed the Protocol putting it into force.

Non-Members of the League.

Monaco. — Has ratified the Convention and signed the Protocol putting it into force.

ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF DRUGS.

The following is a list of the countries which have replied with regard to their estimates of annual requirements of drugs for medicinal and scientific purposes since the last meeting : (Details will be found in Document O.C. 297.)

*Chile, Latvia and Uruguay, and
British Colonies (Uganda)*

have supplied estimates of annual requirements.

Dominican Republic. — Figures of annual consumption sent.

Esthonia. — Estimated requirements the same as imports.

Irish Free State. — Estimated annual requirements the same as the exports given in the British report for 1923.

Norway. — The figures of consumption to count as estimated requirements.

Roumania. — The list of drugs employed annually has been sent.

Spain. — Figures of consumption sent.

IMPORT CERTIFICATES SYSTEM.

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

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

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

Albania
Australia
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Canada
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Finland
Germany
Great Britain
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
India
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Mexico
New Zealand
Norway
Panama
Poland
Siam
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of South Africa
United States of America

Netherlands

Brazil
Danzig
Lithuania

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

Argentine. — No communication has been received from this Government, but a copy of a decree on the subject was forwarded to the Secretariat by Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

Esthonia. — Accepted the system in 1922, but has since written to say that there are no regulations in existence in Esthonia by which such certificates could be authorised. With the exception of substances which, in view of public safety or health, are only admitted on the authorisation of the Ministry of the Interior, importation is entirely free.

Iceland. — States that it is ready to adopt the system, but that a further communication will be sent on the subject.

Luxemburg. — In 1922, accepted the principle of the system and stated that a certificate was already in use, which would be modified to bring it into conformity with League system. According to copies of a certificate sent in 1923, this does not conform to the League system.

Peru. — In 1921, accepted the principle of the system but, on receipt of a later letter from the Secretariat in December 1922, a reply was received stating that the Government was still considering the advisability of adopting the system.

ANNUAL REPORTS ¹.

Since the last meeting of the Advisory Committee, the following States have forwarded annual reports to the Secretariat. Full reports have been sent in some cases, but in others only incomplete statistics have been furnished.

| 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| India | Australia | Australia | Canada |
| Netherlands | Denmark | Austria | Czechoslovakia |
| Uruguay | India | Danzig | Denmark |
| | Netherlands | Denmark | Finland |
| | Switzerland * | France | France |
| | Uruguay | India | Great Britain |
| | | Japan | New Zealand |
| | | Netherlands | Norway |
| | | New Zealand | Spain (1st quarter) |
| | | Poland | Sweden |
| | | Siam] | Turkey |
| | | Spain | Union of South Africa |
| | | Sweden | |
| | | Switzerland * | |
| | | Uruguay | |

British Colonies.

| 1923 | 1924 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| British Honduras | Basutoland |
| British North Borneo | British Honduras |
| Cyprus | British North Borneo |
| Gold Coast | Ceylon |
| Grenada | Cyprus |
| Gilbert and Ellice Islands | Falkland Islands |
| Hong-Kong | Fiji |
| Kenya | Gambia, Gibraltar |
| Leeward Isles | Gilbert and Ellice Islands |
| Malay States (Federated) | Grenada |
| Malay States (Unfederated) | Hong-Kong |
| Malta | Jamaica |
| New Hebrides | Leeward Islands |
| Nigeria | Malta |
| Norfolk Island | New Hebrides |
| Southern Rhodesia | Nigeria |
| Seychelles | Nyassaland |
| Somaliland | Southern Rhodesia |
| Straits Settlements | St. Vincent |
| Sudan | Sarawak |
| Uganda | Sierra Leone |
| | Swaziland |
| | Tanganyika (Mandated Territory) |
| | Tobago |
| | Trinidad |
| | Zanzibar. |

French Colonies.

| 1923 | 1924 |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Equatorial Africa | New Caledonia |
| Guadeloupe | New Hebrides |
| Guiana | Oceania |
| India | Réunion |
| Indo-China | Somaliland |
| Madagascar | St. Pierre Miquelon |
| Martinique | West Africa. |

French Mandated Territories.

1923

Cameroons, Togoland

Japanese Colonies.

1923

Formosa

Kwantung Leased Territory

Netherlands Colonies.

1923

Netherlands East Indies

Surinam

1924

Surinam

Portuguese Colonies.

1924

Macao

¹ A complete list of States which have and States which have not sent in Reports for 1921, 1922, 1923 and 1924 will be found in Appendix 1 to Annex 8.

* Letter from Dr. Carrière (O.C. 206.)

ANNEX 3.

O. C. 297.

PART I.

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORTS.

NOTES.

The following summary of information and statistical tables have been compiled from information contained in annual reports for the year 1924 and other Government statistics received by the Secretariat. Annual reports for years anterior to 1924 which have not appeared in former statistical documents are also included.

No separate digest has been considered necessary of the information received from the following countries, colonies or possessions:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| FALKLAND ISLANDS (1924) | NYASSALAND (1924) |
| FINLAND (1924) | SIERRA LEONE (1924) |
| FRENCH INDIA (1923) | SWAZILAND (1924) |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA (1923) | TANGANYIKA (1924) |
| GAMBIA (1924) | TOBAGO (1924) |
| GILBERT AND ELLICE ISLANDS (1924) | TONGA (1923) |
| NEW HEBRIDES (1924) | TRINIDAD (1924) |
| NORWAY (1924) ¹ | UGANDA (1923). |

Extracts from the reports received from the following countries, colonies or possessions are included in this document:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| AUSTRALIA (1923) | HONGKONG (1923) |
| BASUTOLAND (1924) | INDIA (1923) |
| BECHUANALAND PROTECTORATE (1924) | JAMAICA (1924) |
| BRITISH HONDURAS (1924) | JAPAN (1923) |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO (1924) | KENYA PROTECTORATE AND COLONY (1923) |
| CANADA (1924) | KWANTUNG (1923) |
| CEYLON (1923) | MALTA (1923) |
| CEYLON (1924) | MALTA (1924) |
| CHOSEN (1923) | MAURITIUS (1923) |
| CYPRUS (1924) | NIGERIA (1924) |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA (1924) | POLAND (1923) |
| DENMARK (1922-1924) | ROUMANIA (1923) |
| FIJI (1924) | ST. VINCENT (1924) |
| FORMOSA (1923) | SOUTHERN RHODESIA (1924) |
| FRANCE (1923) | STRAITS SETTLEMENTS (1923) |
| FRANCE (1924) | SWEDEN (1924) |
| GIBRALTAR (1924) | UNION OF S. AFRICA (1924) |
| GILBERT AND ELLICE ISLANDS (1923) | ZANZIBAR (1924). |
| GREAT BRITAIN (1924) | |
| GRENADA (1924) | |

Reports have been received from the following countries, colonies or possessions too late for inclusion in this summary:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| ANTIGUA (1924) | ST. KITTS-NEVIS (1924) |
| DOMINICA (1924) | SIAM (1923) |
| MONTserrat (1924) | |

¹ The information received from Norway was not included in the provisional document submitted to the Seventh Session of the Advisory Committee.

The following countries have not sent in any report for the year 1924:

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| ABYSSINIA ¹ | JAPAN |
| AFGHANISTAN | LATVIA |
| ALBANIA ² | LIBERIA ³ |
| ARGENTINE | LICHTENSTEIN |
| AUSTRALIA | LITHUANIA |
| AUSTRIA | LUXEMBURG |
| BELGIUM | MEXICO |
| BOLIVIA | MONACO ⁴ |
| BRAZIL | NETHERLANDS |
| BULGARIA | NEW ZEALAND |
| CHILE | NICARAGUA |
| CHINA | PANAMA |
| COLOMBIA | PARAGUAY |
| COSTA RICA | PERSIA |
| CUBA | PERU |
| DANZIG | POLAND |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ⁵ | PORTUGAL |
| ECUADOR | ROUMANIA |
| ESTHONIA | SALVADOR |
| GERMANY | SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF |
| GREECE | SIAM |
| GUATEMALA | SPAIN (last three quarters) |
| HAITI | SWITZERLAND |
| HONDURAS | TURKEY ⁷ |
| HUNGARY ⁶ | UNION OF THE SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS |
| INDIA | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
| IRISH FREE STATE | URUGUAY |
| ITALY | VENEZUELA |

Whilst no actual annual reports have been received from Abyssinia¹, Albania², Dominican Republic³, Hungary⁴, Liberia⁵, Monaco⁶ and Turkey⁷, those countries have sent in information as per footnotes.

Commonwealth of Australia (1923).

No new legislation, important regulations or orders were introduced during 1923, except that in Western Australia the State Government amended the Pharmacy and Poisons Act 1910 so as to include cocaine substitutes, diamorphine, morphia (and preparations of all three) in the list of drugs which are regarded as poisons within the meaning of the Act and as such to be sold only by licensed persons, to be kept under lock and key and all sales recorded in the Poisons Book.

No difficulties have arisen in connection with the "Import Certificate" system in regard to exports or imports of drugs into Australia.

No applications have been made to export any restricted drugs to countries which have not adopted the "Import Certificate" system.

The main difficulty to complete suppression of opium smoking is the smuggling of the drug from vessels arriving from other countries, principally the Far Eastern countries. Another difficulty is on account of the elaborate precautions taken by the Chinese conducting opium dens to guard against surprise visits by the Police.

In order to effect complete suppression, the co-operation of countries where opium is produced is necessary in the direction of preventing export from those countries especially by crews of vessels. So far as Australia is concerned, co-operation on the part of India, China and Portugal and the Authorities at Singapore and Hong-Kong would go a long way towards minimising the trouble.

¹ There is no manufacture, consumption or traffic. Small quantities only are imported for medicinal purposes. The Government proposes to institute a control over the imports for medicines.

² In reply to the letter requesting the annual report, the Albanian Government states that dangerous drugs are only known for medical purposes. It cannot answer the questions in the annual report form.

³ The Government of the Dominican Republic states that there is no manufacture, and that imports are chiefly from the United States.

⁴ Morphine is only manufactured in such small quantities that it cannot affect the world market. There is no cultivation or production of opium. The exact consumption cannot be given, but statistics will be kept from January 1st, 1925. Approximate statistics sent for 1921, 1922 and 1923.

⁵ There is no traffic in this country.

⁶ There is no abuse of drugs in Monaco and the Principality does not export these products. The drug is only imported for medical needs and is not used for any other purpose.

⁷ Gives figures for opium production only.

NOTE: (a) Annual reports are to be forwarded to the Secretariat each year not later than July 1st (in the case of Western States) and October 1st (in the case of Far Eastern States);
(b) Pending receipt of further information relative to certain figures in the Cuban report for 1923 this report has not been summarised.

Basutoland (1924).

No publications likely to be of interest to the Opium Advisory Committee were issued during the year 1924.

There is no difficulty in the working of the "Import Certificate" system.

There are no new points of interest or importance in the administration of the laws in force. There is no difficulty in having the law carried out, as there is no drug habit and no incentive to carry on illicit traffic.

Bechuanaland Protectorate (1924).

The only legislation issued during 1924 was the Resident Commissioner's Notice of May 27th, 1924.

No difficulties of substance have been experienced in carrying out the "Import Certificate" system.

There is no manufacture of opium or habit-forming drugs in the Protectorate.

British Honduras (1924).

No new legislation, regulations or orders affecting the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs were made during 1924.

There were no imports or exports of gum opium during the year.

British North Borneo (1924).

No new legislation was issued during 1924.

The "Import Certificate" system has worked satisfactorily. No opium goes through this country in transit, and exports are prohibited.

In North Borneo the import, manufacture and sale of opium is a Government monopoly, and no change has been made in the system during the year, beyond stricter supervision of requisitions generally.

No morphine factories exist, and no manufacture is done in North Borneo.

The coca plant is grown only in a small way in an experimental garden on the Japanese Estate of the Kuhara Co. at Tawau.

Canada (1924).

The licensing system in Canada, in respect to the export of narcotics is working very satisfactorily.

The licensing system in Canada with respect to the import of narcotics has been in effect since July 1919, and has been found to work very satisfactorily. Through this system, the amount of narcotics imported through legitimate trade channels has been reduced by approximately 75 per cent within the past four years.

During 1924 the improvement in conditions in Canada is very noticeable, particularly in the larger centres, due to the drastic penalties provided under the Statutes, in the case of persons convicted, and the Provincial and Municipal Police Authorities.

No cocaine is refined or manufactured in Canada.

The situation in Canada is, generally speaking, much improved, although great difficulty still lies in the direction of the illicit supplies which are smuggled into the country through the so-called underground channels.

It is respectfully suggested that it would simplify matters if the Opium Control Board of the League of Nations would furnish the various countries concerned with some standard form on which to make out annual reports, as this would simply require the filling-in of the necessary information required, with regard to imports, exports, manufacture, seizures, etc., and annual requirements. At the present time, it is somewhat difficult to know just what information is required, and to furnish it in the best possible form, for use of the Central Control Board at Geneva.

This suggestion is made simply with a view to simplifying matters as much as possible, and eliminating unnecessary work.

Ceylon (1923).

New Rules made under "The Opium Ordinance No. 5 of 1910" were published during the year in the *Ceylon Government Gazette* No. 7313 of February 23rd, 1923. These rules were introduced with a view to having efficient control over the medicinal preparations of opium issued to and used by registered medical practitioners, chemists, veterinary surgeons, authorised dispensers and approved estate dispensers, etc.

Excise Notification No. 135, dated July 24th, 1923 (copy of which has been filed in the archives of the Secretariat), containing rules regulating the importation, distribution and use of *cannabis indica* (extract and tincture of), which had been totally prohibited in the Island, was issued under the Excise Ordinance No. 8 of 1912 and published in the *Ceylon Government Gazette* No. 7341 of July 27th, 1923. The administrative arrangements worked satisfactorily and did not call for any change.

No difficulties were experienced in carrying out the "Import Certificate" system in regard to the importation of drugs to this country. As there were no exports from Ceylon, certificates for that purpose were not issued.

With regard to the sale of raw opium in the Island, the same gradual reduction in the consumption has been maintained. The total quantity of eating opium (raw opium) consumed during

the year was 4,264 lbs. as compared with 4,614 lbs. in 1922 — the decrease being 350 lbs. In the year 1913 the sale of this was 8,760 lbs. as against 4,264 lbs. in 1923, showing an appreciable fall in the sale, of 51.32 per cent., in a decade.

There was no real difficulty in the enforcement of the laws and regulations relating to opium and other dangerous drugs. No practicable solution could, however, be found to have an effective check on the opium issued to registered Vedaralas.

Raw opium is largely smuggled into Ceylon through the northern, north-western and eastern coasts by Indian coasting vessels and sailing ships plying between India and Ceylon. The opium thus brought from India is smuggled into Ceylon with the help of Ceylon fishing boats and schooners, etc. Owing to the presence of smuggled opium in this country, the objects of the Opium Ordinance are greatly defeated. The only effective measure by which the smuggling of opium into Ceylon could be stopped is to restrict and control the production of raw opium in India. Unless the production be limited to the medical needs of the Empire, there will always be this immense surplus for smuggling and for distribution through illicit channels.

The smoking habit was confined to the national population of the Island and the consumption of this was 566 lbs. during the year 1923, as against 636 lbs. in 1922. The decrease was due to deaths among the consumers and to the restriction of sale of smoking opium to the smokers only. There has been a remarkable decrease in the sale of smoking opium within the last decade — the figures in 1923 showing 566 lbs. against 1,780 lbs. in 1913 — showing a fall of 68.20 per cent.

A small area of about a quarter of an acre of coca plant was maintained by Government at the Experimental Station, Peradeniya, and another in the Economic Nursery of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Peradeniya, for experimental and botanical purposes.

Ceylon (1924).

There was no new legislation affecting the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, nor were there any important rules or regulations issued in this connection during the year 1924.

The new rules and regulations introduced in the year 1923 have proved satisfactory.

No difficulties were experienced in carrying out the "Import Certificate" system in regard to the importation of drugs into this country during 1924.

With regard to the sale of raw opium in the Island, the same gradual reduction in the consumption has been maintained. The total quantity of eating opium (raw opium) consumed during the year was 4,053 lbs. as against 4,264 lbs. in 1923 — the decrease being 211 lbs.

There was no real difficulty in the enforcement of the laws and regulations relating to opium and other dangerous drugs.

No opium was imported during the year 1924. The demand was met by the balance of opium brought forward at the end of 1923.

No opium was exported from the Island.

Total amount of prepared opium consumed was 474 $\frac{3}{4}$ lbs. as against 566 lbs. in 1923.

There were no factories for the manufacture of morphine preparations.

The cultivation of the coca plant in Ceylon by private individuals was prohibited; no crude cocaine, refined cocaine or its salts were exported from this country.

No drugs are ever exported from this country.

A lengthy account of the illicit traffic in opium accompanies the Report.

Chosen (1923).

During the year 1923 concerning the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, no law was promulgated, abrogated or revised.

Two administrative ordinances, however, concerning the control of morphine, cocaine and its salts were revised. The revised ordinances provide that no medical practitioner, dentist, veterinary surgeon, pharmacist, druggist and manufacturer of drugs or any other person who requires these drugs for professional or scientific purposes, is allowed to buy the drug, unless he produces a certificate issued by the chief of police of his locality.

The importation of opium or prepared opium into Chosen is at present absolutely prohibited and it is the policy of the Government to prohibit for a time the importation of dangerous drugs. It is permitted, however, to import a small quantity of drugs from Japan proper for scientific and medical purposes.

The internal regulations provide that no person is permitted to produce opium without special licence and that all the opium produced shall be delivered to the Government at the price fixed in proportion to the quantity of morphine content.

In Chosen, no prepared opium is allowed to be sold, bought or used, whilst the illicit traffic is strictly under the control of the authorities. In districts adjoining China and Siberia, however, a certain amount of smuggling still continues and considerable difficulty is being experienced, owing to its geographical position, in checking the entry of clandestine traffic into Chosen.

The area of land used for cultivation of poppies is 36,462 ares, the quantity produced, 1,392.677 kgs., having a morphine content of 10.39 per cent.

No statistics are available at present of the quantity of medicinal opium consumed in Chosen. No cocaine is manufactured in Chosen.

Cyprus (1924).

The "Import Certificate" system is working satisfactorily and no difficulties have arisen. There is no exportation of dangerous drugs from Cyprus. There are no regulations with regard to countries which have not yet adopted the system.

The drug habit does not exist in Cyprus, and there is no illicit traffic in opium and its derivatives.

Czechoslovakia (1924).

With the exception of cocaine, the traffic in drugs has been conducted in 1924 in a legal way and has given rise to no abuses. As regards cocaine, it should be mentioned that the investigations undertaken at the time when the newspapers were publishing articles on the fraudulent traffic in this drug at Presburg (Bratislava) — a fact referred to in the 1923 annual report — did not lead to any positive result.

No raw opium is produced in Czechoslovakia.

The coca plant is not cultivated in Czechoslovakia, and cocaine, even synthetic cocaine, is not manufactured.

Denmark (1922/1924).

The report received covers the years 1922, 1923 and 1924 and enumerates the regulations or laws issued since 1922.

The system of certificates recommended by the League of Nations and applied since October 1st, 1922, has on the whole been satisfactory, apart from a few cases in which it was observed that imports could enter the free port of Copenhagen without a licence when they came from countries where the certificate system is not applied, and from which exportation could therefore take place without the production of an import licence granted in Denmark.

As the law putting the Opium Convention into force was only adopted by Parliament and given the royal assent in 1922, no measures for the execution of the decisions of the Convention could be taken until 1923. It has not been possible to extract the statistics referring to the products mentioned in the Convention from the general trade statistics before 1923, and no satisfactory particulars of the import and export of these products will therefore be available for any earlier year.

A quantity of 150 kg. of raw Persian opium in stock before October 1st, 1922, was exported to Switzerland.

The exportation of opium is otherwise prohibited, and morphine, heroin and cocaine are also not manufactured in Denmark.

A circular, dated October 17th, 1923, has been issued, in which the Ministry of Justice directs the police authorities to send in a report on each case where a police enquiry has been held into an infringement of the laws on opium, etc.; this circular was issued in accordance with the undertaking given to the foreign Governments concerned to furnish them with full information regarding seizures of opium and other drugs and certain offences connected with the traffic in opium which have taken place in Denmark. The report must contain a brief statement of the facts, with details as to the nature of the substance, the names of the persons implicated, etc.

The Department of Customs and Consumption Taxes has promised to furnish the Ministry of Justice with a similar report for each confiscation of the substances in question by the Customs authorities or attempts to export them without the authorisation of the Ministry of Justice.

Fiji (1924).

Imports have been only from countries which have adopted the "Import Certificate" system.

The only difficulty that has been experienced is as to the definition of the word "legitimate" in the certificates. It has been taken to include the sale of opium to persons who have been habituated to its use, with the proviso that the quantity provided for such sale should be materially reduced each year.

Formosa (1923).

Formosa Government Ordinance No. 184 for the Control of Morphine, Cocaine and its Salts, promulgated in December of the 9th year of Taisho (1920) was amended in 1923.

The amendments, promulgated on January 31st of the 12th year of Taisho (1923) and put in force the same day, will be found in Document O. C. 23 (C) I.

The "Import Certificate" system was put in force on January 1st of the 12th year of Taisho (1923). In carrying the system into effect, no special difficulty was experienced in regard to either export or import. Irrespective of whether a country has adopted the "Import Certificate" system or not, the Government issues import certificates, and, in case of export, export permits are issued after a strict examination of the authorisation given by the authorities of the importing country.

In the Island the cultivation of poppies has been suspended since 1922, and there was no production of raw opium. All raw opium imported was used for the manufacture of prepared opium to be sold by the Government Monopoly Bureau of Formosa only to licensed opium-smokers.

At the end of 1923 the number of licensed opium-smokers was 39,463, showing a decrease of 2,644 as compared with the preceding year.

Importation of morphine from abroad is prohibited by ordinance.

125 acres represented the total area on which the coca shrub was cultivated.

No cocaine was imported, whilst imports of cocaine salts from Japan proper amounted to 24 kg. 790 gm. Exports were negligible.

France (1923).

The legislative measures in force relative to opium (raw, prepared or medicinal) as well as morphia, cocaine and other dangerous substances have been indicated in the French Government's report for the year 1921. No new modification of any importance has been made to the measures referred to in the report in question.

The French Government has not yet put into practice the system of Import Certificates recommended by the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium which was adopted in the Convention of February 19th, 1925, to which France is one of the signatories.

France (1924).

During the year 1924 the repression of the illicit traffic was continued in all parts of the territory. The results obtained during that period are a proof that the campaign against the illicit traffic was carried out energetically.

As in the year 1923, the bulk of the narcotics seized were of German origin.

Gibraltar (1924).

No new legislation has been enacted, neither have any changes occurred in the administrative arrangements relative to the traffic in opium, etc., during the year 1924.

Opium is not cultivated locally, and the importations of it and its derivatives are solely for medicinal purposes. Opium-smoking is unknown in Gibraltar and therefore legislation prohibiting it has appeared unnecessary.

Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony (1923).

No new legislation relative to the drugs covered by the Convention has been issued during the year 1923.

There have been no prosecutions for illicit traffic.

Great Britain (1924).

COVERING GREAT BRITAIN, NORTHERN IRELAND, THE ISLE OF MAN AND THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.

No new legislation was found necessary in Great Britain during 1924, but in Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man, Guernsey and Jersey, laws were passed on similar lines to the Dangerous Drugs and Poisons (Amendment) Act, 1923, the main provisions of which were explained in the report for 1923.

An important new Regulation was made in 1924 to deal with the diversion of consignments in transit, so anticipating the provision on the same subject which has been inserted in the new Convention on Dangerous Drugs concluded by the Second International Conference in February 1925. Diversion in transit is a method in common use by illicit traffickers for eluding the export control provided for in the Hague Convention.

The Regulation, which is dated November 20th, 1924, prohibits, except under licence from the Home Secretary, any opium or dangerous drugs, while in transit through the United Kingdom, from being diverted to any destination other than that to which they were originally consigned. The destination to which they were originally consigned is defined in the Regulation as the destination stated in the licence permit or other authority for the export of the consignment granted by the Government of the country of export.

A small amendment was made at the same time in the Regulation governing the dispensing by chemists of doctors' prescriptions.

The normal imports of drugs into the country continue to be confined, in the main, to raw opium and refined cocaine and its salts; but in the past year, *exceptionally*, considerable consignments of crude morphine and of morphine salts have been received from the Indian Government Opium Factory at Ghazipur, and in addition large amounts of smuggled morphine and diacetylmorphine which had been seized in Hong-Kong were sent to the United Kingdom for disposal.

The embargoes on the importation of dangerous drugs products manufactured by F. Hoffmann-La-Roche & Co., Ltd., of Basle, and by C. H. Boehringer Sohn, of Hamburg, and Nieder Ingelheim, which were referred to in last year's report, have been maintained throughout 1924.

Exports to countries which are understood to have adopted the system of import certificates are not allowed except on production of such certificates.

No change has been found necessary in the existing Regulations for the control of the manufacture and distribution of the drugs, except a small amendment modifying a chemist's responsibilities in regard to the dispensing or prescriptions issued on official forms under the National Health Insurance Acts.

No large seizures of illicit drugs have been made in the United Kingdom, but cases of smuggling in small amounts by seamen continue to be detected.

Grenada (1924).

The system of "Certificates" works satisfactorily in the case of (b) imports into the Colony; but there are no exports.

All importations are stored by the Government and distributed to the importers on request, subject to the authority of the Colonial Surgeon.

There are no local manufactures of dangerous drugs.

Hong-Kong (1923).

The Dangerous Drugs Ordinance No. 22 of 1923 was enacted on October 5th, 1923, and is based on the Dangerous Drugs Acts 1920 and 1923 of the United Kingdom. Its object is to provide for the more effective carrying out of the policy of the International Opium Convention of 1912 in so far as that Convention deals with dangerous drugs. The penalties have been greatly increased and the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale and use of dangerous drugs strictly regulated.

The Opium Ordinance No. 30 of 1923 to amend and consolidate the law relating to opium came into force on December 31st, 1923. A considerable part of the previous opium law which was repealed by this Ordinance was out of date as it assumed an *entrepôt* trade in opium in Hong-Kong which in fact has long ceased. The new Ordinance gives greater power of control in order to prevent illegitimate dealings in opium. It is hoped that the provisions of Section 38 (1) (d) in particular may prevent Hong-Kong from being used as a base for trade in illicit opium and render the financial arrangements for dealing in opium on a large scale increasingly difficult.

The only opium imported is that directly indented for from the Government of India and all of it is used for the manufacture of prepared opium in the Government factory.

Under the new Dangerous Drugs and Opium Ordinances, the "Import Certificate" system has been brought into force. No difficulties have so far arisen in its application. The export of dangerous drugs to countries which have not adopted the system is prohibited.

Large quantities of Chinese opium continue to be smuggled into the Colony. In four of the detected cases of smuggling, large quantities of Chinese documents relating to opium were found, from which valuable details were obtained of the extent and methods of opium smuggling. Particulars are reproduced in the Report of the Hong-Kong Government for the calendar year 1923 (Document O.C. 23 (1) I.).

There is no manufacture locally of morphine, heroin, medicinal opium, cocaine, or other drugs.

From the educational point of view, it is to be noticed that articles have been inserted in the Chinese school text-books issued by the Government Education Department, describing the dangers of acquiring the opium or drug habit.

India (1923).

The import traffic is of no importance as regards opium since India is itself a producing country and imports are confined to the requirements of pharmacists.

In 1923 exports of opium, as well as of other drugs covered by the International Opium Convention, 1912, both on private and on Government account, were totally prohibited unless covered by a certificate from the Government of the importing country, with effect from January 1st, 1923. No other new legislation or regulations were introduced.

The direct sales agreement with British North Borneo was renewed with effect from January 1st, 1923, for a period of five years. The Direct Sales Agreement with the Dutch East Indies was renewed from January 1st, 1923, for one year and again from January 1st, 1924, for five years. The direct sales agreement with the Straits Settlements was renewed from January 1st, 1925, for five years.

No transactions with countries that have not yet adopted the certificate system have been reported to the Government of India.

The only new point of interest is the issue of an order (*vide* Annex to Document O.C. 23 (Z) to regulate the cultivation, manufacture, possession, transport and sale of opium in the Shan States. This order has had the effect of bringing the law in the Shan States relating to opium into closer conformity with the law in Burma.

The only important thing to record is the Punjab Opium Smoking Act, VI of 1923, which came into force on April 1st, 1924, and prohibits opium-smoking in assemblies in all municipalities and cantonments. The members of opium-smoking assemblies, as well as the owners and managers of places used for opium-smoking assemblies, have been made liable to punishment under the provisions of the Act.

Jamaica (1924).

No new legislation has been issued during the year 1924, but permits for importation of definite quantities of opium and its preparations are now being issued and insisted on. A new law is in course of preparation. No difficulty has been experienced in connection with the application of the "Import Certificate" system. Only legitimate requirements are allowed to be imported.

Japan (1923).

No new laws or regulations have been promulgated in 1923.

In permitting imports, English import certificates were issued together with import permits. With regard to the enforcement of the above system, no difficulties have been encountered.

No drug habit is prevalent in Japan proper.

The area of land used for the cultivation of poppies was 37,494 ares and the amount of opium produced amounted to 2,158 kilogrammes 865 grammes.

No opium has been used for purposes other than the manufacture of drugs.

During 1923, no imports of either morphine or its salts were permitted, neither were imports of heroin, its salts or of drugs containing heroin permitted during the year 1923. No permission was granted for the exportation of drugs containing heroin.

Kenya Protectorate and Colony (1923).

No new legislation, important regulation or order affecting the traffic in opium has been issued during the year 1923, nor has any important change been made in the administrative arrangements.

Kwantung (1923).

During the year 1923 there were no laws or orders promulgated, revised or abolished concerning traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, and no administrative measures were taken in regard to such drugs.

The import certificate system was put into force on January 1st, 1923. The result obtained was satisfactory.

The situation as regards the sources and routes of illicit traffic remained the same as that mentioned in the report for 1921.

No raw opium is produced in the districts under the jurisdiction of the Government of Kwantung.

In order to control more strictly the use of opium, the Opium Ordinance of Kwantung Province was drafted and was to be put in force on September 1st, 1924. The number of addicts is now under investigation.

No coca is grown in the territory, nor are crude cocaine or coca leaves imported.

There is no dangerous abuse of any drug.

Malta (1923)

No regulation has been issued during the period April-December, 1923, neither has any difficulty arisen in the application of the "Import Certificates" system.

The drug habit is so far very little prevalent in this country. No known prosecutions have been instituted under the existing Laws and Regulations.

Malta (1924).

No difficulties have arisen in regard to the "Import Certificate" system.

Drugs imported from countries which have not yet adopted the "Import Certificate" system are not allowed to be withdrawn from Government Stores (Customs Stores or Post Office) unless a permit be obtained from the Superintendent of Public Health.

No coca is grown locally, and no extraction of cocaine from coca leaves or refining of crude cocaine is done locally.

Mauritius (1923).

No legislative measure concerning Opium and Dangerous Drugs was passed during the year 1923.

Neither the opium poppy (*papaver somniferum*) nor the coca plant are grown in this Colony.

Nigeria (1924).

There has been no fresh legislation during the period under review.

Erythroxylon coca is grown as a hedge only (not by the acre) in the Cameroons, Victoria and other places. It is not owned by anyone and no use has been made of the plant medicinally.

No other dangerous drugs is known to grow either in Nigeria or the Cameroons. No illicit traffic in dangerous drugs is believed to exist. There have been no prosecutions during the year 1924.

Opium-smoking is unknown both in Nigeria and the Cameroons. There has been no importation or manufacture of prepared opium, nor is any manufacture of dangerous drugs carried on.

Poland (1923).

The Law of June 22nd, 1923, relating to narcotic substances and products (*Legislative Bulletin*, No. 72, page 559) entered into force on August 9th, 1923. The figures given in the Polish Government report are based on the importation certificates.

No raw opium has been imported into Poland during the period of the report (1923), and there were no establishments in Poland producing morphine or its derivatives.

No licences were granted for the exportation of drugs covered by the Convention. The figures given for importation do not include transit traffic in these substances.

Roumania (1923).

With a view to establishing a still stricter control in the future than that provided for by the Royal Decree No. 2543 of June 12th, 1920, a bill providing for the organisation of a State opium monopoly is at present being considered.

Roumania neither produces nor exports any narcotic.

St. Vincent (1924).

An Ordinance was passed amending the Sale of Poisons Ordinance, 1908 (March 17th, 1924). No publication has been issued.

There is no evidence of opium-smoking in the Colony, which does not produce any opium.

Southern Rhodesia (1924).

Alterations in the Southern Rhodesia Opium and Habit-forming Drugs Regulations Proclamation of 1923 were made during the year 1924 and are filed in the archives of the Secretariat. These modifications principally tend to overcome the difficulty encountered in administering the regulations in so far as they related to habit-forming drugs required for veterinary purposes.

Straits Settlements (1923).

There was no new legislation affecting the traffic in opium during the year 1923, not were there any noteworthy changes in the administrative arrangements.

The "Import Certificate" system was strictly adhered to in respect of all raw opium exported, the only difficulty experienced being on the side of applicants who could not procure certificates in strict accordance with the League's requirements and whose applications were refused in consequence.

Much trouble was experienced from an outbreak of smuggling of both raw opium and prepared opium from the Hokkien province of Southern China, with which the Colony is in intimate contact.

Seizures of opium from other sources were relatively small.

Sweden (1924).

As regards legislation in 1924, concerning the traffic in opium, a Decree of the General Medical Board (Kungl. Medicinalstyrelsen) No. 108 Series "A", of July 14th, 1924, was issued concerning information as to the traffic in opium.

No morphine, heroin or salts of heroin were manufactured in Sweden, and there were no exports of heroin or salts of heroin or preparations containing the same.

The application of the system of "import certificates" has given rise to no difficulties.

As far as is known, illicit traffic in narcotics has been on the most limited scale.

Union of South Africa (1924).

The Regulations under Section 10 of the Customs and Excise Duties Amendment Act No. 35 of 1922, promulgated under Proclamation No. 181 of 1922, were amended by the Proclamation No. 38 of 1924, so as to provide for the purchase of tincture of opium (landanum) by farmers or owners of live-stock for the prevention or treatment of disease in stock, also for the procuring and keeping of cocaine solutions for "first-aid" treatment of eye injuries or other necessary purposes by managers of factories or workshops.

Zanzibar (1924).

No new legislation has been enacted and no important changes have taken place in the Administrative arrangements.

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS.
(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|------|---|--|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total imports | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. gr. | | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | | |
| AUSTRALIA (a) . . . | 1923 | nil | | nil | nil | nil | nil | nil | nil | 5,426 | (a) The figures for importation of all dangerous drugs into Nauru Isl., Norfolk Isl. and New Guinea (mandated area) are negligible. |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified (b) . . . | 1924 | 68 394 | | | | | | | | | (b) See list under Table II. |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1924 | 6,108 480 | India | | | | | | nil | 258 | (c) The demand was met by the balance of opium brought forward at the end of 1923. |
| CANADA | 1924 | 256 793 | United Kingdom | 256 793 | nil | 256 793 | nil | 256 793 | | 9,030 | |
| Ceylon | 1923 | 1,636 200 | India | 1,636 200 | nil | 1,636 200 | nil | 1,636 200 | nil | 4,504 | |
| | 1924 | nil | | nil | nil | nil | nil | (c) | | | |
| CUBA (d) | | | | | | | | | | 2,889 | (d) We have received figures for 1923 but owing to lack of certain information they could not yet appear in this document. |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | 138 789 | | 138 789 | nil | 138 789 | nil | 138 789 | nil | 13,595 | |
| DENMARK | 1924 | nil | | nil | nil | nil | 150 000 | nil | 301 100 ¹ | 3,289 | |
| FRANCE (e) | 1924 | 300 000 100 000 100 000 200 000 1,400 000 4,800 000 300 000 | Great Britain Germany Belgo-Luxemburg Econ. Uni. Yugoslavia Greece Turkey Other Asiatic countries | | | | | | | 39,210 | (e) The statistics established by the Customs Administration does not separate raw opium, prepared opium, and medicinal opium. |
| | | | | 7,200 000 | | | 774 000 | | | | |
| FRENCH COLONIES (b) | 1923 | 26 246 | | | | | | | | | |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (*concluded*).
(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|----------|---|--|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. gr. | | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . . | 1924 | 841 000 26,768 000 298 000 33,815 000 | Europe Turkey Persia India | 61,722 000 | nil | 61,722 000 | 8,318 000 | 53,404 000 | 51,898 000 | (f) 44,200 | (f) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| INDIA | 1923 | | | | 858,038 000 g | | 543,398 000 | | | 319,075 | (g) Including Punjab, which produces 4,032 kg. |
| INDO-CHINA. . . . | 1923 | 231,143 000 | | 231,143 000 | (h) | | | | | 20,000 | (h) The opium monopoly bought 29,272 kg. within the country. |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) . | | 2,208 125 43,621 505 | New York Constantinople and European Turkey | | | | | | | 77,674 | (i) This quantity was sent back to the country of origin on account of inferiority in quality. |
| | | 1,144 545 8,073 607 3,901 000 10,800 000 25,345 000 | Hamburg Marseilles Asiatic Turkey India Persia | 95,093 782 | 3,551 542 | 98,645 324 | 6,123 000 (i) | 92,522 324 (j) | 14,191 302 (h) | | (j) The quantities of raw opium used for the manufacture of prepared opium in Formosa and Kwantung are under entries Formosa and Kwantung. |
| CHOSEN (Korea) ¹ . | 1923 | nil | | nil | 1,392 677 | 1,392 677 | nil | 1,392 677 | 1,638 023 (i) | 17,264 | (k) Excluding 958 kg. manufactured in narcopon and other drugs and 1,082 kg. in medicinal opium. In Japan proper and Chosen no opium was used for other end than manufacturing drugs. |
| FORMOSA ¹ | 1923 | 10,800 000 37,722 000 3,901 000 10,800 000 | Persia European Turkey Asiatic Turkey India | 60,223 000 | nil | 60,223 000 | 3,888 000 (i) | 56,335 000 | (m) | 3,655 | |
| KWANTUNG ¹ | 1923 | 14,545 000 | Persia | 15,545 000 | nil | 14,545 000 | 2,235 000 (i) | 12,310 000 | (m) | 687 | (l) Excluding 18 kg. used in the manufacture of other drugs. |
| SPAIN | 1924 (n) | | | | | | | | | | |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS | 1923 | 152,464 968 2,432 276 | India Persia | 154,897 244 | nil | 154,897 244 | 16,691 774 | 138,205 470 | nil | 881 | (m) All raw opium imported is used for the manufacture of prepared opium for sale to licensed smokers. The exportation of prepared opium is prohibited. |
| SWEDEN | 1924 | 24 450 | Turkey | 24 450 | nil | 24 450 | nil | 24 450 | | 5,903 | |
| TURKEY | 1924 | | | | 565,826 000 | | | | | 13,357 | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1924 | 84 992 296 939 | Turkey Unknown | 381 931 | nil | 381 931 | 1 703 | 380 228 | | 6,928 | (n) Only the figures for the first six months have been received (see doc. O.C. 23(q)1) |

¹ These figures are included in those for Japan and territories.

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|--|----------|------------|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | | |
| ABYSSINIA * | | Negligible | | | | | | | | | * There is neither consumption, manufacture, nor traffic of dangerous drugs in Abyssinia. |
| AUSTRALIA | 1922 | 52 | United Kingdom | 52 | 2 | 54 | 4 | 50 | | 5,426 | (a) The figures for certain colonies for 1923 have already appeared in doc. O.D.C.1(1). These are extracted from the annual reports of: Mauritius, Trinidad and Tobago, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Malta, New Hebrides, Kenya, Tanganyika, received after the publication of that document. |
| | 1923 | 67 | United Kingdom Switzerland | 68 | nil | 68 | 6 | 62 | | | |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified ¹ | 1923 (a) | 20 | | | | | | | | | (b) 1924: Zanzibar, Jamaica, Nyasaland, Cyprus, Gambia, Malta, Southern Rhodesia, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Sierra Leone, British Honduras, Gibraltar, Falkland Isl., Basutoland, Gilbert and Ellice Isl., New Hebrides, Fiji, Nigeria, Grenada, St. Vincent, Trinidad and Tobago, Bechuanaland. |
| | 1924 (b) | 69 | | | | | | | | | |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1924 | 3 | | 3 | | | | | | 258 | |
| CANADA | 1924 | 106 | United Kingdom | 106 | | | 8 | | | 9,030 | |
| CEYLON | 1923 | 68 | Great Britain | 68 | nil | 68 | | 68 | | 4,504 | |
| | 1924 | 16 | | 16 | nil | 16 | nil | 16 | | | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | 402 | | 402 | nil | 402 | nil | 402 | | 13,595 | |
| DENMARK | 1924 | negligible | Great Britain | | | | negligible | | 318 | 3,289 | |
| FINLAND | 1924 | 125 | Great Britain | | | | | | | 3,364 | (c) French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, Reunion, Somaliland, French India, French Establishments in Oceania, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane. |
| | | 23 | Denmark | | | | | | | | (d) Cameroons and Togo. |
| | | 1 | Germany | 149 | | | | | | | (e) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| FRENCH COLONIES | 1923 (c) | 185 | | | | | | | | | (f) Contained in preparations. |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA | 1923 | 7 | | | | | | | | 20,000 | |
| FRENCH MANDATED TERRITORIES (d) | 1923 | 13 | | 13 | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN | 1924 | negligible | | negligible | 3,569 | 3,569 | 2,362 | 1,207 | | (e) 44,200 | |
| INDIA | 1923 | 4 | Great Britain | | | | | | | 319,075 | |
| | | 2 | Other countries | 6 | | | | | | | |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES | 1923 | 901 | Great Britain | | | | | | | 77,674 | |
| | | 225 | France | | (f) 631 | 1,906 | negligible | | | | |
| | | 149 | Germany | 1,275 | | | | | | | |

¹ Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS *(concluded)*

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|----------------------|------|------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | | |
| CHOSŒN (KOREA) . . | 1923 | 6 | Japan proper | 6 | 15 | 21 | nil | 21 | | 17,264 | (g) All raw opium imported since June 1st, 1923, has been transformed into medicinal opium. |
| KWANGTUNG | 1923 | negligible | Japan proper | negligible | nil | | | | | 687 | |
| NORWAY | 1924 | 312 | | 312 | nil | 312 | | | 518 | 2,649 | |
| POLAND | 1923 | 1,263 | | 1,263 | nil | 1,263 | nil | 1,263 | | 27,160 | |
| ROUMANIA | 1923 | 86 | | 86 | nil | 86 | nil | 86 | 273 | 17,393 | |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS | 1923 | 44 | | 44 | | | 40 | | | 881 | |
| SWEDEN (g) | 1924 | | | | | | 30 | | 717 | 5,903 | |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE.

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| I | 2 | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | 10 |
|--|-------------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------------|-----|---|-----|--------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | | Manufacture | | Imports plus manufacture | | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | | Exports (including re-exports) | | Available for internal consumption | | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1922 | 148 | 674 | Nil | | 148 | 674 | Nil | | 6 | 276 | 142 | 398 | 5,426 | (a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, Note (a). |
| | 1923 | 193 | 574 | Nil | | 193 | 574 | Nil | | 11 | 360 | 182 | 214 | | |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified ¹ | 1923 (a) | 2 | 222 | | | | | | | | | | | | (b) 105 kg. 687 were sent back to England by the Department of Customs and Excise. |
| | 1924 ² | 6 | 458 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CANADA | 1924 | 138 | 352 | Nil | | 138 | 352 | | | 106 | 306 (b) | | | 9,030 | (c) Including 439 kg. 405 seized in Hong-Kong and brought to Great Britain for disposal, and 1,819 kg 162 of crude morphine imported from India. |
| CEYLON | 1924 | 2 | 354 | Nil | | 2 | 354 | | | Nil | | 2 | 354 | 4,504 | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | 148 | 000 | Nil | | 148 | 000 | Nil | | Nil | | 148 | 000 | 13,595 | (d) The net amount of morphine manufactured during the year cannot be exactly stated. |
| DENMARK | 1924 | 74 | 746 | Nil | | 74 | 746 | | | 27 | 574 | | | 3,289 | |
| FINLAND | 1924 | 27 | 202 | Nil | | 27 | 202 | Nil | | Nil | | 27 | 202 | 3,364 | (e) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| FRANCE | 1924 | 829 | 000 | | | | | | | 781 | 000 | | | 39,210 | |
| FRENCH COLONIES | 1923 ³ | 18 | 447 | | | | | | | | | | | 20,000 | (f) Manufacture from November 1st, 1922 to October 31st 1923. |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA | 1923 | 26 | 000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN | 1924 | 2,583 | 090 (c) | (d) | | | | 4,411 | 798 | 2,510 | 446 | | | 44,200 (e) | (g) The quantities of drugs containing morphine such as: solutions, powder and tablets of pantopon, etc. have been imported. |
| INDIA | 1923 | | | 59 | 255 (f) | | | | | | | | | 319,075 | |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including, Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung) | 1923 | 107 | 784 (g) | 2,325 | 100 | 2,432 | 884 | (h) | | 1 | 699 | | | 77,674 | (h) In Japan proper and Chosen, a quantity of 2,616 kg. 998 of morphine salts has been used for the manufacture of heroine salts, codeine and dionin. |
| CHOSEN (Korea) ⁴ | 1923 | 11 | 236 (i) | 43 | 200 | 54 | 436 | (h) | | 0 | 216 | | | 17,264 | |
| FORMOSA ⁵ | 1923 | 12 | 810 (i) | Nil | | 12 | 810 | Nil | | Nil | | | | 3,655 | (i) Importation from Japan proper. |
| KWANTUNG ⁶ | 1923 | 5 | 359 (i) | Nil | | 5 | 359 | Nil | | Nil | | | | 687 | |
| NORWAY | 1924 | 54 | 409 | Nil | | 54 | 409 | Nil | | Nil | | | | 2,649 | (j) Including 15 kg. of morphine exported to Paris, part of a seizure of 25 kg. made in 1923. |
| POLAND | 1923 | 154 | 510 | Nil | | 154 | 510 | Nil | | Nil | | 154 | 510 | 27,160 | |
| ROUMANIA | 1923 | 16 | 178 | Nil | | 16 | 178 | Nil | | Nil | | 16 | 178 | 17,393 | |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS | 1923 | 4 | 204 | Nil | | 4 | 204 | Nil | | 2 | 897 | 1 | 307 | 881 | |
| SWEDEN | 1924 | 42 | 587 | Nil | | 42 | 587 | Nil | | Nil | | 42 | 587 | 5,903 | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1924 | 14 | 791 | Nil | | 14 | 791 | Nil | | 16 | 159 (j) | | | 6,928 | |

¹ Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

² See list under Table II.

³ The figures are included in those for Japan and territories.

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN.

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout).

| I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of preparations | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1922 | 11 729 | nil | 11 729 | | 1 136 | 10 593 | 5,426 | (a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, note (a). |
| | 1923 | 33 483 | nil | 33 483 | | 1 789 | 31 694 | | |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified ¹ | 1923 (a) | 0 119 | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 ² | 0 883 | | | | | | | |
| CANADA | 1924 | 15 189 | nil | 15 189 | | negligible | | 9,030 | (b) Including 734 kg. 850 seized in Hong-Kong and brought to Great Britain for disposal. |
| CEYLON | 1924 | negligible | | | | | | 4,504 | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | negligible | | | | | | 13,595 | |
| DENMARK | 1924 | 6 153 | nil | 6 153 | | 0 475 | 5 678 | 3,289 | |
| FINLAND | 1924 | 14 000 | nil | 14 000 | nil | nil | 14 000 | 3,364 | (c) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| FRENCH COLONIES | 1923 ³ | negligible | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN | 1924 | 739 905 ^b | 474 422 | 1214 327 | | 304 022 | 910 305 | 44,200 (c) | |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc) | 1923 | nil | 1724 680 | 1724 680 | nil | nil | 1724 680 | 77,674 | (d) Import from Japan proper. |
| CHOSEN (KORRA) ³ | 1923 | 2 562 ^d | 1 350 | 3 912 | | | | 17,264 | |
| FORMOSA ³ | 1923 | 23 059 ^d | | 23 059 | | | | 3,655 | |
| KWANTUNG ³ | 1923 | 14 025 ^d | | 14 025 | | | | 687 | |
| POLAND | 1923 | 23 500 | nil | 23 500 | nil | nil | 23 500 | 27,160 | |
| ROUMANIA | 1923 | 2 850 | nil | 2 850 | nil | nil | 2 850 | 17,393 | |
| SWEDEN | 1924 | 4 493 | nil | 4 493 | | nil | 4 493 | 5,903 | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1924 | 1 212 | nil | 1 212 | | nil | 1 212 | 6,928 | |

¹ Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

² See list of colonies under Table II.

³ These figures are included in those for Japan and territories.

V. DIONIN.

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | 9 |
|---|----------|---------|-----|-------------|-----|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | | Manufacture | | Imports plus Manufacture | | Exports (including re-exports) | | Available for internal consumption | | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1922 | 0 | 568 | nil | | 0 | 568 | nil | | 0 | 568 | 5,426 | (a) These figures are included in those for Japan and territories. |
| | 1923 | 1 | 278 | nil | | 1 | 278 | nil | | 1 | 278 | | |
| FINLAND | 1924 | 6 | 800 | nil | | 6 | 800 | nil | | 6 | 800 | 3,364 | |
| FRANCE | 1924 | 317 | 000 | | | | | 652 | 000 | | | 39,210 | |
| JAPAN and Territories (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1923 | nil | | 14 | 669 | 14 | 669 | nil | | 14 | 669 | 77,674 | |
| CHOSEN (Korea) | 1923 (a) | nil | | 0 | 207 | 0 | 207 | nil | | 0 | 207 | 17,264 | |
| POLAND | 1923 | 24 | 300 | nil | | 24 | 300 | nil | | 24 | 300 | 27,160 | |

VI. CODEIN.

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1922 | 9 912 | nil | 9 912 | nil | 9 912 | 5.426 | |
| | 1923 | 15 023 | nil | 15 023 | 0 197 | 14 826 | | |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES NOT SEPARATELY SPECIFIED ¹ | 1923 (a) | 0 759 | | | | | | (a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, note (a). |
| | 1924 ² | 3 315 | | | | | | |
| CEYLON | 1924 | 2 457 | nil | 2 457 | nil | 2 457 | 4.504 | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | 393 425 | nil | 393 425 | nil | 393 425 | 13.595 | |
| FRENCH COLONIES | 1923 ³ | 3 639 | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN | 1924 | | 4.353 720 | 4.353 720 | 3.865 723 | 487 997 | (b) 44.200 | (b) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1923 | nil | 35 354 | | | | 77.674 | |
| CHOSEN (KOREA) | 1923 (c) | nil | 9 874 | | | | 17.264 | (c) These figures are included in those for Japan and territories. |
| ROUMANIA | 1923 | 25 700 | nil | 25 700 | nil | 25 700 | 17.393 | |

¹ Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

² See list of colonies under Table II.

VII. ALKALOIDS OF OPIUM NOT SPECIFICALLY NUMERATED

(Weight in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-----------|------|---------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | kg. gr. | | |
| Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil. | Nil | Nil | Nil | |

VIII. COCA LEAVES

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|----------|---------|--------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manufacture of cocaine | Used in manufacture of cocaine | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | kg. | | |
| AUSTRALIA . . . | 1922 | 47 (a) | France | 47 | nil | 47 | nil | 47 | nil | 5,426 | (a) Ground coca leaves. |
| BOLIVIA | 1923 | | | | | | 342,606 | | | 2,889 | (b) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| GREAT BRITAIN . | 1924 | 40 | | 40 | nil | 40 | 40,799 | | | 44,200 (b) | |
| JAPAN and territories (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1923 (c) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | (c) 1874 kg. 599 of crude cocaine were imported as raw material for the manufacture of cocaine of this quantity; 984 kg. 999 were from Germany and 889 kg. 600 were from South America. |

IX. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | 9 |
|--|-------------------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | | Manufacture | | Imports plus manufacture | | Exports (including re-exports) | | Available for internal consumption | | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | | |
| BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified ¹ . | 1923 (a) 1924 ² | 4 | 152 | | | | | | | | | | (a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, note (a). |
| | | 4 | 943 | | | | | | | | | | (b) 2 kg. 840 have been sent back to Germany. |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1924 | 0 | 227 | | | | | | | | | | (c) Including 826 kg. of raw cocaine. |
| CANADA | 1924 | 42 | 424 | nil | | | | 2 | 886 b | | | 9,030 | |
| CEYLON | 1923 1924 | 1 | 030 | nil | | 1 | 030 | nil | | 1 | 030 | 4,504 | (d) Excluding Irish Free State. |
| | | 4 | 423 | nil | | 4 | 423 | nil | | 4 | 423 | | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1924 | 137 | 354 | nil | | 137 | 354 | nil | | 137 | 354 | 13,595 | (e) In 1923, 1,874 kg. 599 of raw cocaine were imported for the manufacture of this quantity. This quantity of crude cocaine was a part of the raw material from which the 3,313 kg. 620 of cocaine were manufactured. |
| DENMARK | 1924 | 28 | 166 | nil | | 28 | 166 | 6 | 121 | 22 | 045 | 3,289 | |
| FINLAND | 1924 | 16 | 960 | nil | | 16 | 960 | nil | | 16 | 960 | 3,364 | (f) The exports were as follows: 3 kg. 851 from Japan proper to China; 1 kg. 360 from Formosa to a hospital in China under the management of the Government of Formosa, and 0 kg. 040 to Russia. |
| FRANCE | 1924 | 1,055 | 000 c | | | | | 23 | 000 | | | 39,210 | (g) Importation from Japan proper. |
| FRENCH COLONIES | 1923 ² | 3 | 354 | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA | 1923 | negligible | | | | | | | | | | 20,000 | (h) These figures are included in those of Japan and dependencies, column 7. |
| GREAT BRITAIN | 1924 | 419 | 468 | nil | | 419 | 468 | 176 | 847 | 242 | 621 | 44,200 (d) | |
| INDIA | 1923 | 39 | 078 | | | | | | | | | 319,075 | |
| JAPAN AND DEPENDENCIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1923 | nil | | 3,313 | 620 e | 3,313 | 620 | 5 | 251 f | 3,308 | 369 | 77,674 | |
| CHOSEN (KOREA) | 1923 | 19 | 525 g | nil | | 19 | 525 | negligible | | 19 | 525 h | 17,264 | |
| FORMOSA | 1923 | 24 | 790 g | nil | | 24 | 790 | 1 | 360 | 23 | 430 h | 3,655 | |
| KWANTUNG | 1923 | 32 | 025 g | nil | | 32 | 025 | nil | | 32 | 025 h | 687 | |
| NORWAY | 1924 | 8 | 979 | nil | | 8 | 979 | | | | | 2,649 | |
| POLAND | 1923 | 117 | 200 | nil | | 117 | 200 | nil | | 117 | 200 | 27,160 | |
| ROUMANIA | 1923 | 15 | 675 | nil | | 15 | 675 | nil | | 15 | 675 | 17,393 | |
| SWEDEN | 1924 | 19 | 750 | nil | | 19 | 750 | | | | | 5,903 | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1924 | 14 | 991 | nil | | 14 | 991 | negligible | | 14 | 991 | 6,928 | |

¹ Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

² See list of colonies under Table II.

PART II.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF OPIUM AND ITS DERIVATIVES TOGETHER WITH ESTIMATED REQUIREMENTS OF COCAINE.

The following tables have been established from information contained in annual reports for the year 1924 received by the Secretariat which have not appeared in former statistical documents.

The calculations made for the purpose of reducing all estimated requirements to a common opium equivalent have been made according to the tables of equivalents given in document O. D. C. I. (1).

I. TOTAL ESTIMATED REQUIREMENTS PER 100,000 INHABITANTS AND PER CAPITA SHOWN AS RAW OPIUM EQUIVALENT AND MORPHIA EQUIVALENT

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | 10 | | 11 | 12 | | 13 |
|--------------|------|--------------|--|-----|---|-----|--|-----|-----------------------------------|---|-----|--|---|--|--|--|--|---------|
| Country | Year | Name of drug | Estimated annual requirements in kilos | | Estimated raw opium equivalent in kilos | | Estimated morphine equivalent in kilos | | Estimated population in thousands | Estimated raw opium equivalent per 100,000 inhabitants in kilos | | Estimated raw opium equivalent per capita in grammes | Estimated morphine equivalent per capita in grammes | | Total estimated raw opium equivalent per 100,000 population in kilos | Total estimated raw opium equivalent per capita in grammes | | Remarks |
| | | | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | kg. | gr. | | kg. | gr. | | | | | | | |
| AUSTRIA . . | 1924 | Opium | 650 | 000 | 650 | 000 | 65 | 000 | 6,527 | 9 | 958 | 0.0996 | 0.00996 | | 60 | 179 | | 0.6017 |
| | | Morphine | 220 | 000 | 2200 | 000 | 220 | 000 | | 33 | 706 | 0.3370 | 0.03370 | | | | | |
| | | Heroin | 10 | 000 | 78 | 000 | 7 | 200 | | 1 | 195 | 0.0119 | 0.00119 | | | | | |
| | | Codeine | 100 | 000 | 1000 | 000 | 88 | 000 | | 15 | 320 | 0.1532 | 0.01532 | | | | | |
| CANADA . . . | 1925 | Opium | 636 | 000 | 636 | 000 | 63 | 600 | 8,788 | 7 | 237 | 0.0724 | 0.00724 | | 48 | 406 | | 0.4840 |
| | | Morphine | 181 | 000 | 1810 | 000 | 181 | 000 | | 20 | 596 | 0.2059 | 0.02059 | | | | | |
| | | Heroin | 34 | 000 | 265 | 200 | 24 | 480 | | 3 | 018 | 0.0302 | 0.00302 | | | | | |
| | | Codeine | 145 | 000 | 1450 | 000 | 127 | 000 | | 16 | 491 | 0.1649 | 0.01649 | | | | | |
| | | Dionine | 11 | 000 | 93 | 500 | 8 | 580 | | 1 | 064 | 0.0106 | 0.00106 | | | | | |
| NEW ZEALAND | 1924 | Opium | 103 | 000 | 103 | 000 | 10 | 300 | 1,219 | 8 | 449 | 0.0845 | 0.00845 | | 39 | 458 | | 0.3946 |
| | | Morphine | 30 | 000 | 300 | 000 | 30 | 000 | | 24 | 000 | 0.2461 | 0.02461 | | | | | |
| | | Heroine | 10 | 000 | 78 | 000 | 7 | 200 | | 6 | 399 | 0.0640 | 0.00640 | | | | | |
| ROUMANIA . | 1924 | Opium | 95 | 000 | 95 | 000 | 9 | 500 | 17,393 | 0 | 546 | 0.0055 | 0.00055 | | 3 | 918 | | 0.0392 |
| | | Morphine | 20 | 000 | 200 | 000 | 20 | 000 | | 1 | 149 | 0.0115 | 0.00115 | | | | | |
| | | Heroin | 5 | 000 | 39 | 000 | 3 | 600 | | 0 | 224 | 0.0022 | 0.00022 | | | | | |
| | | Dionin . . . | 8 | 000 | 68 | 000 | 6 | 240 | | 0 | 390 | 0.0039 | 0.00039 | | | | | |
| | | Codeine | 28 | 000 | 280 | 000 | 24 | 640 | | 1 | 609 | 0.0161 | 0.00161 | | | | | |

II. SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES OF ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
|-----------------------|------|--|-----|-------------------------|---|---------|
| Country | Year | Total estimated Raw Opium equivalent requirements in kilos | | Population in thousands | Estimated average requirement per capita in grammes | Remarks |
| | | kg. | gr. | | | |
| AUSTRIA | 1924 | 3,928 | 000 | 6,327 | 0.6018 | |
| CANADA | 1925 | 4,254 | 700 | 8,788 | 0.4841 | |
| NEW ZEALAND | 1924 | 481 | 000 | 1,219 | 0.3945 | |
| ROUMANIA | 1924 | 682 | 000 | 17,393 | 0.0392 | |

III. ESTIMATED ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS OF COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (calculated on a basis of 100% cocaine).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------|------|--|---|---|-------------------------|---------|
| Country | Year | Estimated annual requirements in kilos | Estimated requirements per 100,000 inhabitants in kilos | Estimated requirements per capital in grammes | Population in thousands | Remarks |
| | | | | | | |
| ROUMANIA . . | 1924 | 23 000 | 0 132 | 0.00132 | 17,393 | |
| NEW ZEALAND | 1924 | 18 000 | 1 474 | 0.01474 | 1,219 | |

PART III.

PREPARED OPIUM.

The following table has been established from information contained in annual reports received by the Secretariat which have not appeared in former statistical documents.

PREPARED OPIUM STATISTICS

(Weights are given in kilos throughout.)

| Countries | Year | Locally manufactured | Available for internal consumption | Actually Consumed | Population in thousands | Adult chinese male population | Number of registered smokers | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | | | |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1924 | (a) | | 4,137 | | | | (a) 5,459 kg. of raw opium were used for the manufacture of prepared opium. |
| CEYLON | 1924 | 219 | | 216 | | | (b) 8,323 | (b) Number of consumers using prepared opium only—1922: 674; 1923: 666; 1924: 643. |
| FORMOSA | 1923 | | | 48,126 | 3,643 | | (c) 39,463 | (c) 33,965 men, 5,498 women. |
| FRENCH INDIA | 1923 | | | 516 | | | | (d) Quantities of opium placed on the market by the monopoly: 64,510 kg. prepared opium and 9,408 kg. raw opium. In Kwan-Tcheou-Wan 41,362 kg. raw opium and 10,660 kg. prepared opium have been placed on the market. |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA | 1923 | | (d) | | | | | |
| KWANTUNG | 1923 | (e) | | | | | | (e) The quantity of raw opium used for the manufacture of prepared opium amounts to 14,464 kg. |

ANNEX 4.

O. C. 291.

INDIAN HEMP.

Report by the Secretariat submitted to the Committee on August 26th, 1925.

Resolution IV of the Advisory Committee (Sixth Session) (Document C. 397. M.146. 1924, p. 110).

"With reference to the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa that Indian hemp (*Cannabis indica* or *Cannabis sativa*) should be treated as one of the habit-forming drugs, the Advisory Committee recommends the Council that, in the first instance, the Governments should be invited to furnish to the League information as to the production and use of, and traffic in, this substance in their territories, together with their observations on the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa. The Committee further recommends that the question should be considered at the annual session of the Advisory Committee to be held in 1925."

On August 29th, 1924, the Council passed the following resolution on this subject:

"The Council of the League of Nations instructs the Secretary-General to request the Governments of the States Members of the League and parties to the Hague Convention to furnish the Secretariat with information on the production, use of and traffic in Indian hemp (*Cannabis indica* or *Cannabis sativa*) in their territories, and to ask for their observations on the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa that this substance be treated as one of the habit-forming drugs."

In accordance with this resolution, a circular letter (C.L.169) was forwarded on November 17th, 1924, to all Governments. The following replies have been received:

Albania. — This Government states that it is of the opinion that Indian hemp should be considered as a dangerous drug. There is no cultivation and it is not used in the country.

Argentine. — This drug is considered as harmful in the Argentine, and is included in the legislation, copies of which are enclosed.¹ There is no cultivation and its use is chiefly for the manufacture of callicidas. Imports for 1924 amount to 14 kilogrammes, 600 grammes.

Australia. — This Government states that Indian hemp is practically unknown in Australia outside medical and pharmaceutical practice. *Cannabis indica* is included in the lists of poisons drawn up under legislative enactments of the several Australian States, and is thereby subject to certain drastic restrictions. The drug is not produced or used by human beings in any of the territories under the administration of the Commonwealth, and there is no traffic in the drug in the territories.

Austria. — There is no cultivation of this plant in Austria. The entire trade in Vienna may be estimated at about 30 kgs. There is no abuse.

Belgium. — The Belgian Government has no objection to the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa, but it does not consider that it is necessary to have the same regulations concerning Indian hemp as are in force for other drugs coming under the Opium Convention.

Bulgaria. — This drug is considered by the Bulgarian Government as a dangerous drug. This Government states that up to the year 1922 there was no cultivation of Indian hemp for the extract of hashish. After 1922 this plant was cultivated, not by the local population, but by the Armenian refugees established in the district. The drug is not consumed in the country. It is exported by the port of Bourgas. Hashish is imported for medical needs principally from Germany. Its importation is only permitted to chemists, and the public cannot procure it unless they have a medical certificate.

Canada. — Indian hemp is included in the Schedule of Drugs governed by an Act of Parliament, a copy of which is enclosed². Its use is negligible in Canada.

China. — This Government considers that Indian hemp should be treated as a habit-forming drug. It is only known to be used for medical purposes in China, and there is no production.

Czechoslovakia. — There is no production in Czechoslovakia, but a small quantity is imported for medical needs. The consumption is insignificant and no cases of abuse have as yet been reported. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to class Indian hemp as a dangerous drug as far as Czechoslovakia is concerned.

¹ These laws are in the archives of the Secretariat.

² These laws are in the archives of the Secretariat.

- Ecuador.* — This Government agrees with the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa. An enquiry into the trade, etc., has been made by the Ministry of Health, and there is no production, trade or consumption of Indian hemp in the Republic.
- Esthonia.* — There is no production in Esthonia. The drug is considered harmful, and its use is only permitted on a medical certificate. There are no statistics available.
- Finland.* — This Government agrees with the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa, and has included Indian hemp in its list of dangerous narcotics. This drug is not cultivated in Finland, and strict medical control of trade and consumption is exercised. Statistics of import sent.
- Germany.* — No statistics regarding production, trade and consumption of the drug known as Indian hemp are available. This drug is not identical with the substance which in German commercial statistics is called "Hemp, Indian, New Zealand, etc." The use of Indian hemp for medical purposes is at present of very little importance in Germany. The abuse of this drug is not known.
- Great Britain.* — There is no cultivation in Great Britain. As the traffic has not been controlled in the past, no statistics are available. The volume of trade is inconsiderable. There is no trade whatever in charras or bhang; the use of medicinal preparations of *cannabis* appears to be diminishing. Until recently, it was used as colouring matter in corn plasters, but as it has now been classed as a poison this use will probably disappear. There is no evidence of abusive use.
- British Colonies. — Southern Rhodesia.* — Indian hemp is classed as a dangerous drug in Southern Rhodesia. Copies of Regulations are enclosed.¹
- Hungary.* — This drug may only be supplied to pharmacies in Hungary by a medical permit. It is considered out of date and is scarcely used. Hashish is quite unknown. The Hungarian Government does not therefore see the necessity of taking any further measures.
- Irish Free State.* — Indian hemp is only employed medicinally in the Irish Free State, and never as a habit-forming drug.
- Italy.* — This Government agrees with the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa. Indian hemp is imported under the general heading of "Non-specified Medicaments" and therefore no statistics of imports are available. Dagga and hashish form the subject of special regulations which came into force in April 1924. Statistics as to import will therefore be available after April 1925.
- Latvia.* — The Latvian Government is in complete agreement with the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa. There is no cultivation of Indian hemp, and pharmacies may only dispense it on medical prescription.
- Monaco.* — There is no trade or production in Monaco and practically no consumption. Indian hemp is only employed on a medical certificate and regulations in force prevent its use as a habit-forming drug.
- New Zealand.* — This Government agrees that Indian hemp should be included in the list of drugs covered by the Convention. There is no production in New Zealand. Imports of extract amount to 16 to 18 lb. per annum. No cases of addiction have been reported.
- Norway.* — This Government accepts the proposal of the Government of the Union of South Africa, with the reservation that chemists are not obliged to report every transaction and only annual reports are called for. There is no consumption in Norway, except with a medical prescription. No case of abuse has been reported.
- Panama.* — This Government states that Indian hemp will be included as a dangerous drug as soon as the League Committee has come to a decision on the narcotics contained therein.
- Portugal.* — This Government agrees that Indian hemp should be classed as a dangerous drug¹ and enclosed a memorandum giving information with regard to the production and use of and traffic in Indian hemp in Angola and Mozambique.
- Mozambique.* — There is no trade in hemp, though small quantities are imported for medical use, but the dried leaves (called bhang) of *Cannabis indica* are smoked by natives everywhere as a narcotic and as an exhilarant, with injurious effect. The Portuguese Colonial Ministry suggests that the cultivation might be prohibited, and that the local authorities should be instructed to uproot and destroy the plant.
- Angola.* — The Customs statistics do not mention hemp as an export. The provisional Department of Agriculture states that it has never been grown on any large scale, an assertion confirmed by local knowledge and by information from the higher agricultural section.

¹ These laws are in the archives of the Secretariat.

No replies have been received to Document C.L.169 from the following Governments:

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------|--|
| Abyssinia | Haiti | Poland |
| Bolivia | Honduras | Roumania |
| Brazil | India | Salvador |
| Chile | Japan | Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes |
| Colombia | Liberia | Siam |
| Costa Rica | Lithuania | Spain |
| Cuba | Luxemburg | Sweden |
| Denmark | Mexico | Switzerland |
| Dominican Republic | Netherlands | United States of America |
| France | Nicaragua | Uruguay |
| Greece | Paraguay | Venezuela |
| Guatemala | Persia | |
| | Peru | |

ANNEX 5.

O. C. 312.

THE POLICY OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT AS REGARDS THE CONTROL OF
OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Memorandum by Dr. Tsurumi submitted to the Committee on August 26th, 1925.

In reviewing the statistics for Japan for the year 1923 we should bear in mind the two aspects of the question. One is the policy or line of the procedure which has been adopted by the Japanese Government in regard to the control of opium and narcotic traffic; and the other is the technical process by which this policy was to be put into execution. When the directive line of the Government is known, the rest is the administrative and technical measures upon which the success of the policy depends.

What has been the policy of the Japanese Government since it ratified the Hague Convention and put it into force in 1921? It was to regulate strictly the import and export and manufacture. As to the consumption of opium and narcotic drugs, the Japanese Government has had no trouble in controlling them so as to avoid the abuse of the narcotics in the hands of the population.

As to the import of raw opium, it is the Government which buys the opium, and as to the export it is absolutely prohibited. You have seen the figures for Japan proper, which are very much limited for the year; they are even below the figures which have been set by the League's Committee. There must be a certain variation of the drugs manufactured from year to year according to the demand and articles on hand during the preceding year, but the total of the raw material is set by the Government by the budget and no increase is possible during the year.

As to the import and manufacture of the opium alkaloid, the Japanese Government has tightened the regulation so as to reduce the import, and the quantity of manufactured too is reduced. There is certain adjustment yet necessary, but the Committee must be assured of the effort of the Government of Japan in this administrative side of the regulation.

With this definite policy of strict regulation, the Japanese Government found itself in difficulty as to the quantities to be allotted to the manufacturers for the year 1923. In order to regulate the manufacture for the year 1923 the allotment should have been made during the preceding year, but no country had any definite idea in 1922 what was to be the quantity needed for the country. For cocaine, for example, the Japanese authorities, in 1921, had estimated the need at about 1,800 kilos per year, and in order to give permit to manufacture this quantity the authorities allowed so much for coca leaves at the rate of 35 per mille of cocaine content, and 45 per cent of cocaine for the crude cocaine. This low rate was due to the rather undeveloped stage of the cocaine manufacture in Japan at the time this allotment was decided upon. The difficulty of apportioning the raw material for this manufacture is the great variation of the cocaine content in the coca leaf according to the year's crop and length of time elapsed after picking the leaf. However, all these technical matters will be adjusted as soon as the results of the enquiry now in progress as to the consumption of the country are known and as soon as a certain amount of definite experience has been gained by the manufacturers. Under all circumstances the Government of Japan will press the measure year by year in the hope that our control will be as effective as our measures for the control of consumption at home.

ANNEX 5a.

O. C. 313.

THE POLICY OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT AS REGARDS THE CONTROL
OF OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Second Memorandum by M. Tsurumi, submitted to the Committee on August 26th, 1925.

In reply to the questions raised by the British representative regarding the supplementary information for Chosen and for Japan proper as to the figures for the raw opium which is used to manufacture morphine and that of salt of morphine, I should like to state that for Japan proper the figures given in Section (4) (c) (1) represent the amount of raw opium used from the quantity which was produced and imported in the year 1923, for manufacturing a portion of morphine which was indicated in the table (6) (b).

Evidently this was not the total raw material used. From the exact information on these questions, I shall ask the Government to give us the accurate data which I shall communicate to this Committee during the session, or, if it is too late for the present session, then to the Secretariat.

As to another question with regard to the quantity of heroin and cocaine manufactured in the year 1923, I have set forth in my statement yesterday the exact position in which the Japanese Government was placed. It seems that no further explanation is necessary as far as the position of the Japanese Government was concerned.

From the point of view of medicine and science — I speak with my professional experience as a medical man — the Japanese practitioners resort much more frequently to heroin and morphine than to medicinal opium. This is explained by the fact that, in order to obtain medicinal opium, it is necessary for the practitioners to obtain the police permit each time for the quantity less than 50 gr., and if it is over 50 gr. then the permit of the local governor of the prefecture is required. Then the transport for medicinal opium from one prefecture to another is prohibited. This will naturally increase the demand at the retailers who obtain the sale of the narcotics following the strict regulation of book-keeping and reporting to the local police.

At the present time — the latest figure I have is for 1922 — there are in Japan proper 5,019 pharmacists, 22,510 druggists, 1,585 manufacturers of medicine, 1,431 hospitals, excluding infectious diseases hospitals, which number 1,437; 32,851 physicians, 5,644 dentists, 4,853 veterinary surgeons, the grand total of 75,339 places besides laboratories, medical schools and institutes, making about 75,500 places which have the permits to keep the drugs which are in the Japanese Pharmacopœia.

If you are interested in the detailed figures of the number of inspections made and the number of arrests, etc., I shall be glad to give them to any one.

From these figures you can figure out what the absorbing power is in the hands of professional men and retailers, besides stocks on hand of manufacturers and the wholesalers. You will see that tremendous machinery is needed for giving a fair distribution.

In order to safeguard it, the Japanese authorities are very anxious to stop the leakage for illicit traffic for fear of disturbing this equilibrium and in raising the prices for the internal consumption for the indispensable medical materials.

This is more so when the Government is trying to curtail, as far as possible, the manufacture and import.

This is in our own interest and we shall be glad when all the leakages out of Japan can be completely stopped.

As Sir John Campbell himself admitted, even in India, where the Government has the absolute control on opium according to the statement of her representative, it is difficult to stop entirely the leakage of opium out of his country. This is the first time that he ever admitted it. Japan also has the same difficulty in finding her necessary commodities leak through. If the representative from India can give us any assurance on any measure which has been proved to him successful, I shall be very much indebted to him, for I shall not fail to transmit it to the Japanese Government with my recommendations.

ANNEX 6.

O. C. 295.

FALSIFICATION OF LABELS.

Memorandum by Dr. Anselmino, submitted to the Committee on August 28th, 1925.

The seizures of narcotics made in the past year at Hong-Kong, Singapore and Calcutta have shown to an increasing extent that the labels affixed to the packages were counterfeits or falsifications of the labels of German firms. Several types of these falsifications exist in various sizes. Many of these falsifications are careless and unskilful, but others are well executed and reproduce

the original correctly, both in the coloured ground and in the printing. Nevertheless, they display occasional errors in the letterpress. Moreover, they are copied from the previous year's impression and do not contain the control marks and control numbers of the authentic labels, which vary for each consignment and are separately stamped on each occasion. In the case of the falsified labels, these control marks have sometimes been printed in advance, or have been executed in a manner not used by the firm concerned.

Up to now falsifications of the labels of the firms of Merck, Boehringer, Ingelheim (Hambourg) and Boehringer (Mannheim) have been detected. Sometimes a package bearing the label of Merck would have a negative seal of an entirely different firm which, in fact, did not deal in narcotics; sometimes a package ostensibly coming from the firm of Boehringer would bear a counterfeit seal of the firm of Merck.

In this way the contraband is imputed to a certain firm, although neither the package nor the goods were consigned by it. It is of course possible to determine, from the size and shape of the crystals and from other secret characteristics, whether it is the product of a particular firm.

Seeing that it is not only a question of counterfeit labels of German firms, but that imitations of English and American products appear also to be in circulation, it is to the general interest to discover the origin of these falsifications.

In the cases that have been brought to my notice, these seizures were made on ships coming from the Far East and touching at the above-mentioned ports.

In my opinion, it would be of value to ascertain as accurately as possible, whenever a seizure is effected, the origin of the narcotics on board the ship and the port in which they were shipped.

ANNEX 7.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO STUDY THE QUESTION OF THE FORM OF THE SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORTS FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Approved by the Committee on August 28th, 1925.

The Sub-Committee designated to study the question of the manner in which the summary of annual reports could best be presented met at 6.30 p.m. on August 26th and again at 3 p.m. on August 28th, 1925.

Present: Sir John CAMPBELL, M. Van WETTUM, M. BRENIER and M. BOURGOIS.

The Sub-Committee agreed that:

(a) The first part of the summary reproducing extracts of the reports should in future be completed by a comparative statement covering, where possible, the preceding five years as well as the year of the last report received.

(b) Such comparative statements should, in the case of opium-producing countries, show:

- (1) Acreage;
- (2) Production ;
- (3) Exports, showing main countries of destination and total exports.

(c) In the case of coca-producing countries, the same particulars and comparisons should be given.

(d) In the case of drug-manufacturing countries, the particulars would concern manufacture and show:

- (1) Amounts manufactured;
- (2) Exports, showing main countries of destination and total exports.

(e) No changes are proposed in the general manner of presentation of Table I, but countries whose total imports of raw opium do not exceed 500 kilogrammes should not appear in the table in question, although, where necessary, particulars of their imports would appear in the comparative statements.

(f) In the résumé, the order is to be purely alphabetical.

(g) In the tables, the order is also to be alphabetical.

(h) With reference to (e), a note is to appear under the heading of Table I to the effect that countries whose imports are less than 500 kilogrammes are not entered in the table. A similar reference stating the criterion adopted in each case should appear at the head of each separate table.

(i) Subject to the general indications given above, résumés of the reports of the following countries are always to be given if the reports are available, and if not received, a statement to that effect is to appear:

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|--|
| Austria | Germany | Peru |
| Belgium | Great Britain | Poland |
| Bolivia | Greece | Portugal |
| British North Borneo | Hong-Kong | Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats • and Slovenes |
| Canada | Hungary | Spain |
| Ceylon | India | Straits Settlements |
| China | Italy | Switzerland |
| Chosen | Japan | Turkey |
| Czechoslovakia | Kwantung | Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics |
| Danzig | Mexico | United States of America. |
| Formosa | Netherlands | |
| France | Persia | |

(j) *Medicinal opium* (Table II).

In the table for medicinal opium, all countries whose imports plus manufacture are equal to 50 kilos. or over are to appear.

(k) *Morphine and salts of morphine* (Table III).

In the table for morphine and salts of morphine, all countries manufacturing morphine are to appear as well as all countries which import or consume more than 25 kilos.

(l) *Diacetylmorphine and its salts (diamorphine, heroin)* (Table IV).

In the table for heroin and salts of heroin, all countries manufacturing heroin are to appear as well as countries whose imports or consumption equal 10 kilos. or more.

Dionin (Table V omitted).

Codein (Table VI omitted).

Alkaloids of opium not specifically numerated (Table VII omitted).

(m) *Coca leaves* (Table VIII).

All countries producing, importing or exporting 500 kilos. or more are to appear.

(n) *Cocaine and salts of cocaine* (Table IX).

All countries manufacturing, importing, exporting or consuming 10 kilos. or more are to appear.

(o) *Raw cocaine.*

All countries manufacturing, importing or exporting 10 kilos. or more are to appear.

(p) *Prepared opium.*

The table relative to prepared opium, now appearing as Part III of Document O. C. 297, is to include all countries where the use of prepared opium is still permitted.

GENERAL REMARKS.

When establishing any of the tables above referred to, the grammes are to be eliminated in all tables, except the table showing the estimated requirements *per capita*.

When writing a figure representing a percentage, a comma is to be used in the French text to separate the unit from the fraction, whilst in the English text a point is to be used.

The table for estimated annual requirements of opium and its derivatives together with estimated requirements of cocaine now appearing as Part II of Document O.C.297 is not, in future, to be incorporated in the summary of annual reports. A table drawn up from the estimates available up to date can be prepared by the Secretariat and kept up to date in case the particulars should be required by the Advisory Committee. The same applies to the summaries of estimated annual requirements now given in Tables II and III of Part II of Document O.C.297.

ANNEX 8.

A. 28. 1925. XI.
O. C. 319 (r).

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL
ON THE WORK OF THE SEVENTH SESSION

Approved by the Committee on August 31st, 1925.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs has the honour to submit to the Council of the League of Nations the following report on the proceedings of its seventh session. The questions of policy which have engaged much of the time of the Committee at its previous sessions, particularly the question of the strengthening of the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912, have now been disposed of for the time being by the two International Conferences which were held at Geneva from November 1924 to February 1925, and the work of the Committee at its present session has been mainly concerned with questions of an administrative character, more particularly the measures for the prevention of the illicit traffic in opium and dangerous drugs.

All the members of the Committee and the assessors were present, except the representatives of China and Bolivia. The representative of China had received instructions from his Government not to attend the meeting, and the representative of Bolivia was detained by illness in his family.

The Committee had the pleasure of welcoming for the first time the attendance of a representative of Switzerland and also of Mr. Pinckney Tuck, the Consul of the United States of America at Geneva, who was appointed by his Government to attend in an unofficial capacity. The following is a full list of those present:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, K.C.B. (<i>Chairman</i>) | Great Britain |
| Dr. ANSELMINO (<i>Vice-Chairman</i>) | Germany |
| M. BOURGOIS | France |
| Sir John CAMPBELL, C.S.I., O.B.E. | India |
| Dr. TSURUMI | Japan |
| M. VAN WETTUM | Netherlands |
| H. E. M. FERREIRA | Portugal |
| M. PETROVITCH | Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes |
| Luang SRI VISARVAJA | Siam |
| Dr. CARRIÈRE | Switzerland |
| Mr. PINCKNEY TUCK | United States of America |

Assessors:

M. Henri BRENIER
Sir John JORDAN, G.C.I.E., K.C.B., K.C.M.G.
Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT

After the election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and the adoption of the agenda, the meetings of the Committee were held in public with the exception of two private sessions, at which the Committee considered the measures for dealing with the illicit traffic and the question referred to it by the Council as to the qualifications required in future for the assessors to be appointed on the Committee.

ANNUAL REPORTS FURNISHED BY THE GOVERNMENTS.

The consideration of the annual reports received from the Governments is one of the most important parts of the work of the Committee, and the Committee devoted some time to it. It regrets that reports had not been received from a number of Governments for either 1923 or 1924,

and it would ask the Council to urge upon all Governments the great importance of sending their reports to the League, for the consideration of its Advisory Committee, at the earliest possible date. A list of the countries Members of the League or parties to the Convention, showing what reports have been furnished by them, is appended to this report.

At a previous session, the Committee recommended that in the case of the European and nearer countries the report should be despatched not later than July 1st of the year following the year to which the report relates, and in the case of far-distant countries not later than October 1st. It was agreed by all the representatives of the Governments present that there should be no difficulty in sending in the reports by these dates.

A summary of the reports, which has been prepared by the Secretariat, is appended to the Minutes of the proceedings. The Committee has considered the form in which this summary should be prepared in future and has made certain suggestions to the Secretariat for its improvement.

A useful discussion took place on various points arising on the reports. Further information was promised by the representatives concerned in regard to the export of the drugs to certain countries, and in regard to the manufacture of the drugs in quantities which appeared to be excessive.

The representative of India informed the Committee that the Indian Government had decided to stop any exports of opium to Persia and to Macao.

PROPAGANDA.

The Committee has considered this question, which was referred to it by the Council in consequence of the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League at its session last year. That resolution was as follows:

“The Assembly requests the Council to be good enough to ask the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs whether it considers it desirable and expedient that the work undertaken by the League of Nations in connection with the traffic in opium, under Article 23 of the Covenant, should be completed by the preparation of a scheme of propaganda to acquaint the masses with the terrible consequences resulting from the use of dangerous drugs, and thereby to restrict the consumption of such drugs. Should the Advisory Committee be of opinion that it is desirable and expedient to prepare such a scheme, the Assembly of the League of Nations requests the Council to submit the scheme to it at its next session, and to indicate what measures are required in order to carry it into effect.”

The Committee had before it a report on the subject by the Health Committee of the League. The Health Committee expressed the opinion that propaganda directed against the use of dangerous drugs, such as cocaine and morphine, would be likely to arouse curiosity and to do more harm than good and advised that such propaganda should be addressed only to medical practitioners and students. The Advisory Committee were informed that this view was shared by the medical authorities of various Governments and the Committee decided unanimously to adopt it. It therefore recommends that the League should not undertake the preparation of any scheme of general propaganda.

CHINA.

In view of the fact that the situation in China was fully discussed at the First International Opium Conference last November, unfortunately without reaching any definite result, and in view also of the present situation in China, the Committee has not further considered the subject. It desires, however, to reaffirm the resolution adopted by it at its meeting last year, which was to the following effect:

“The Advisory Committee recommends that Powers having extra-territorial rights in China should, if they have not already done so, make regulations, the breach of which shall be punishable by adequate penalties, to control the carrying on by their nationals in China of any trade in the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies. The Committee further recommends that copies of such regulations be communicated to the Secretariat of the League.”

The Progress Report submitted by the Secretary of the Committee, which is published as an annex to the Minutes of the proceedings, shows the present situation in regard to this matter referred to in that resolution.

The Committee also suggests that each year a summary of all the available information in regard to the situation in China should be prepared by the Secretariat and submitted to the Committee for publication with the report and Minutes of its proceedings, being of opinion that an important part of its work would be incomplete and a misleading view of the opium situation would be given, if no information were supplied in regard to the country which is, in fact, at present the chief producer of raw opium.

EXPORTS OF OPIUM FROM THE PERSIAN GULF.

The export of opium from the Persian Gulf to the Far East is, next to the production of opium in China, the most important factor in the illicit traffic in opium which is being carried on in the Far East. The Committee had before it particulars (see memoranda appended to this report) which showed that during the period from May 9th, 1924, to May 25th, 1925, 6,456 cases containing approximately 460 tons of opium were known to have been exported from the port of Bushire. Of this amount, 4,489 cases, or approximately 346 tons, were declared at the port of export as destined for Vladivostock; 506 cases, or approximately 36 tons, for Dairen; 371 cases, or approximately 26 tons, for Keelung; and 350 cases, or approximately 25 tons, for Macao.

Apart from the quantities required for Formosa and the leased territory of Kwantung, it may be stated positively that nearly the whole of these exports were destined for the illicit traffic. Only a very trifling amount of the huge quantity declared as destined for Vladivostock is known to have reached that port. It should be mentioned that the latest information received by the British Government from its mission at Vladivostock is to the effect that the Soviet authorities appear to be doing their best to prevent the illicit traffic in narcotics there.

Persia has not yet ratified the Opium Convention of 1912 or adopted the Import Certificate System recommended by the League, and exports from the Persian Gulf are not controlled by any system of export licences or authorisations. The Committee considers that measures for the effective control of this traffic are of the first importance. Complete control can only be secured by the adoption and enforcement on the part of the Persian Government of the system of export licences and import certificates, and it recommends to the Council and to the Assembly that urgent representations should be addressed to the Persian Government, requesting them to come into line with the other Powers in this respect. It also desires to draw attention to certain subsidiary measures which it would recommend should be put into force as soon as possible by other Powers.

I. The Committee's attention has been called to regulations which have been made by the British Government for the control of the conveyance of opium on British ships from the Persian Gulf and which came into force on January 1st of this year. The regulations are in the following terms:

"1. The Master of any British ship sailing from the Persian Gulf with opium on board shall, before obtaining clearance, be required:

"(a) To make an affidavit stating the real destination of the opium;

"(b) In the case of exports to countries that have adopted the Importation Certificate System recommended by the League of Nations or entered into a similar agreement with His Majesty's Government, to produce a certificate of the Government of the country of destination authorising the import of the opium; and

"(c) To enter into a bond for the delivery of the opium at that destination."

It will be seen on reference to the memoranda referred to above, which are appended to this report, that ships of other nationalities are engaged in this traffic and also that there is a tendency to evade the restrictions which are imposed by the British Regulations, by transferring a vessel from the British to some other flag. The Committee suggests that the Council should ask all Governments whose flag is carried by ships trading to the Persian Gulf to consider the possibility of adopting the same regulations, or other regulations suited to the circumstances of the individual country, which would effectively control the carriage of opium on ships bearing their flag and prevent its diversion to the illicit traffic. A recommendation in general terms to this effect was made by the Second International Opium Conference and appears as Resolution 2 in the Final Act appended to the Convention.

II. The fact that the Persian Gulf is distant from the Far East and that consequently the traffic from the Persian Gulf to the Far East can only be carried on in large vessels makes it necessary in many cases for the distribution of the opium to the various illicit destinations for which it is intended to be effected by means of transshipment into smaller vessels at various ports *en route*. In the Convention concluded by the Second International Opium Conference last February, a provision is inserted (Article 15) for the control of transshipment of opium or drugs *en route*. The Committee would suggest that that provision should be put into force immediately by any Power at whose ports transshipment of opium from the Persian Gulf at present takes place, without waiting for the Convention to come into operation.

Reference has been made above to the transfer of vessels from the British flag to the flag of some other country which has not imposed similar restrictions. The Committee is not aware under what conditions such transfer is allowed by the countries in question, nor has it sufficient information to enable it to consider whether any useful suggestions could be made to meet the difficulty. It would suggest that the question might be referred by the Council to the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

A large amount of information on the subject of the illicit traffic has accumulated during the year which has elapsed since the last meeting of the Committee. A number of important

seizures have been made in Europe, in the Far East and in America which have thrown a great deal of light on the extent of the illicit traffic, the people who are engaged in it and the methods by which it is carried on. Particulars of one or two of the most important of these seizures will be found in the memoranda appended to this report. The information which has been obtained has disclosed the names of a number of firms and persons engaged in this traffic, some of whom had previously come under the notice of the Committee, and others were brought to light for the first time. The information also throws a great deal of light on the manner in which the traffic is organised, the huge financial resources at the back of it and the world-wide connections of the persons engaged. The Committee considered it desirable to discuss in private session the measures which had been taken by the various Governments for the purpose of discovering traffickers and their operations and the sources from which their supplies are obtained, and the other measures which should be taken for dealing with the situation. The Committee has framed a resolution indicating in general terms the action which, in its opinion, should be taken by the Governments. This resolution is appended to the report. The Committee would emphasise in particular its view that any manufacturer or dealer possessing the licence or authorisation of his Government to manufacture, deal in or be in possession of the drugs, who is discovered to be knowingly supplying drugs or procuring them for the purpose of the illicit traffic, should be dealt with, whether criminal proceedings are taken against him or not, by the withdrawal of his licence or authorisation.

The Committee is aware that the provisions of the new Convention, if ratified and enforced by all the Powers, will provide a much more effective means for preventing the illicit traffic than exists at present, but it considers the existing situation to be so serious that it thinks that the League should urge upon all its members to adopt and put into force immediately — if they have not already done so — the administrative measures which are indicated in the Committee's resolution.

As the Committee has stated in its previous reports, the illicit traffic can never be entirely prevented so long as the drugs continue to be manufactured in quantities greatly in excess of the quantities required for the scientific and medical needs of the world. The limitation of the manufacture of the drugs to the amounts so required is essential, and the Committee hope that the provisions of the new Convention will eventually lead to that result. Some time must elapse, however, before the Convention produces its full effect and, in the meantime, and even afterwards, the most vigorous action on the part of the Governments for the control of the traffic in drugs, both national and international, will be necessary.

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS.

At its meeting last year, the Committee decided that, in view of the fact that the question of the international control of the traffic was to be considered by the International Conferences to be held in the autumn, it would be better to postpone until the present year the further consideration of the second resolution adopted by the Assembly in 1922. That resolution reads as follows:

“The Assembly inclines to the view that the Governments which are Parties to the International Opium Convention should be asked to agree not to issue licences for the import of opium, or the other drugs to which the Convention applies, from any country which has not yet ratified and put into force the Convention, and adopted the system for the control of exports and imports approved by the Second Assembly in paragraph 1 (3) of the resolution adopted on September 30th, 1921, and previously approved by the Council on June 28th, 1921. The Assembly considers this question important and urgent, but, recognising the complicated and technical character of the issues involved, it is of opinion that the matter should be examined in detail by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium before any definite action is taken. It therefore requests the Council to convene a meeting of the Advisory Committee, as soon as possible, to study the question, and should that Committee report in favour of the proposal, the Council is asked to act at the earliest possible date on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in the form approved by the Council, and without further reference to the Assembly if the Council considers such reference unnecessary.”

The question of the action to be taken by the Powers towards a country which does not apply the provisions of the Hague Convention, or the new Convention in regard to the control of the international trade, was considered by the Second International Conference. The Conference did not recommend the adoption of the measures suggested in the resolution of the Assembly, but provided in Article 18 of the Convention that:

“If any Contracting Party finds it impossible to apply any provisions of this Chapter to trade with another country by reason of the fact that such country is not a party to the present Convention, such Contracting Party will only be bound to apply the provisions of this Chapter so far as the circumstances permit.”

and in Article 26 that:

“In the case of a country which is not a party to the present Convention, the Central Board may take the same measures as are specified in Article 24”, etc.

In view of this decision on the part of the Conference, the Committee did not consider that it would be desirable at this time to reopen the question raised by the resolution of the Assembly

and that its further consideration should be postponed indefinitely. When the provisions of the new Convention have been in operation for some time and it is seen whether any substantial difficulties arise or not in connection with countries which stand outside the Convention, the question can be brought up again for further consideration if it should be found necessary.

The Committee had under consideration a suggestion from the British Government as to the manner in which the obligation which will arise under Article 13 of the new Convention to transmit a copy of any export authorisation to the Government of the importing country, and the similar obligation in respect of diversion certificates under Article 15, can best be carried out. The British Government called attention to the importance of avoiding delay in the transmission of the documents in question and suggested that the most satisfactory method to ensure this would be by direct communication between the actual officers who issue and receive such documents in each country. This would be in accordance with the view expressed in the report of the Sub-Committee of the Second Conference on whose recommendations the proposals in Chapter V of the Convention were adopted, that

“A copy should be sent direct from the competent authorities in the one country to the competent authorities in the other and not through the diplomatic channels.”

This procedure, which was in line with the procedure recommended by the Advisory Committee for the communication of information in regard to the illicit traffic, is recommended by the Committee for general adoption when the Convention comes into force. It was pointed out, however, that in some cases the Government might find it more convenient to transmit the documents to its consular officer in the importing country and the Committee think that this might be agreed to when desired.

The attention of the Committee was drawn to a treaty which had been recently concluded between His Britannic Majesty, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, and the United States of America, concerning the extradition of offenders against the laws relating to opium and dangerous drugs. The Committee was also informed that the question of extending the existing extradition treaty between Great Britain and the United States of America to those offences was also under consideration. The Committee, in view of the gravity of many of the offences committed in connection with the traffic in opium and drugs, adopted the resolution which is appended to this report.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSESSORS.

The Committee was asked by the Council to consider what special qualifications would be required in future for the appointment of assessors, in order to secure the most effective assistance possible for the Committee in carrying on its work.

The Committee desires to place on record its sense of the great value of the assistance which has been given to it during the past five years by the present assessors, more particularly in connection with the difficult questions which have arisen in connection with the situation in the Far East and also in connection with the commercial aspect of the many questions relating to the general control of the international traffic.

The Committee has carefully considered, as desired by the Council, the nature of the expert assistance which would be of the most value to it in the future for the efficient conduct of its work. It recognises that the situation has changed to some extent since the first appointment of the assessors in 1921. The Committee has been enlarged to include representatives of other States and a number of questions which came before it for consideration in the earlier years have now been definitely settled, more particularly by the new Agreement and Convention adopted by the International Opium Conferences in 1924-25. The creation of a Permanent Central Board provided for in Chapter VI of the Convention will also, when that Convention comes into operation affect to a considerable extent the duties of the Advisory Committee. How far the creation of the Central Board will affect these duties cannot at present be clearly foreseen and the suggestions, therefore, that the Committee has to make in regard to the appointment of assessors should be regarded as provisional only. The qualifications which the Committee, on a careful review of its work, considers as essential are, to state them very briefly, the following:

1. Knowledge of conditions generally in the Far East.
2. Knowledge of the commercial side of the questions which arise in connection with the control of the international traffic, Customs practice, trade statistics, etc.
3. Knowledge of what may be called the “police” side of the administration of the laws in regard to opium and dangerous drugs, more particularly in regard to the international control of the traffic, the measures adopted for tracking the operations of illicit traffickers, the sources from which the supplies are drawn and so on.

DATE OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Committee has referred above to the importance of that part of its work which consists in the examination at its annual meeting of the reports received from the various Governments. As its annual meetings have hitherto been mostly held in the spring or summer, it has only had before it for examination the reports relating to the year but one preceding the year in which the meeting was held and in some cases only the reports for a still earlier year. Consequently,

the information which it has had to consider has been to a large extent out of date. As it is impossible for the reports of the more distant countries to reach the Secretariat before the latter months of the year and some time is also required by the Secretariat for the circulation of the reports and the preparation of a summary of their contents, the Committee has considered whether it would not be desirable to alter the date of its annual meeting. It has decided that, starting from 1927, the annual meeting should be held some time during the month of January. This will reduce the interval between the end of the year to which the reports relate and their examination by the Committee to about twelve months. Even this interval is long, but it seems impossible to shorten it.

RESOLUTIONS.

- I. (i) The Committee desires to call the attention of the Council and the Assembly to the prevalence of the illicit traffic in the drugs at the present time, its organised character and the large financial resources behind it, as indicated by the documents laid before the Committee and appended to its report.
 - (ii) Its examination of these reports and of the action taken by various Governments as indicated in the reports leads the Committee to urge, in amplification of its previous recommendations on the subject,
 - (a) That in all cases in which illicit transactions are discovered or suspected the most energetic steps should be taken by the Government to follow up every clue which may lead to the discovery of the persons engaged in the traffic.
 - (b) That any information pointing to the complicity of any person or persons in another country should be *immediately* communicated to the Government of that country with a view to similar investigations being made. (The recommendations made by the Committee in 1922 and 1923 have, in many cases, not been acted upon by the Governments.) A report of the results of the investigations should be sent to the Government communicating the information (and to the Secretariat of the League in any case in which the communication is made through the Secretariat.)
 - (c) That the particulars so communicated should be as full as possible and should include in particular, if known, a description of the packages and the *marks* on the packages, the names and addresses of the consigner and consignee, the names and addresses of any agents through whom the goods have passed, the place from which the goods were despatched, the date on which they were despatched, the name of the ship (or description of the route) by which they were despatched, etc., etc. Specimens of the containers and labels should also be sent.
 - (iii) The Committee would also lay great stress on the importance of discovering the sources from which the supplies are obtained by the illicit traffickers and of dealing severely with firms of licensed manufacturers and dealers who are found to be knowingly supplying drugs for the illicit traffic. In the opinion of the Committee, the most effective method of dealing with such manufacturers and dealers is to deprive them of their licence or authorisation to manufacture, deal in or be in possession of the drugs, and it recommends that this course should be considered by the Government in each case.
 - (iv) The Committee would also draw attention to the fact that, in some of the most important cases mentioned in the documents before it, it has not been possible for the Governments to take any action for the punishment of the persons engaged, for the reason that no offence against the laws of the country had been committed, and it would point out that this fact strongly emphasises the importance of the provisions in Article 29 of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference in February 1925.
- II. The Committee desires to call the attention of the Council to the large illicit traffic in opium which is being carried on between the Persian Gulf and the Far East and it suggests:
 - (a) That the Persian Government should be urged to put into force *without delay* an effective system of control over exports of opium from Persian ports, more particularly by the adoption of the system of export authorisations and import certificates in respect of each consignment;
 - (b) That Powers whose flag is carried by ships engaged in trade with the Persian Gulf should be recommended to adopt measures to control the conveyance of opium from the Persian Gulf on such ships and to prevent its diversion into the illicit traffic;
 - (c) That Powers at whose ports vessels conveying opium from the Persian Gulf call should be recommended to put in force at once the measures contained in Chapter V of the Convention concluded by the Second International Opium Conference for the control of transshipment of consignments of opium and dangerous drugs.
 - III. The Committee asks the Council to represent to the States Members of the League or Parties to the Convention the importance for the work of the Committee of the annual reports

relating to the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs being despatched in no case later than October 1st following the year to which the reports relate in the case of the Far Eastern States, or than July 1st in the case of other States.

IV. The Committee is of the opinion that it is not desirable that any scheme of propaganda for the purpose of acquainting the general public with the consequences resulting from the abuse of dangerous drugs should be prepared or recommended by the League.

V. The Committee, having had its attention called to the extradition treaty recently concluded between the United States and Canada in respect of offenders against the laws relating to opium and dangerous drugs and being impressed with the gravity of many of the offences against those laws, suggests to the Council that the attention of the Governments Members of the League or parties to the Convention might be called to the conclusion of this treaty, and that they might be asked to examine the question, with a view to the possible conclusion of similar treaties.

VI. The Committee, having considered the method by which the provisions in Article 13 and 15 of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference (that a copy of any export authorisation or diversion certificate shall be sent to the Government of the importing country) can be best carried into effect, recommends that the copies should be sent direct by the authority which issues the certificate to the corresponding authority in the importing country, and that, on the Convention coming into operation, a list of the authorities in the different countries charged with the issue and reception of such certificates should be issued by the Council to all the signatory States.

Alternatively, a copy might be sent, if preferred, through the consular or diplomatic officer in the importing country.

VII. The Committee, having had its attention called to a statement in certain official statistics circulated by the Secretariat that an import of "prepared opium" had been made from another country (an import which would be contrary to the provisions of the Hague Convention), considers that in such a case where there is *prima facie* reason for questioning the correctness of the statement, the Secretariat should, as a general rule, before circulating the document to other Governments, make enquiry, officially or unofficially, of the Government supplying it as to the correctness of the statement.

Appendix 1.

STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO ANNUAL REPORTS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE AND PARTIES TO THE OPIUM CONVENTION OF 1921.

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

| | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 |
|------------------------|--|------|------|------|
| ABYSSINIA ¹ | | | | |
| | Letter despatched to the Secretariat on October 23rd, 1924. No manufacture, consumption or traffic. Small quantities imported for medicinal purposes. | | | |
| ALBANIA | | | | |
| | Letter despatched to Secretariat on March 10th, 1923. Cannot answer questions in Annual Report form. Dangerous drugs only used for medicinal purposes. | | | |
| ARGENTINE | — | — | — | — |
| AUSTRALIA | × | — | × | — |
| AUSTRIA | — | × | × | — |
| BELGIUM | × | × | × | — |
| BOLIVIA ² | × | × | — | — |
| BRAZIL ³ | — | × | — | — |
| BULGARIA ¹ | — | — | × | — |

¹ In these cases, statistics were sent in reply to a request made by the Opium Preparatory Committee for the information of the Conferences.
² Cocaine statistics only sent.
³ Imports only.

| | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| CANADA | — | × | × | × |
| CHILE ² | × | × | × | — |
| * CHINA | — | × | — | — |
| COLOMBIA | — | — | — | — |
| COSTA RICA | — | — | — | — |
| CUBA ² | × | × | × | — |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | — | — | × | — |
| DANZIG | — | — | × | × |
| DENMARK | — | × | × | — |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | — | × | × | × |
| Letter despatched to the Secretariat on January 10th, 1924. No manufacture. Imports chiefly from France and U.S.A. | | | | |
| ECUADOR | — | — | — | — |
| ESTHONIA | × | × | × | — |
| FINLAND | — | — | × | × |
| FRANCE | — | — | × | × |
| GERMANY | × | — | — | — |
| GREAT BRITAIN | × | × | × | × |
| GREECE ¹ | × | × | × | — |
| GUATEMALA ² | × | × | — | — |
| HAITI ² | — | — | — | — |
| Letter despatched to the Secretariat on January 8th, 1924. No year stated, but annual imports, exports and consumption given. | | | | |
| HONDURAS | — | — | — | — |
| HUNGARY ¹ | × | × | × | × |
| ICELAND | — | — | — | — |
| *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. | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS | × | × | × | — |
| NEW ZEALAND | × | × | × | × |
| NICARAGUA ¹ | — | — | — | — |
| NORWAY ⁴ | — | × | × | × |
| PANAMA | — | — | — | — |
| Letter despatched on March 26th, 1923, saying that details were sent in reply to questionnaire of 1921. | | | | |
| PARAGUAY | — | — | — | — |
| PERSIA ¹ | × | × | — | — |
| PERU | — | — | — | — |
| POLAND | × | × | × | — |
| PORTUGAL | — | — | — | — |
| ROUMANIA ⁵ | × | × | × | — |
| SALVADOR | — | — | — | — |
| No year given. General information despatched to the Secretariat on June 20th, 1923. | | | | |
| KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES | — | — | — | — |
| *SIAM | × | × | × | × |
| SPAIN ⁴ | — | — | × | × |
| (1st 3 months only) | | | | |
| SWEDEN | — | × | × | × |
| SWITZERLAND | — | — | — | — |
| Statistics for 1921, 1922 and 1923 were forwarded by Dr. Carrière (Document O.C. 206). | | | | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | × | × | × | × |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | × | × | × | — |
| URUGUAY | — | — | — | — |
| VENEZUELA | × | — | — | — |

¹ In these cases, statistics were sent in reply to a request made by the Opium Preparatory Committee for the information of the Conference.

² Imports only.

³ Imports and exports.

⁴ Imports and consumption.

⁵ Consumption figures.

* The asterisks denote that the reports are not yet due from those States against which they are placed, as the date for the despatch of reports from Far-Eastern States is October 1st.

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

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

| | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>British</i> | | | | |
| Ceylon | × | × | × | × |
| HONG-KONG | — | × | × | × |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS | × | × | × | — |
| <i>French</i> | | | | |
| INDO-CHINA | × | × | × | — |
| <i>Japanese</i> | | | | |
| CHOSEN | × | × | × | — |
| FORMOSA | × | × | × | — |
| KWANTUNG | × | × | × | — |
| <i>Netherlands</i> | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS | | | | |
| EAST INDIES | × | × | × | — |
| <i>Portuguese</i> | | | | |
| MACAO | — | × | — | × |

Appendix 2.

IMPORT CERTIFICATES SYSTEM.

| States which have accepted system and put it into force. | States which have accepted system but have not yet put it into force. | States which have accepted system but have not intimated whether it is in force or not. |
|--|---|---|
| ALBANIA. | NETHERLANDS. | BRAZIL. |
| AUSTRALIA. | | DANZIG. |
| AUSTRIA. | | LITHUANIA. |
| BELGIUM. | | |
| BULGARIA. | | |
| CANADA. | | |
| CUBA. | | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA. | | |
| DENMARK. | | |
| FINLAND. | | |
| GERMANY. | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN. | | |
| GREECE. | | |
| GUATEMALA. | | |
| HAITI. | | |
| HUNGARY. | | |
| INDIA. | | |
| IRISH FREE STATE. | | |
| JAPAN. | | |
| LATVIA. | | |
| MEXICO. | | |
| NEW ZEALAND. | | |
| NORWAY. | | |
| PANAMA. | | |
| POLAND. | | |
| SIAM. | | |
| SPAIN. | | |
| SWEDEN. | | |
| SWITZERLAND. | | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA. | | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. | | |

Additional Information.

| | |
|------------|--|
| ARGENTINE. | No communication has been received from this Government, but a copy of a decree on the subject was forwarded to the Secretariat by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. |
| ESTHONIA. | Accepted the system in 1922, but has since written to say that there are no regulations in existence in Esthonia by which such certificates could be authorised. With the exception of substances which, in view of public safety or health, are only admitted on the authorisation of the Ministry of the Interior, importation is entirely free. |
| ICELAND. | States that it is ready to adopt the system, but that a further communication will be sent on the subject. |
| LUXEMBURG. | In 1922 accepted the principle of the system and stated that a certificate was already in use, which would be modified to bring it into conformity with League system. According to copies of a certificate sent in 1923, this does not conform to the League system. |
| PERU. | In 1921 accepted the principle of the system, but on receipt of a later letter from the Secretariat in December 1922, a reply was received stating that the Government was still considering the advisability of adopting the system. |

Appendix 3.

MEMORANDUM ON INFORMATION RECEIVED WITH REGARD TO ILLICIT SHIPMENT OF DANGEROUS DRUGS.

I.

In May 1925 the British Government received information of a series of illicit shipments of dangerous drugs, which had been made by a Russian named Jacob Midler of Rue Breughel 38, Antwerp, on behalf of a Russian named David Samsonovitch, to Cuba and to destinations in the Far East.

As a result, the following seizures were effected.

Ex. s.s. *Antiochia*. The consignment consisted of 9 cases containing iron safes consigned to Havana. The Cuban Government on May 27th seized 600 kilos of opium concealed in the walls of the safes.

Ex. s.s. *Peru*. The consignment consisted of 7 cases declared to contain woollen goods and chemicals consigned to Dalny. On May 30th the Government of Hong-Kong seized 50 kilos of morphia in cubes concealed in the cases.

Later in June the authorities at Dairen seized 55 lbs. morphin concealed in another case of this consignment.

Ex. s.s. *Haruna Maru*. The consignment consisted of 8 casks containing carbolic acid crystals consigned to Dalny via Kobe. On May 31st the Government of Singapore seized 63 lbs. of morphia concealed in the casks.

Another consignment of eight casks carbolic acid despatched from Antwerp on this vessel was found by the authorities at Dairen to contain 32 kilos of morphia.

Ex. s.s. *Amazon Maru*. The consignment consisted of 25 casks of carbolic acid consigned to "B. James, of Yohohama, who will arrange about delivery at Dalny". On May 31st the Government of Singapore seized 139 lbs. of morphia concealed in the casks.

Ex. s.s. *Glentara*. The consignment consisted of 16 cases of iron bedsteads consigned to Shanghai. On June 16th the Government of Hong-Kong seized 2,622 ozs. of heroin concealed in the hollow legs of the bedsteads.

Ex. s.s. *Havestein*. The consignment consisted of 5 cases declared to contain various harmless chemicals consigned to Dalny direct, or via Kobe. On June 29th, the authorities of Singapore seized 110 lbs. of morphine packed in tins concealed in the cases.

With the possible exception of the consignment of bedsteads on the s.s. *Glentara* and the second consignment of carbolic acid on the s.s. *Haruna Maru* seized at Dalny, all the consignments had been despatched, in the first instance, from Basle by the firm of Macdonald & Co.

In this connection, reference may be made to the seizure effected by the Netherlands Government at Rotterdam about the same time of 540 kilos of opium concealed in 12 cases of iron safes. These cases had also been despatched by Macdonald & Co., at Basle and shipped from Antwerp to Rotterdam at the order of Jacob Midler. Midler was arrested in Holland, but subsequently released as apparently he had not committed any offence against the opium law of the Netherlands.

A point of interest with regard to this series of seizures is the skilful methods employed by the traffickers to conceal the drugs, which must have entailed considerable expense and preparation on their part. They emphasise the extent of expert experience which is required to detect the concealed drugs, and the consequent desirability of subjecting consignments coming from any suspected source to a very thorough search.

In order to discover the opium concealed in the safes, for instance, the Customs authorities in Cuba had to drill through the bottom of the safes, and it was found necessary to break up the safes in order to obtain it.

The heroin in the bedsteads seized at Hong-Kong was packed in tin tubes specially made to fit in the hollow legs of the iron bedsteads. The bedsteads themselves appear to have been adapted to the purpose, there being, above the castors, which were made to screw off, plugs which, after the heroin had been inserted, were soldered into place.

II.

In February 1925, the Authorities at Hong-Kong seized 111 lbs. morphine ex the s.s. *Gemma* in 7 cases declared to contain gelatine. The cases had been shipped by the firm of H.C.H. Hoffmann at Bremen, and bore railway labels which indicated that they were originally despatched from Frankfort-on-Main. This information was at once sent to the German Government, who, on July 4th, reported that the morphine confiscated at Hong-Kong had been sold and despatched by Messrs. Rudolph Osk Raebel at Frankfort-on-Main to Messrs. Uda & Company, of Shanghai, that Messrs. Raebel held a permit for export trade in narcotics, and that the consignment had been exported for China on September 11th, 1924, under export permits issued by the Ministry of Health of the Reich. It was ascertained that the morphine had been packed together with 299 kilos of gelatine in 7 cases which had been declared as gelatine, and the explanation of this which was offered by Messrs. Raebel was that it had been done in accordance with the custom of the trade in order to protect the consignment from the danger of theft. The German authorities state that they do not consider this course to be admissible, but that the German Opium Law of December 30th, 1920, gave no ground for a criminal prosecution.

Subsequent to the communication made to the German Government, but prior to the receipt of their report of July 4th, a full account of the investigations following the seizure which was made by the Government of Hong-Kong was received by the British Government. As a result, it was discovered that the seven cases comprised one of a series of shipments which had been made by Heinrich Hoffmann, of Bremen, to a Japanese named T. Uda; that Hoffmann had sent bills of lading to Uda in Kobe and that Uda had forwarded them to Hong-Kong; that five other cases of drugs had been on board the s.s. *Gemma* consigned to Shanghai and that Uda had gone from Kobe to Shanghai to meet this consignment.

This further information was forwarded to the German Government, the result of whose investigations have not yet been received.

Extracts from letters addressed by Heinrich Hoffmann, of 27 Schelfmühle, Bremen. Cable address: Yamato. Telephone: Roland 7580. To T. Uda, c/o H. Parsonage & Co., No. 3, Hachimandori 3-chome, Kobe.

I. Date: January 3rd, 1925.

"I have received your three letters of 19th and 22nd November which I have read with much interest. I am very sorry that our mutual efforts to do business in *Dark Brown* have not been successful so far; but I trust that we shall come to some positive result when you come to Germany again this summer. I note that you will leave there in April with one of your partners and an expert. . . . hope to be successful in my efforts to obtain prices which are not so much out of the way as those quoted recently. The price of course will always be a delicate point, as it is very difficult or impossible to compete against such people as S. S. & Co. During the present month I shall go to Frankfurt to discuss all points with Mr. Th. . . . For transportation I believe a motorship will be the most suitable, because it requires no coal, so that it will not be necessary to call at any port, which is a very important point. . . . I regret to hear that you found your profit in this business too small. I was under the impression that you shared in the whole profit, but now I understand that that was only the case with the Chiat Sing party. . . . It is peculiar that your friends want powder, whereas I am informed that other importers always ask for cubes.

"*Risk of seizure.* — With reference to my letter of 19th November, I regret that it was impossible to cover risk of confiscation, and therefore the amount of £185 is due to you which I propose to deduct from the next order."

II. Date January 10th, 1925.

“ Regarding the risk of seizure I must say that I am feeling rather uneasy about this insurance, because I had formerly written you that I could cover the risk. But suddenly the Insurance Companies stopped to accept it, so that in spite of my efforts I could not cover the risk. I assure you that I am feeling very sorry about it. The decision of the insurance companies came quite unexpectedly and could not be foreseen by me. Sooner or later the insurance companies may resume the business again, but kindly understand that I can never guarantee that the risk will actually and finally be accepted by them. On the whole I have not much confidence in this insurance, as I already wrote you in previous letters; but if your partners wish to insure the risk when it is possible, I shall always do my best with the above understanding. But I think it is best to persuade them that it is advisable not to rely on insurance and to drop the whole question as it will always be an uncertain matter. ”

III. Dated January 17th, 1925.

“ I have read with much interest what you say about future business and am very glad to learn that you have succeeded in bringing your former competitors under your control. Such being the case, I have no doubt that further orders in white will follow in due course before you leave for Europe in April, as advised. I know the Hamburg people with whom your competitors have been doing business.

“*Establishment of Godown Company.* — No doubt it is very smart of your party to establish their own godown company which will considerably facilitate the delivery of the goods.

“*Steamship Company.* — [Writer proceeds to discuss at length the price of old and new tonnage, quoting four steamers in particular. He states that motor tonnage is dearer, but that vessels of 700 to 800 tons are hard to get as they are generally built for special purposes.]

“As to motor ships Motor sailers (*i.e.*, sailing ships with motor engines) which are being used here frequently, especially for the trade with America, are comparatively easy to get. . . . I think such sailing with motor engines are the most suitable for the trade.

“[The writer then discusses at length the establishment of a shipping office for which he offers his services as an expert, and states that registration can be made either in his personal name or that of a neutral.] The four prescriptions have been passed on to the factory. Your telegram of yesterday's date has duly come to hand reading as follows: 'Read from Condenser. Want lowest possible quotations cubes. Exact quantity cannot be determined at present. Dimensions.' The last code word must have been slightly mutilated (dunog instead of dunug). The matter is being attended to now, and I shall reply as soon as possible. I am informed that C. I. & Co. are doing the same business. ”

III.

NOTE ON THE OPERATIONS OF A SYNDICATE FOR IMPORTING OPIUM AND NARCOTICS, AS DISCLOSED BY THE SEIZURE OF DOCUMENTS AT 51, CANTON ROAD, SHANGHAI, IN JANUARY 1925.

This case arose from a complaint lodged before the Mixed Court at Shanghai by G. Dodounashvili and N. E. B. Ezra that Yih Ching Woo, C. K. Yap and Zung Taz-Moo disposed of certain stolen opium contrary to the provisions of the Chinese Criminal Code. At the same time, a petition in Civil action was brought before the Court against the same persons and Gwanho and Co. and Ting Liong and Co., it being alleged that 180 cases of opium which had been shipped from Constantinople for Vladivostock on a bill of lading jointly owned by the plaintiffs had been feloniously removed from the ship by the defendants and sold by them at Shanghai. A search warrant and warrant of arrest were issued, and, as a result of the discoveries made upon the execution of the search warrant, the Municipal Police charged the defendants, together with other Chinese found on the premises of 51, Canton Road, with various offences in connection with the illicit importation, sale and possession of opium. These charges were heard before the Mixed Court and Yih Ching Woo was sentenced to imprisonment for 18 months and a fine of \$500; Zung Taz-Moo to nine months' imprisonment and a fine of \$500. C. K. Yap fled from justice.

The papers seized in Shanghai do not disclose in what way the syndicate came to be formed; it is evident, however, that the actual organisation was in the hands of a member of Gwanho & Company of Shanghai. The syndicate was financed by a Japanese in Kobe named M. Kanako, to whom was handed, on October 20th, 1924, "the whole account of your concerned". Beyond this, nothing is known of M. Kanako.

From the accounts presented to M. Kanako, it is possible to reconstruct the arrangements made. The syndicate got into touch with a merchant captain named H. Yamasaki. In October, November or December (the accounts give different dates) he received large payments in dollars, pounds and yen, either through or on behalf of the firm of H. M. H. Nemazee. H. M. H. Nemazee and Co. are a large firm of brokers in the Far East, whose dealings in opium between the Persian Gulf and China are notorious. This firm has a branch in Shanghai. Although, as will be seen,

Yamasaki got into trouble in Japan, he seems to have made a very good thing out of the voyage and to have received large and continuous sums of money from Shanghai.

The s.s. *Kamagata Maru* (owners, Kahafuto Kisen Kaisha, at Nishinomyia) was chartered through the firm of Y. Sate and Co., of Naniwa-Nachi, Kobe, in October 1923, and the vessel left Wakamatsu on or about December 4th, 1923. On January 24th the ship arrived at Genoa, where she took on board 26 cases of drugs, which were shipped by Burckhardt Walter & Co., and consigned to S. O. Ebralidze, at Vladivostock. The seized documents show that these drugs came from Basle. Enquiries have been made of the Italian Government as to the origin of these cases¹. As will be seen later, the syndicate had been in frequent communication with two firms in Basle, from either of whom the drugs may have been obtained. The *Kamagata Maru* proceeded to Constantinople via Smyrna, where she arrived on February 24th.

According to the Danish Vice-Consul at Constantinople, who is responsible for the protection of Chinese subjects in Turkey, C. K. Yap, evidently acting as super-cargo, was accompanied by C. Huang, his secretary and interpreter, and a Russian Jew who was fraudulently in possession of a Chinese passport. The Russian Jew may have been either G. Leonoff or Grigori Alexeevitch Dodounashvili (Dadanashvilli), referred to below. C. K. Yap seems to be a man of superior intelligence, for amongst the papers discovered at Shanghai was found a well-written, descriptive and statistical study of the production of opium in Turkey, of which he was the author.

On November 1st, 1923 (*i.e.*, some months previous to the arrival of the *Kamagata Maru* in Constantinople), Dodounashvili contracted to buy from Vahaboff et Frères, Stamboul Dilziz, Zade Khan No. 12, 10,000 kilos of Anatolian opium, the opium to contain not less than 10 per cent morphia — £4,993 to be paid by Dodounashvili as earnest money through the Constantinople Branch of the Banque Hollandaise pour la Méditerranée. This contract is the only paper seized which refers to Dodounashvili. As will be seen later, he appears in Shanghai with N. E. B. Ezra as a claimant against the syndicate for misappropriation of the opium. It is evident, however, that Dodounashvili purchased the opium on behalf of the syndicate, for all subsequent communications with regard to the opium were made direct to Vahaboff by Gwanho and Co. from Shanghai.

The *Kamagata Maru* loaded with 2,200 tons of salt at Smyrna, and 180 cases of opium at Constantinople. The papers seized at Shanghai tell us little about the return journey of the *Kamagata Maru*. It is known, however, that she arrived at Sabang in April 1924, where, upon search, she was found to contain 180 cases of raw opium hidden behind a wooden screen in one of the holds, together with 26 cases of drugs. Both the drugs and the opium were consigned to S. O. Ebralidze at Vladivostock. S. Ebralidze appears to be a Caucasian, resident at Vladivostock, who has for years past been engaged in the opium trade. In 1921-22, when the trade was legal in Vladivostock, he was in partnership with one Eugene Mende, a naturalised British subject of Swiss origin. The practice of the partnership was to obtain licences to import opium, which were used as a cover to obtain opium abroad. The opium was never imported into Vladivostock, but transhipped into junks and clandestinely conveyed to China. The partnership also exported locally-grown opium. Ebralidze bought from the Soviet Government the rights of an opium monopoly, which, however, was peremptorily stopped by the Central Government in Moscow.

For his failure to report the cargo of opium, Yamasaki was fined 2,000 guilders, but as there was no evidence that the opium was intended for smuggling into Dutch territory, the ship was allowed to sail from Sabang with the opium and drugs on board on April 3rd. It is a matter of surmise where the *Kamagata Maru* went to between April 13th, when she was heard calling up Manila by wireless, and May 3rd, when she arrived at Kobe, or whether, indeed, she touched at any point between Sabang and Kobe. It is not possible, from the documents, to ascertain definitely whether the opium and drugs were discharged from the *Kamagata Maru* before or after she arrived at Kobe.

The account to Kaneko written in Kobe shows that part of the opium was sold in small lots, day by day, commencing on June 6th, and ending with October 10th, the remaining 138,708 taels in stock being handed over to the "partnership". As the opium was sold in Shanghai, it is clear that it reached that port before June 6th. The s.s. *Kamagata Maru*, according to *Lloyd's Weekly Shipping Summary* of July 9th left Kobe on May 10th, ostensibly for Vladivostock. She had not arrived at that port by August 15th, if she ever did. Of the 180 cases of opium, 124 cases were transported to Shanghai and 56 to Swatow. The cost of this transport (the accounts use the term "carry-hire") was \$148,880 for the opium to Shanghai, and \$67,200 for the opium to Swatow.

Large sums were also paid for the "carry-hire" of the morphia and heroin.

From an article in the *Japan Chronicle* dated May 15th, it appears that the Water Police at Kobe, upon information obtained abroad, searched the *Kamagata Maru* four days after her arrival, and took many of the crew into custody, but that they were subsequently released, Yamasaki alone being detained.

Payments were made for food to Yamasaki whilst in gaol from May 26th to May 30th, when he appears to have been released. The crew of the *Kamagata Maru* were entertained at the Kobe Gin Shati Restaurant on June 16th. The *Japan Chronicle* reports the *Kobe Shimbun* as stating that Yamasaki distributed a large sum of money as a reward to the crew on May 7th, and as implying that in consequence no evidence could be obtained from any member of the crew.

Wherever the *Kamagata Maru* discharged her cargo of opium, it is clear how it was brought into Shanghai. By an Agreement dated November 20th, 1924, between the Phoo-Li Co. and the Dzienkyih Co. (*i.e.*, Yih Ching Woo), it was agreed that the Phoo-Li Co. should receive, transport, store and despatch with guard, opium belonging to the Dzienkyih Co. The Phoo-Li Co. undertook to transport opium from ships outside the Port of Woosung to the Dzienkyih Co. or any part of the Kiang Su Province. "Kautshaungmiao" is the Chinese name of the arsenal,

¹ For reply from the Italian Government, see Sub-Appendix.

and the arsenal was under the direct control of the Defence Commissioner, the highest military official in Shanghai. The cost of transportation of the cases of opium varied according to whether it was Turkish, Persian, or Chinese.

From the accounts presented to Kaneko, it would appear that the whole venture of the *Kamagata Maru* resulted in a loss of \$86,126. This loss could be partially explained by the fact that 32 kilos of drugs (if heroin, at £42 10s. a kilo) were unaccounted for, and entered as "lost", and a very large sum was spent by individuals of the Syndicate in travelling expenses, and in payments to Customs officials, cablegrams, and the like; but it is also probable that the Japanese was being defrauded by his Chinese associates.

The occasion of the discovery by the Settlement Authorities of Shanghai of the operations of the Gwanho Company was the civil proceedings commenced in the Mixed Court by Dodounashvili and a person named N. E. B. Ezra. Dodounashvili was, according to the documents seized, the actual purchaser of the opium from Vahaboff Frères. There is no indication as to the part played in the affair by Ezra. According to the Press reports of the case, he is a resident of Shanghai who originally claimed British citizenship, but in 1911, the year in which an agreement was made between the Chinese and British Governments by which the import of opium into China was restricted (and ultimately abolished in 1912), he registered as a Spanish protégé.

Dodounashvili and Ezra claimed that the cargo of the *Kamagata Maru* had been wrongfully diverted by Gwanho & Company from Vladivostock to Shanghai. No information has come to hand as to the result of the case, as a dispute arose as to the Assessor, the British or the Spanish, before whom the case should be tried, but it is quite evident that the opium was never intended for Vladivostock.

Besides the 180 cases of opium on board the *Kamagata Maru*, Gwanho & Company had purchased further cases from Vahaboff Frères, but as the purchase money could not be raised in time they were not despatched on the *Kamagata Maru*. Many attempts were made during 1924 to get Vahaboff Frères to release these cases without payment.

Leonoff, during this period, was acting for Gwanho & Company in Constantinople, and at one time was arrested at the instigation of Vahaboff. Gwanho & Company then agreed with Hoffman-La-Roche, of Basle, for the latter to deposit in a bank the balance owed to Vahaboff frères, in return for the bills of lading of 33 cases of opium. Vahaboff, however, refused to have dealings with Hoffman-La-Roche, and threatened to obtain the assistance of the Japanese Ambassador to cause the opium to be shipped to Vladivostock by a Japanese steamer.

What was the eventual result with regard to these negotiations is not known, nor whether Vahaboff was behind the civil proceedings taken in Shanghai in January 1925 by Dodounashvili and N. E. B. Ezra. Now is the part played by Leonoff very clear. Leonoff, in his cables to Gwanho, made piteous appeals for his expenses. He seems to have been very hardly treated, and on one occasion Gwanho were informed by a telegram despatched from Pera and signed "Feldman", that Leonoff's condition was terrible. This was probably when he was arrested. In any event, Leonoff was released and received £200 from Gwanho & Company, on December 12th, 1924. The money was sent through a London Bank to Leonoff, c/o Chimipharma, Vernier Geneva, which may be the address of "Mr. Roman" referred to later. The identity of "Feldman", whose name appears more than once in the seized documents, is discussed below.

Besides the purchases of opium made by Vahaboff frères, Gwanho & Company were throughout 1924 making enquiries as to the price of Turkish opium of Sumina and Keun, 23, Gul Camondo Han Galata, Constantinople, and Smyrna, who were anxious to obtain an order. The correspondence between Gwanho and Sumina and Keun is interesting as showing the keen interest displayed by these firms in the activities of the League of Nations and the result of the Opium Conference. Gwanho anxiously enquires if there is any trouble in passing the Suez Canal.

Gwanho & Company also made enquiries of a person or firm E. Wohl, of Saigon, who, in a letter dated April 23rd, 1924, guarantees to ship opium to one port on the coast of China, or any other place on the Chinese coast between Yantze-Kiang and Macao. E. Wohl stipulated that buying and shipping permits should be taken out in the name and at the cost of the buyer, but guaranteed that the buyer should receive a permit. That the permit was to be obtained at Saigon is evident from the following extract from the letter: "In order to facilitate this first transaction, we are willing to pay first-class passages and hotel here for the Chinese representatives when, after signing the contract with our man, they are coming down to take out the shipping permit, and to control the shipping of the goods." E. Wohl also stated in his letter that "we have often enquiries from Siam, Hainam, and China, similar to yours"; and also, "During the month of October our representative will be leaving here for Canton, Tientsin, Peking. If your clients are still desiring, we may instruct him to call on you before going to Peking."

Gwanho & Company's activities were not confined to opium. As was related above, the cargo of the *Kamagata Maru* contained 26 boxes of narcotics, mainly heroin. The drugs came from Basle. \$198,276 (£23,444) was paid for them, in seven telegraphic transfers through the Banque Belge pour l'Étranger, between November 1923 and February 11th, 1924. Two hundred and twelve kilos were sold in quantities ranging between 1,785 ozs. and 105 ozs., between April 9th and August 3rd, 1924.

Two hundred and eighty-four kilos were handed over to the "partnership" and 32 kilos entered as "lost", the total amount resulting from their sale being Mex. \$378,190.

The documents seized do not specify the origin of these drugs, but point to one or both of two firms as being the suppliers:

(1) *F. Hoffman-La Roche & Company, of Basle.*

In an undated letter, Gwanho & Company addressed Hoffman-La Roche, stating that "through the kindness of Mr. Holland we are fortunate in having introduced to you and resulted

in getting 520 kilos of M. H. C. (? Morphia Hydrochlor. Crystals or Cubes) from you last winter. The cargo reached us in good condition and to our greatest satisfaction. We thank you ever so heartily for your kindness done us in the past. . . We have had big and small orders from you all the time. . . For any future big orders we may either have our steamers ready for the shipment or may ask you to ship us or else for the small orders you may send us by parcel post. ”

In a letter dated November 6th, 1924, Hoffman-La Roche & Company forwarded to Gwanho & Company their private code for fine chemicals. This code states that prices for morphia, heroin and cocaine can be had only on application; code words are given for these drugs. This letter was in reply to a cablegram sent by Gwanho & Company to Hoffman-La Roche at Grenzach, and which had been handed over to the firm in Basle to deal with.

(2) *Macdonald & Company, of Richen, Basle.*

This Company is notoriously engaged in the illicit traffic. It was discovered in 1919, when resident at The Hague, to be shipping drugs to the Far East via the Free Port Copenhagen. It subsequently removed to Frieberg, Baden, from whence it transacted a considerable traffic in drugs and arms to the Far East. In consequence of the searching enquiries made by the German Government into its dealings, the firm decided to move to a more convenient centre, and in 1924 established itself at Richen, Basle. The head of the firm is named Macdonald; a partner or manager is named Feltman. Two of the papers seized relate to Macdonald & Company. The first is an undated copy of a telegram in code, which reads:

“Referring to your telegram 28th, we offer firm c.i.f. shipment by steamer promptly. More for kilograms (H.) 42 1/2 lbs parcel post, or cargo steamer. Do not recommend via Italy. Subject to immediate reply. Telegraph remittance Amsterdam or to London. Macdonald.”

The second is a copy of a telegram addressed to Gwanho & Company in code, which reads:

“Prices advancing. Can supply 6,000 ounces prompt shipment.”

It is significant that Macdonald should be prepared to send drugs to China by parcel post. If the “Feldman” of the telegram is identical with Feltman, the manager of Macdonald & Company, it would appear that he has recently been in China on the business of the firm.

(3) *Mr. Roman, of Geneva.*

Among the papers seized was a “Code with Mr. Roman”, which included words signifying heroin, morphia, cocaine, etc., and their despatch by parcel post, by the Hugo Stinnes Line and by the Holland East Asiatic Line. A note is appended that the steamers leave Hamburg and Genoa once a fortnight, and that goods sent via France must be accompanied with indigo.

A telegram handed in at Geneva on December 23rd, 1924, in code, informs Gwanho & Company that heroin is £43. This is signed “Roman”. This would seem to locate Mr. Roman in Geneva.

(4) *T. H. Geyer & Company, of Stuttgart.*

On August 15th, 1924, Gwanho & Company cabled to T. H. Geyer, Stuttgart (whose cable address is “Boehrgeyer”, Stuttgart), that they had remitted £2,000 sterling through the Schweizerische Kreditanstalt, of Zurich.

Although no drugs were seized on the premises of 51, Canton Road, it is quite evident from these telegrams to European drug manufacturers that Gwanho & Company were doing a considerable trade in them in 1924.

Sub-Appendix.

LETTER FROM THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT.

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
ROME.

May 15th, 1925.

[Translation.]

To the Secretary-General.

Sir,

With reference to your letter, with enclosures, No. 12A/33176/24297, of October 25th, concerning the 26 cases shipped by s.s. *Kamagata Maru*, I have the honour to inform you that, from enquiries made by the Prefect of Genoa, it would appear that, on January 15th and 24th, 1924, 26 cases containing synthetic medical products, according to the consignor's declaration, did arrive in that port. These cases, made up in two separate consignments, came from Switzerland through Chiasso accompanied by the proper Customs permits and way-bills issued by that Customs Office.

Both consignments, sent by the consignor Burckhardt, Walter and C.A.G., of Bâle, for account of a German firm from which the cases originally came, were addressed to S. O. Obralitza of Vladivostock. The cases were taken out by the consignor, L. Schumacher, and handed over to the agent of the Japanese s.s. *Kamagata* who loaded them on the vessel on January 24th, 1924. The same evening the vessel left Genoa for the East.

(Signed) PAULUCCI DE' CALBOLI BARONE.

INFORMATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE MOVEMENTS OF THE *KAMAGATA MARU* FORWARDED
BY THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT.

According to the testimony of the crews of the steamer *Kamagata Maru*, the ship reached, on April 27th, near the North Saddle Island off Shanghai and there they transboarded the opium to the Chinese junks waiting for the steamer. Before they accomplished this transshipment, the ship had tried to enter the river Yangtsu, but, failing to do so, she then went to Jusan, Korea, and returned on the 27th to the proximity of North Saddle Island. Here the cargo of 180 cases of opium and 13 cases of morphine was transhipped. It was also stated that 13 other cases of morphine were thrown into the sea in the vicinity of Saishu Island, south of Korea, and then the ship sailed for Kobe, arriving there on May 3rd.

On board the ship, there were five Chinese crews who looked after the cargo of opium and drugs, but they disappeared with the cargo when they transboarded the cargo near Shanghai.

Appendix 4.

SHIPMENTS OF PERSIAN OPIUM KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN SHIPPED FROM THE PORT
OF BUSHIRE DURING THE PERIOD MAY 1st, 1924, TO MAY 31st, 1925.

*(In continuation of Table appended to previous Memorandum issued as League Document
C. 515, M. 185, 1924. XI.)*

| Vessel | Date | No. of cases of opium | Declared destination of opium | Flag | See Notes |
|----------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| <i>Shinyia Maru</i> | 9.5.24 | 850 | Vladivostock | Japanese | A. |
| <i>Cochin-Chine</i> | 9.5.24 | 164 | Vladivostock | Chinese | A. |
| <i>Vasna</i> | 12.5.24 | 58 | Dairen | British | B. |
| <i>Vasela</i> | 21.5.24 | 42 | Keelung | British | B. |
| <i>Tai-Tak</i> | 30.6.24 | 450 | Vladivostock | Chinese | A.G. |
| <i>Shiketan Maru</i> | 16.8.24 | 350 | Vladivostock | Japanese | A. |
| <i>Shima Maru</i> | 26.9.24 | 388 | Vladivostock | Japanese | A. |
| <i>Cochin-Chine</i> | 30.9.24 | 360 | Vladivostock | French | A.C. |
| <i>Gorgistan</i> | 22.10.24 | 350 | Macao | British | |
| | 22.10.24 | 646 | Vladivostock | | A.D |
| <i>Promethean</i> | 25.11.24 | 350 | Vladivostock | Chinese | A. |
| <i>Bankura</i> | 25.11.24 | 100 | Dairen | British | B. |
| <i>Varela</i> | 1.12.24 | 100 | Singapore | British | |
| | 1.12.24 | 100 | Keelung | | B. |
| <i>Varela</i> | 22.12.24 | 50 | Dairen | British | B. |
| <i>Bamora</i> | 8.12.24 | 100 | Keelung | British | B. |
| <i>Varsora</i> | 13.12.24 | 38 | Dairen | British | B. |
| <i>Vasna</i> | 29.12.24 | 62 | Dairen | British | |
| | 29.12.24 | 50 | Keelung | British | B. |
| <i>Barpeta</i> | 16.1.25 | 151 | Keelung | British | B. |
| <i>Barmora</i> | 19.1.25 | 50 | Hamburg | British | |
| <i>Bandra</i> | 30.1.25 | 29 | Keelung | British | B. |
| <i>Vasela</i> | 2.2.25 | 25 | Hong-Kong | British | E. |
| <i>Kashimra Maru</i> | 2.2.25 | 322 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Vasela</i> | 23.2.25 | 98 | Dairen | British | B. |
| <i>Shensei Maru</i> | 4.3.25 | 663 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Barjora</i> | 10.3.25 | 30 | Hamburg | British | |
| <i>Vasna</i> | 21.3.25 | 25 | Singapore | British | F. |
| <i>Varsova</i> | 20.4.25 | 25 | Singapore | British | F. |
| <i>Wardenfels</i> | 26.4.25 | 5 | U.S.A. | German | |
| <i>Yeroppa Maru</i> | 10.5.25 | 300 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Varela</i> | 18.5.25 | 25 | Singapore | British | F. |
| <i>Vasna</i> | 25.5.25 | 100 | Dairen | British | B. |

The total amount of Persian opium mentioned in this table as having been exported from Bushire is 6,456 cases (approximately 460 $\frac{1}{2}$ tons).

The total amount of Persian Opium declared for :

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|--------|---------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Vladivostock | was | 4,489 | cases, | or | approximately | 346 | tons. |
| Dairen | " | 506 | " | " | " | 36 | " |
| Keelung | " | 371 | " | " | " | 26 1/2 | " |
| Macao | " | 350 | " | " | " | 25 | " |
| Singapore | " | 175 | " | " | " | 12 1/2 | " |
| Hamburg | " | 80 | " | " | " | 5 1/2 | " |
| U.S.A. | " | 5 | " | " | " | | " |
| Hong-Kong | " | 25 | " | (see note E.) | | | " |

Of that declared for Vladivostock, 646 cases were carried upon British, 964 cases upon Chinese¹, 2,893 upon Japanese and 360 cases upon French vessels.

(For the purpose of these calculations the weight of a chest has been taken as 160 lbs.)

The figures in this table and that appended to the previous Memorandum show the known exports of opium from Bushire for the last three calendar years to have been as follows:

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------|--------|----|---------|------|
| 1922 . . . | 1,549 | cases, | or | 247,840 | lbs. |
| 1923 . . . | 5,914 | " | " | 946,240 | " |
| 1924 . . . | 5,008 | " | " | 801,280 | " |

The official Persian Customs returns (total exports from Persia) were:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|----|---------|------|
| 1922 | 39,338 | batman, | or | 257,503 | lbs. |
| 1923 | 101,638 | " | " | 665,312 | " |

(Conversion rate: one batman equals 6,5459 lbs. avoird.)

Notes.

A. Definite information has been received that these shipments never reached Vladivostock. The official returns of the Vladivostock Customs shows some five pounds weight of opium to have been imported for medical purposes during 1924. Note D below on the s.s. *Gorgistan* indicates the actual destination of these shipments.

B. These vessels belong to the British India Steam Navigation Company; it is understood that they have required the production, by the purchaser's agents, of the licence of the Japanese Government. In all cases was the opium transhipped at Bombay.

C. For the previous history of the *Cochin-Chine*, see Note 7 of the previous Memorandum.

D. Before the 996 cases which formed the cargo of the s.s. *Gorgistan* on this trip were loaded at Bushire, 240 cases were compressed into 120 packages and the remaining 756 into 189 packages — 309 packages in all. The vessel cleared Bushire for Sabang and arrived at Hong-Kong on November 19th from Macao. The captain produced a clearance from Macao dated November 19th showing that he had left that port after discharging 309 packages of opium there. This was afterwards confirmed by the Macao authorities. He stated that the vessel left Bushire on charter to the Macao Opium Farm with this opium on October 24th and cleared for Sabang for orders, but that he did not call at Sabang, as he received his orders by wireless to proceed to Macao. The ship took an unusual course, he said, to avoid bad weather and went via Palawan in the Philippines. It appeared, however, from a cable which he had received at Basra from the ship's owners (H.M.H. Nemazee & Co.), and which he produced, that he was told before he left Bushire that he was to proceed to Macao, and there was therefore no reason, other than to disguise the ship's movements, to declare that he cleared for Sabang. When he arrived at Macao, the captain stated, he was met by a representative of the Opium Farm and he handed the cargo over to them under the supervision of the Macao Government officials.

The s.s. *Gorgistan* again appeared in the Persian Gulf in April 1925, and May 6th the master acquainted the British Consul-General that he had come to Bushire for opium, was on charter to some party unknown to him, and desired to sign the prescribed affidavit and bond in order to comply with the British Opium Traffic Regulations (the s.s. *Gorgistan* flies the British flag). He produced a translation of a licence issued to the South Transportation Company by the Government of Macao, a copy of which is attached. The translation was authenticated by M. Dameo Rodriguez, Public Notary of Macao. It will be observed that the licence purports to be a general licence to import and export and mentions no specific quantity of opium, and upon this ground and because the document was not certified as a true copy by a British Consular officer, and as the captain did not produce documentary proof that he was acting for the South Transportation Company, the Consul-General refused to allow the master to sail with opium on board until he was able to establish the validity of the licence. The vessel left Bushire without any opium on May 18th.

¹ One of these vessels has since become Portuguese: see Note H.

E. It is probable that the destination of Hong-Kong is incorrectly stated, as the Government of Hong-Kong does not import Persian opium and is not likely to have issued the necessary certificate without which the vessel could not have left Bushire.

F. These consignments were destined for the use of the monopoly of the British North Borneo Company.

G. For the previous history of the s.s. *Tai Tak*, see notes on the s.s. *Coloane* (previous name of this vessel) in Note 7 of the previous Memorandum. She was purchased in 1922 or 1923 by H. M. H. Nemazi and continued to fly the British flag. In December 1923 she arrived at Bushire under the *Chinese* flag and her name changed to *Coloane*. She sailed for Vladivostock with 400 cases of opium on the 28th of that month. She returned to Bushire in May 1924 and, under the new name *Tai Tak*, sailed again for Vladivostock with a cargo of opium, as shown in the table. The latest particulars of this vessel are that she arrived at Bushire from Swatow on May 3rd last and left on June 5th with 181 cases of opium declared for Keelung. She was then flying the Portuguese flag and her articles were in Portuguese. The owner was then reported to be Cuan Kwong, a Portuguese citizen of Macao. She appears to have no Lloyd's or any other registry number, but her signal letters are stated to be M. C. E. R.

Since this note was written, the Report of the Government of Hong-Kong for 1924 on the Traffic in Opium and Dangerous Drugs has been received. It contains the following paragraph:

"The arrival of s.s. *Tai Tak* in the port on her return from her second opium smuggling trip to the China coast afforded an opportunity for a thorough investigation into this traffic. It was proved that the persons to whom the ship belonged had been responsible for the introduction of at least four shiploads of Persian opium into China during the last two years, and that at least four million dollars had been spent on the purchase of the opium. The money came from Swatow mostly, though occasionally Shanghai joined in the venture. The persons who financed the business were discovered to be wealthy and very influential Chinese merchants in Swatow. The procedure was to send the ship chosen to Formosa to load coal sufficient for the round trip to the Persian Gulf and back to the China coast, with a considerable margin to allow the ship to leiter off the coast or steer unusual courses. Supercargoes were embarked in Formosa, and the ship sailed for Basra via Goa. The ship remained at Basra until a cable was received from Hong-Kong that the opium was ready at Bushire, and the ship then proceeded to Bushire and loaded her opium, declaring the destination as Vladivostock. She touched at Goa and then sailed for the China Sea, avoiding Sabang, the former usual port of call for these opium ships. A course was then steered for Hong-Kong, keeping over to the coast of the Philippines to avoid being seen by other ships and reported; a course was then set for the vicinity of the Eastern entrance to the harbour of Hong-Kong near Waglan, where apparently some means were prepared of getting a message through to Swatow. The ship then proceeded to the neighbourhood of Swatow, where some of the opium was transferred into waiting steam launches. Some of the remainder of the opium was transferred into waiting gunboats near Amoy. In one case arrangements had been made to meet junks near the mouth of the Yangtse. After delivering her cargo the ship proceeded to Formosa to coal and then came back to Hong-Kong to refit or lay up till the next trip. The captain of s.s. *Tai Tak* was warned to leave the colony, and the Chinese manager of the local agents for the ship was deported."

[Copy.]

Publica Forma.

PROVINCIA DE MACAU. — LOGAR DAS ARMAS DA REPUBLICA PORTUGUEZA. — SUPERINTENDENCIA DA FISCALIZACAO DO OPIO. — CERTIFICATE OF IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION OF RAW OPIUM. — By the Macao Opium Superintendency, licence is given to the South Transportation Company, according to the terms of paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the Opium Trade Regulations in force, to import raw opium to be re-exported to the countries that have not prohibited its importation, or, having restricted the importation, should be made within the limit and conditions stipulated by these countries. I have passed this certificate, which is signed and sealed with the seal of this Superintendency. — Superintendency of Opium of Macao, November 6th, 1924. The Opium Superintendent, A. MARIA DE MEIRELES, Director of Finance. — Logar de um carimbo, a tinta azul com o escudo nacional ao centro e a seguinte legenda: SUPERINTENDENCIA DA FISCALIZACAO DO OPIO. — PROVINCIA DE MACAU. — VAE BEM e fielmente trasladado em publica forma o documento acima, sem acrescentar, diminuir ou alterar cousa alguma que duvida faca em juizo ou fora dele pelo que se lhe deve dar inteira fe e credito quanto em direito se daria ao proprio se apresentado fosse o qual tornei a parte. Macau oaos trinta dias do mes de Marco de mil novecentos vinte e cinco. E eu, DAMIAO RODRIGUES, notario publico de Comarca de Macao, que a fiz escrever, subscrevi e assino.

(Stamp)

(Signature) DAMIAO RODRIGUES,
Notario Publico,
MACAU.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE MEMORANDUM ON THE SITUATION IN THE PERSIAN GULF.

The following extracts from a report dated June 27th, 1925, from the British Consul-General at Bushire throw light on the manner in which the opium traffic is carried on.

"The s.s. *Hanan* arrived here on 22nd instant from Sabang for the purpose of shipping opium from Bushire. When the Quarantine Medical Officer (British) visited the ship he was struck by her resemblance to s.s. *Promethean*, which left here in November 1924 with 350 cases of opium for Vladivostock. He accordingly asked the master if it was indeed the former s.s. *Promethean*. The latter replied that it was not, the *Promethean* having been sold. The Quarantine Medical Officer then went into one of the cabins and in it noticed a small brass plate inscribed s.s. *Promethean*. The master's signatures on the Bills of Health on both visits bear a strong resemblance. This time he calls himself Captain Corney, a naturalised French citizen of Norwegian origin.

"There is no doubt that the present s.s. *Hanan* is the old s.s. *Promethean*. The reason for the change can only be conjectured.

"When questioned as to the details of his ship, the master was very evasive. He said the ship was Chinese owned, but he was uncertain whether his owners lived in Shanghai or Canton. He stated that the firm chartering him was unknown to him and furthermore that he had no articles or log-book. The Quarantine Medical Officer was unable to insist on the production of these documents."

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

✓ C. 393. M. 136. 1926. XI.

GENEVA, September 1st, 1926.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM
AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS**

MINUTES

OF THE

EIGHTH SESSION

held at Geneva from May 26th to June 8th, 1926.

| |
|--|
| <p>Publications of the League of Nations XI. OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS 1926. XI. 4.</p> |
|--|

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| FIRST MEETING, May 26th, 1926, at 11 a.m. | |
| 1. Absence of Certain Members and Appointment of Assessors | 6 |
| 2. Election of the Chairman | 6 |
| 3. Election of the Vice-Chairman | 6 |
| 4. Absence of M. Brenier | 6 |
| 5. Publicity of the Meetings | 6 |
| 6. Hours of Meeting | 6 |
| 7. Adoption of the Agenda of the Session | 7 |
| 8. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary | 7 |
| SECOND MEETING, May 26th, 1926, at 3 p.m. | |
| 9. Methods employed in the United States to prevent Smuggling. | 10 |
| 10. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary (<i>continuation</i>) | 10 |
| 11. Advisability of declaring, at the Time of Importation, the Morphine Content of Opium destined for Uses other than the Manufacture of Prepared Opium for Smoking: Memorandum by the Secretariat. | 13 |
| THIRD MEETING, May 27th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 12. Morphine Content of Opium used in Great Britain for the Manufacture of Morphia | 15 |
| 13. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments. | 16 |
| FOURTH MEETING, May 27th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m. | |
| 14. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (<i>continuation</i>) | 21 |
| FIFTH MEETING, May 28th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 15. Method of Preparation of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments | 26 |
| 16. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (<i>continuation</i>) | 27 |
| 17. Annual Reports from the Government of the United States of America for the Years 1924 and 1925. | 32 |
| SIXTH MEETING, May 28th, 1926, at 3 p.m. | |
| 18. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (<i>continuation</i>) | 32 |
| 19. Agreement concluded by the First Opium Conference (Geneva, 1925) | 36 |
| 20. Opium Policy of the Government of India: Statement by Sir John Campbell | 36 |
| 21. Opium Policy in the Netherlands Indies: Statement by M. van Wettum | 38 |
| 22. Information concerning the Opium Policy in Japan: Statement by M. Sugimura. | 39 |
| 23. Omission of Certain Governments to furnish Information under Article 21 of the Hague Convention. | 40 |
| SEVENTH MEETING, May 29th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 24. Annual Reports from the Government of the United States of America for the Years 1924 and 1925. | 41 |
| 25. Reservation made by the Austrian Government when Signing the Opium Convention of 1925 | 42 |
| 26. Question of Co-operation between the Union catholique d'études internationales and the Advisory Committee. | 44 |
| 27. Situation as regards the Ratification of the Hague Convention of 1912. | 45 |
| 28. Consideration of the Position as regards the Application in Turkey of the Hague Convention of 1912. | 45 |
| 29. Consideration of the Position as regards the Application in Central and South America of the Hague Convention of 1912. | 47 |
| EIGHTH MEETING, May 31st, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 30. Measures taken in the United States of America to control the Drug Traffic: Statement by Colonel Woods | 47 |

| NINTH MEETING, May 31st, 1926, at 3.30 p.m. | | Page |
|---|--|------|
| 31. Application of the Hague Opium Convention of 1912 in certain States. | | 53 |
| 32. List of the Conditions regulating the Import, Export and Despatch by Post of Narcotics in all Countries | | 54 |
| 33. List of Seizures of Drugs reported to the League since August 1925 | | 55 |
| | | |
| TENTH MEETING, June 1st, 1926, at 10 a.m. | | |
| 34. Request by the Netherlands Government for Information from the Mexican Government regarding the Drug Situation in Mexico | | 59 |
| 35. List of the Conditions regulating the Import, Export and Despatch by Post of Narcotics in all Countries (<i>continuation</i>) | | 59 |
| 36. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs at Singapore | | 59 |
| 37. Position of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes with regard to the Import and Export of Narcotics. | | 59 |
| 38. Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : Question of the Publicity of the Discussion | | 61 |
| 39. Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : General Discussion. | | 62 |
| | | |
| ELEVENTH MEETING, June 1st, 1926, at 3 p.m. | | |
| 40. Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : General Discussion (<i>continuation</i>) | | 67 |
| 41. New British Regulations for British Subjects in Persia | | 68 |
| 42. Illicit Traffic : The Case of the Hai Tung Pharmacy (Shanghai). | | 68 |
| 43. Illicit Traffic in Opium in Formosa : The Case of Hoshi and Others | | 71 |
| 44. Illicit Traffic : The Position in Dairen | | 71 |
| | | |
| TWELFTH MEETING, June 2nd, 1926, at 10 a.m. | | |
| 45. Report by the Japanese Ministry for the Interior regarding Seizures and the Punishment of the Illicit Traffic. | | 72 |
| 46. Report by the Rotterdam Police on the Operations of the Firms of Messrs. Buxtorf & Co, of Bale, and M. A. Broemson, of Hamburg | | 74 |
| 47. Illicit Traffic : Smuggling of Drugs at Hamburg | | 77 |
| | | |
| THIRTEENTH MEETING, June 2nd, 1926, at 3 p.m. | | |
| 48. Illicit Traffic : Seizures at Singapore. | | 81 |
| 49. Illicit Traffic in Shanghai. | | 82 |
| 50. Question of the Publicity of the Meeting | | 85 |
| 51. Illicit Traffic : Consignment by the Steamship <i>Oostkerk</i> | | 85 |
| 52. Illicit Traffic : Traffic in Indian Opium from Kwang Chow Wan | | 85 |
| 53. Illicit Traffic : Letter from the Secretary of the International Anti-Opium Association, Pekin, concerning Alleged Opium Shops in the French Concession in that City. | | 86 |
| 54. Illicit Traffic : Prospectus of the Shanghai Tat Seng Company | | 86 |
| 55. Question of Co-operation between the Union catholique d'études internationales and the Advisory Committee : Reply to the Union | | 86 |
| | | |
| FOURTEENTH MEETING, June 3rd, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. | | |
| 56. Adoption of the Minutes. | | 86 |
| 57. Omissions or Delays on the part of Governments to notify Results of Investigations into Cases of Illicit Traffic reported to them | | 87 |
| 58. Protest from the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs against the Smuggling of Russian Opium into Manchuria. | | 87 |
| 59. Illicit Traffic : Seizures in the Philippines. | | 87 |
| | | |
| FIFTEENTH MEETING, June 3rd, 1926, at 5.30 p.m. | | |
| 60. Illicit Traffic : General Situation | | 87 |
| | | |
| SIXTEENTH MEETING, June 4th, 1926, at 10 a.m. | | |
| 61. Appointment of a Drafting Sub-Committee. | | 90 |
| 62. Adoption of the Minutes | | 91 |
| 63. Action to be taken by the Secretariat with regard to the Distribution of Reports on Seizures and the Question of Forged Labels. | | 91 |
| 64. General Application of the System of Import Certificates. | | 95 |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| SEVENTEENTH MEETING, June 4th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m. | |
| 65. General Application of the System of Import Certificates (<i>continuation</i>) | 98 |
| 66. Extracts from the Intelligence Reports from His Britannic Majesty's Consuls in China for the Half-Year ending September 30th, 1925 | 102 |
| 67. Smuggling of Opium from China | 102 |
| 68. Use of the Registered Letter Post for smuggling Drugs into China : Circular issued by the Inspector-General of the Chinese Customs. | 104 |
| 69. Summary of a Despatch from the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Soviet Ambassador in Peking (February 24th, 1926), protesting against Russian Opium being smuggled into China | 104 |
| 70. Annual Reports from the Chinese Government. | 104 |
| 71. Opium Situation in Mandated Territories. | 105 |
| 72. Action taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference (Geneva, 1925) | 105 |
| EIGHTEENTH MEETING, June 5th, 1926, at 10 a.m. | |
| 73. Action taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference (Geneva, 1925) (<i>continuation</i>) | 106 |
| 74. Question of the Insurance of Consignments of Opium and other Dangerous Drugs : Proposal from the British Government suggesting that a Clause concerning Drugs to which the International Opium Convention of 1912 applies be inserted in all Maritime Insurance Policies | 106 |
| 75. Examination of the List drawn up by the Committee of Experts of Drugs and Preparations falling under the Provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912 | 107 |
| 76. Question of a Centre at Goa of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs | 108 |
| 77. Position as regards the Ratification of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference at Geneva 1925 | 109 |
| 78. Export of Morphine from France to Greece and to Cuba : Annual Report from the French Government for 1923 | 109 |
| 79. Export of Raw Cocaine from the Netherlands to France : Annual Report from the French Government for 1923 | 110 |
| 80. Question of Imports of Heroin into Formosa in 1923 : Annual Report from Formosa for 1923 | 110 |
| 81. Relation of the Quantities of Raw Opium used in Japan in the Manufacture of Morphine to the Amount of Morphine produced : Annual Report from the Japanese Government for 1923 | 110 |
| 82. Extradition : Statement of the Position of Certain Countries in regard to this Question. | 111 |
| 83. Consideration of the Report of the International Anti-Opium Association on certain New Opium Substitutes and of Dr. Knaffl-Lenz's Notes on that Report | 111 |
| 84. Opium Situation, particularly as regards the Philippine Islands : Letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright. | 111 |
| 85. Reports from the Government of the United States of America and List of Seizures. | 112 |
| NINETEENTH MEETING, June 5th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m. | |
| 86. Measures for Controlling the Drug Traffic. | 113 |
| 87. Summary Report concerning the Application of the Swiss Federal Narcotics Law during the Last Five Months of 1925. | 116 |
| 88. Compilation of an Index of the First 500 Documents distributed to the Committee | 117 |
| 89. Situation in Free Ports regarding the Control of the Import and Export of Opium and Dangerous Drugs. | 117 |
| TWENTIETH MEETING, June 8th, 1926, at 3 p.m. | |
| 90. Examination of the Draft Resolutions to be submitted to the Council | 118 |
| 91. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council | 118 |
| TWENTY-FIRST MEETING, June 8th, 1926, at 9.45 p.m. | |
| 92. Shipments of Persian Opium from Bushire during the Period June 1st, 1925, to April 30th, 1926 : Question of the Publication of Document O.C. 417 (a). | 122 |
| 93. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council (<i>continuation</i>) | 124 |
| 94. Close of the Session | 125 |
| ANNEXES | 127 |

LIST OF MEMBERS PRESENT AT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EIGHTH SESSION)

May 26th to June 8th, 1926.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| M. BOURGOIS (Chairman) | <i>France.</i> |
| Dr. ANSELMINO (Vice-Chairman) | <i>Germany.</i> |
| His Excellency M. CHAO-HSIN CHU | <i>China.</i> |
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, K.C.B. | <i>Great Britain.</i> |
| Sir John CAMPBELL, C.S.I. | <i>India.</i> |
| M. SUGIMURA (replacing Dr. Tsurumi) | <i>Japan.</i> |
| M. W. G. VAN WETTUM | <i>Netherlands.</i> |
| His Excellency M. FERREIRA | <i>Portugal.</i> |
| M. Constantin FOTITCH | <i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.</i> |
| His Highness Prince CHAROON | <i>Siam.</i> |
| M. DINICHERT (replacing Dr. Carrière) | <i>Switzerland.</i> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. S. Pinkney TUCK ¹ | <i>United States of America.</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|

Colonel Arthur WOODS, Assessor.

Absent :

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Dr. CUELLAR | <i>Bolivia.</i> |
| M. Henri BRENIER, Assessor | |

Mr. H. C. BERG, Acting Secretary.

¹ Attended the meetings in an unofficial capacity.

FIRST MEETING

Held on Wednesday, May 26th, 1926, at 11 a.m.

In the Chair : Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire).

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

1. Absence of Certain Members and Appointment of Assessors.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that M. Dinichert was replacing Dr. Carrière as the representative of Switzerland and that M. Sugimura was replacing Dr. Tsurumi as the representative of Japan. M. Dinichert and M. Sugimura had both been associated on a previous occasion with the work of the League regarding the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. They were thoroughly acquainted with many of its aspects, and the Committee was glad to welcome them.

On behalf of the Committee, he also extended a welcome to Colonel Arthur Woods, who had been appointed as one of the three assessors of the Committee. In this connection, he would recall the Committee's decision whereby the three assessors should represent : (1) the police aspect of the work in connection with the regulation of the traffic in opium and drugs ; (2) the commercial aspect ; (3) the Far Eastern aspect.

Colonel Woods had been Commissioner of Police in New York and had had great experience of police work in connection with the drug traffic. M. Brenier would continue to represent the commercial aspect. The Council had not yet appointed an assessor to take the place of the late Sir John Jordan, who had represented the Far Eastern aspect.

M. Chao-Hsin Chu would attend the later meetings of the Committee. Until he arrived, he would be represented by Dr. Hiu, his secretary. Dr. Fotitch would take the place of M. Petrovitch as representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes when the latter was prevented by other business from attending the meetings.

2. Election of the Chairman.

On the proposal of Sir John CAMPBELL (India), supported by the representatives of the Netherlands, Portugal, Germany and Japan, M. BOURGOIS (France) *was unanimously elected Chairman.*

M. BOURGOIS (France) thanked his colleagues for the honour paid to him. His task would be particularly difficult owing to the competence and tact shown by his predecessors in the office.

3. Election of the Vice-Chairman.

After an exchange of views, M. Ferreira (Portugal), M. Sugimura (Japan) and Sir John Campbell (India) having declined to stand as candidates for the office of Vice-Chairman, *the Committee unanimously decided, on the proposal of Sir John CAMPBELL (India), to ask Dr. Anselmino to continue to act as Vice-Chairman.*

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thanked the Committee for this mark of confidence.

4. Absence of M. Brenier.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a telegram from M. Brenier stating that urgent business prevented him from being present at this session of the Committee.

5. Publicity of the Meetings.

The Committee decided that its meetings should be held in public, unless for some particular reason it thought it better to sit in private.

6. Hours of Meeting.

The Committee decided to hold two meetings a day, the first from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and the second from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN, in answer to M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands), assured him that he would do his best to keep rigidly to these hours.

7. Adoption of the Agenda of the Session.

The Committee adopted its agenda (Annex 1).

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), the Committee decided to discuss together Item 7 (b) (Traffic from the Persian Gulf) and Item 12 (To call attention to the new British regulations for British subjects in Persia and to propose a resolution).

The Committee also decided to discuss Item 6 (Reservation made by the Austrian Government when signing the International Opium Convention of 1925) in the presence of a representative of that Government.

8. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to discuss the progress report submitted by the Acting Secretary (Annex 2).

Agreement drawn up by the First Opium Conference : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan), in the name of his Government, said that he would confirm the declaration made at the last Assembly by the Japanese delegate to the effect that Japan would ratify the Agreement and that it was only a question of time before such ratification took place.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, before the Dutch Government could ratify the Agreement of the First Conference, it was necessary for that Agreement to be approved by law. The law approving it was before the House of Representatives.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) enquired the position with regard to Portugal and Siam.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that the question was being considered by the Portuguese Government.

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that everything had been in abeyance since the death of the late Siamese King and the accession of the new King. Many urgent matters had had to be dealt with, and the question of the ratification of the Agreement concluded by the First Conference had been left until a later date.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) called the Committee's attention to Article 14 of the Agreement, which stipulated that it should come into force after ratification by two Powers. The date of coming into force was to be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the second ratification. As the Agreement had now been ratified by three Powers, he asked the Secretariat on what date it would come into force in pursuance of the provisions of Article 14.

M. BERG, Acting Secretary, said that he would have to consult the Legal Section of the Secretariat before replying to this question.

Convention drawn up by the Second Opium Conference : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that he wished to remind the Committee of his previous statement to the effect that the Japanese Government was pursuing a policy of close co-operation with all civilised Powers with a view to achieving the final and complete abolition of the illegitimate use of opium and other dangerous drugs. It was in this spirit that it had sent representatives to the two Conferences and was following the work of the Committee.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the same observations as he had made concerning the Agreement concluded by the First Conference applied with equal force to the Convention concluded by the second.

The CHAIRMAN said that the French Government had been able immediately to ratify the Agreement of the First Conference, because it had not been necessary to obtain the approval of Parliament for that ratification. Such approval, however, was necessary with regard to the Convention concluded by the Second Conference. The Bill for ratification had been on the table of the House for nearly two months, and only unforeseen circumstances had prevented its consideration. There was reason to think that it would be placed on one of the next agendas of the Chamber and that ratification would give rise to no difficulties, so that, by September next, France would have ratified the Convention.

He would remind the Committee that it would have another opportunity of discussing the question of the ratification of both the Agreement and Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) hoped that the Committee would have an opportunity for a full discussion, as the matter was of great importance.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne in thinking that this question was one of the most important before the Committee. It was essential for the members of the Committee to do everything in their power to persuade the greatest possible number of Powers to ratify the Convention rapidly and, in any case, to put into practice certain parts of the Convention. The Committee might perhaps feel disposed to propose new resolutions to the Council regarding this question of ratification.

In any case, the Committee would have to decide what points in the Convention it should recommend should be put into effect immediately if, owing to circumstances, a sufficient number of ratifications were not immediately forthcoming to enable the Convention as a whole to be put into force. The Committee could, for instance, ask certain Powers which were unable to ratify the Convention immediately to take certain measures of international control without delay—such, for instance, as the notification of the export of opium or drugs to the Government of the country of destination.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Assembly had adopted a resolution in September 1925 urging all States to ratify or adhere to the Agreements and resolutions adopted by the First and Second Opium Conferences. It was certainly the duty of the Committee to inform the Assembly of the response that had been made to that resolution. It had been circulated to all Members of the League, and if any replies had been received those replies should be submitted to the Committee by the Secretariat. If no replies had been received, the Committee should report that fact to the Assembly. Very great stress had been laid in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly of 1925 on the desirability of ratifying the Agreement and Convention at the earliest possible moment.

He hoped that those members of the Committee who had not yet made any statement as to the position of their own Governments in the matter would be able to do so before the end of the session. He was in favour of postponing the general discussion on the subject of the ratification of the Agreement and Convention, as it might give those members of the Committee who had not yet made a declaration time to consult their Governments. It would be deplorable if the Committee did not insist on the importance of the speedy ratification of the Convention drawn up by the Second Conference and pass a resolution to that effect on the lines suggested by the Chairman. Nearly a year and a-half had elapsed since the Convention had been signed, and the date on which it would come into force was still unknown. With reference to that date, he would remind the Committee that Article 36 of the Convention stated :

“ The present Convention shall not come into force until it has been ratified by ten Powers, including seven of the States by which the Central Board is to be appointed in pursuance of Article 19, of which at least two must be permanent Members of the Council of the League. The date of its coming into force shall be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the last of the necessary ratifications. Thereafter, the present Convention will take effect in the case of each Party ninety days after the receipt of its ratification or of the notification of its accession. ”

Thus the new machinery which was set up by the Convention for the better control of the traffic in drugs was awaiting the moment when the ratifications had been completed. Until the Convention came into force, the whole work of the Committee was held up.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thought that the Committee would be unanimous in agreeing with the Chairman and Sir Malcolm Delevingne that a resolution should be adopted emphasising the necessity for a speedy ratification of both Conventions. With regard to his own Government the position was as follows :

The Swiss Government had taken time to sign the second Convention, because it had examined the question again since February 1925. As the result of this new examination, and in spite of certain hesitations, it had signed the Convention, which meant—he thought he could speak in the name of his Government—that, once it had signed the Convention, it had clearly decided to recommend the Swiss Parliament, at the right moment, to approve the Convention so that it could be ratified. As regards the moment when it would be convenient to do this, the Swiss Government had thought that there was no particular need for hurry in view of the provisions of Articles 36 and 19 of the Convention, which stipulated that, in particular, the ratification of seven of the Powers which would take part in the appointment of the Central Board was necessary before the Convention could come into force. He thought he could assure the Committee, however, that the entry into force of the Convention would not in the least be delayed by Switzerland.

Moreover, in Switzerland, legislation was already in force which, as regards the supervision of the international trade, covered the provisions of the second Convention. If Switzerland had not yet undertaken the procedure of ratification, it was for two reasons : first, because there was no urgency until the seven States mentioned in Article 36 had ratified the Convention ; and, secondly, because Switzerland was already applying the essential part of the Convention by virtue of an internal law. The Swiss Government was thus in a position

to make certain useful experiments, the results of which it would wish to know before ratifying the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said the position was extremely delicate, and it was obviously of the greatest interest for the Committee to ascertain in a general way the feelings of each country regarding ratification. He entirely agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne in thinking that the work of the Committee was almost paralysed by the fact that the Convention was not yet ratified, since the principal international measures to be adopted for controlling the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs were all contained in that Convention. The Committee hesitated to adopt new resolutions which would only be repeating the above measures, since it was awaiting the ratification of the Convention. If, after having considered the matter, the Committee was of the opinion that the chances of early ratification were small, it might perhaps consider the advisability of suggesting certain preparatory measures with the object of putting into force immediately certain of the provisions of the Convention. It would be most regrettable if, because of the delay in ratification, the sole result of the Second Conference were the paralysis of the work of the Committee. Endeavour must be made to deal with this danger.

France would very shortly ratify the Convention. Of the seven Powers mentioned in Article 36, two would thus have ratified it. It would be useful for the Committee to try to ascertain how long it would take to obtain the ratification of the five other countries. This unknown element would have a very great influence on the work of the session, for, if the Committee found that the five countries in question would ratify shortly, it could await that date. If, on the contrary, it was a question of several years, he would ask the Committee to consider adopting a certain number of resolutions which could be immediately put into practice.

At the moment, however, the Committee was merely taking note of the list of States which had ratified the Convention. It was when dealing with another item on its agenda that it would open a general discussion on the whole question of ratification. He would repeat that it was of the greatest importance for such a discussion to take place, for the question was fundamental.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) stated that general experience of League work showed that at least two or three years were necessary to obtain a sufficient number of ratifications for the entry into force of any international convention. Such was the case, for example, with regard to the Transit Conventions, which dealt with matters far less controversial than the Opium Convention, and which, nevertheless, had not come into force for several years owing to an insufficient number of ratifications. The Committee, however, was fully agreed that all signatory States should be urged to ratify the Agreement and Convention of 1925 as quickly as possible.

While awaiting the necessary number of ratifications for the entry into force of the Convention, however, the Committee would certainly have to adopt a number of measures making it possible to carry out certain stipulations of the Convention in order to cover the intervening period. He would ask if any member of the Committee had any suggestion to make regarding the measures which might be recommended for immediate adoption while awaiting the entry into force of the Convention.

Perhaps the Chairman or another member of the Committee could extract from the Convention such points as should be made the object of immediate recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN considered that M. Sugimura had divided the question into two parts :

- (1) A recommendation from the Committee concerning the immediate ratification by all signatory States of the Convention ;
- (2) The preparatory measures to be taken by the Committee while awaiting the entry into force of the Convention.

He thought that the first of the questions could be inserted in the agenda under the heading of " Examination of the question of ratification " .

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) warned the Committee against the danger of doing anything which would interfere with the early ratification of the Convention. It could, for instance, make no proposal for the creation of a Permanent Central Board dealt with in Chapter VI of the Convention, because the establishment of that Board depended on the ratification of the Convention.

Any proposal which would tend to substitute for early ratification a series of other measures would be most unfortunate. The Committee's policy should be to concentrate primarily on the ratification of the Convention, which would enable the Council to set up the Permanent Central Board. The subject should therefore be discussed as a whole and not divided into parts, as the Chairman and M. Sugimura suggested.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) suggested that, with regard to his second point, the Committee would have to decide if any measures should be proposed for enforcement while awaiting the entry into force of the Convention and, if so, what those measures should be. As regards the general recommendation concerning the early ratification of the Convention, he thought that the Committee was unanimous, and that a text could therefore be prepared which could be adopted at the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, despite the unanimous feeling of the Committee, further discussion on the proper wording of such a recommendation would be necessary. He would accordingly put the question on the agenda as he had suggested, but change its title to "Recommendations concerning the ratification of the Convention of the Second Opium Conference".

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) agreed with the Chairman, but thought that it would be advisable for the Committee to state definitely that its work would be facilitated if declarations concerning the position of their own Governments in the matter could be made, by those members who had not yet done so, before the above item was discussed.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the delicacy of this question. Governments, though willing to ratify, might well feel it impossible to give anything more than general information on the subject, for it was necessary for them to proceed with great prudence, as they could not bind their Parliaments.

With regard to M. Sugimura's second point—the examination of measures to be taken in the case of non-ratification—he thought that some less pessimistic title could be chosen, such as, for example, "The position of countries which have not yet adhered to the Convention".

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) pointed out that to put the question in this form would scarcely induce States which had not ratified to do so. The Committee should concentrate on obtaining the largest possible number of ratifications. For the rest, as its work proceeded, it would be able to investigate the different measures which would have to be taken in the interval, and in that it should be guided entirely by what had been achieved by the two Conferences.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question of the measures which should be taken would undoubtedly be raised during the course of the discussion, and could best be dealt with in that manner rather than by being inserted in the agenda as a separate item.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, the Committee added the following item to its agenda: "14a. Recommendations concerning the Ratification of the Convention of 1925."

SECOND MEETING

Held on Wednesday, May 26th, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

9. Methods employed in the United States to prevent Smuggling.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, asked Colonel Woods whether he was prepared to make a statement on the methods employed in the United States to suppress smuggling.

Colonel Woods said that he would prepare a statement on the subject which could be distributed to the members of the Committee.

10. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary (continuation).

Resolutions requiring Action passed at the Last Session of the Advisory Committee, August 1925.

Resolution 1: Illicit Traffic.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan), referring to point 2 (b) of the resolution, said it was desirable that the information referred to should be communicated directly and by telegram to the Governments concerned. Information sent by the British authorities, for example, in regard to Bushire, went first to London, then to Geneva and afterwards to Paris and Tokio. He further stated, in reference to point 2 (c), that the information which the Japanese Government had received was not sufficiently detailed.

The CHAIRMAN replied that, when this question came to be discussed, account would be taken of the observations of M. Sugimura.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that these matters could be discussed when the Committee took up the question of export from the Persian Gulf. He thought the

Committee would agree that a good deal more had been done in the way of exchange of information during the last year than in previous years.

The CHAIRMAN stated that it was interesting to note that these exchanges were becoming more frequent. The exchange of information would automatically increase when the offices concerned had formed the habit of communicating such information directly.

Resolution II : Illicit Traffic in the Persian Gulf.

The CHAIRMAN said that the French Government had taken account of the communication made by the Secretariat. There had, however, been no important case of smuggling. Only one boat had been notified by the authorities of Indo-China to the French Government, which had informed the Secretariat.

Resolution III : Date of the Despatch of Annual Reports.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that his Government had not sent any report in 1925, but he had received statistics by telegram for that year which he would communicate in writing to the Committee.

Resolution V : Extradition Treaty between the United States and Canada.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question of extradition was of some importance. He would later on explain the position of France in regard to this question. He would propose that the subject should be placed on the agenda as Item 15a.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) wondered whether it was necessary to discuss again the question of extradition, as the subject had been referred to the Governments which had not yet sent any replies.

The CHAIRMAN said he would content himself with stating the position of France in regard to this question, which was similar to that of several countries. He did not think that there was any necessity for a detailed discussion of the question, since it had been put aside by the Opium Conference. Some explanations on the position of certain Powers might, however, be useful by way of information.

He accordingly proposed to place the following item on the agenda : Extradition : Statement of the position of certain countries in regard to the question.

The Committee agreed.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that the summary of the reply of the Swiss Government was not quite accurate. Switzerland had replied that she had noted with interest the text of the treaty, with a view to getting suggestions from it, if necessary, at the time when extradition treaties of this kind were being concluded. Switzerland did not propose to conclude extradition treaties to meet this special case.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as this question was of a legal character, it should be defined with extreme precision, and he would ask the Secretariat to make the necessary correction.

Resolution VI : Export Authorisations.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this question was not directly on the agenda, and asked whether any member of the Committee desired to make any proposals.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the resolution referred to the procedure to be adopted when the Convention adopted by the Second Conference came into force. He did not think that any question arose at the present moment. The Governments were presumably still considering the matter.

The Committee agreed.

Extra-territorial Rights in China.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that this question only interested a certain number of Powers which had concluded treaties with China. He would explain the position of France under Item 9 of the agenda. The question was of some importance owing to the considerable traffic in drugs in China and the danger which threatened that country at the present time.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that the Swiss Government had made a study of the question. As a result of that study, a formal proposal had been submitted to the Chinese Government. The Swiss Government had asked the Chinese Government to introduce the system of export and import licences as between China and Switzerland. The Swiss Government had not yet received a reply to this proposal, but it had reason to believe that the reply would not be in the negative, since China had already made similar arrangements with other countries.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said he did not quite see the bearing of this statement on the question of Swiss nationals in China, since they were subject to the

jurisdiction of the Swiss representatives in that country. Any agreement between the Swiss Government and the Chinese Government for the adoption of the import certificate system would not affect the position of the Swiss nationals in China, vis-à-vis their own Government in regard to the traffic in drugs or opium.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that the question of smuggling in China had two aspects so far as Switzerland was concerned. First, there was the direct despatch of contraband, a problem which Switzerland was endeavouring to meet by asking China to introduce the system of import certificates. Secondly, there was the fact that certain foreigners in China were under the jurisdiction of their countries of origin.

In regard to the second point, Swiss legislation had existed since August last, and it was now a question of regulating the procedure for the application of that legislation by the Consul-General of Switzerland at Shanghai. This procedure had not yet been definitely established, but if a case arose in practice, the penalties applicable in Switzerland could be inflicted by the Swiss representative in China on the persons concerned.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he was sure that the Chinese Government would be very glad to make the arrangement proposed by the Swiss Government. He would make enquiries and report to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question was particularly complex. Eighteen months ago the Chinese Government had submitted to the diplomatic corps in Peking a plan for modifying and making uniform the control of the entry and importation of narcotics into China and of the trade in narcotics in China. The discussions had been long and complicated, because it was necessary to obtain the assent of several countries, and events in China had delayed a settlement. Pending the acceptance by China of the proposals, certain measures had been taken by other Powers. He believed, for example, that the British Government had adopted special rules for the import of and the control of the trade in drugs in China. The Chinese Government had proposed that these rules should be adopted by the other Powers. The question could be discussed in detail under Item 9 of the agenda.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said the Committee would feel some disappointment that, apart from the replies of the Netherlands and Switzerland, no communications had been received from the Powers in regard to this matter. The Chinese delegate to the Second Opium Conference had expressed a wish that the matter should be considered by the Conference, and it had been arranged that private conversations should take place between the Chinese delegation and the delegations of the Powers having extra-territorial rights in China. The Chinese delegate had said that he was fully satisfied with the regulations which had been adopted lately by Great Britain and the United States. A satisfactory agreement on the subject had been in sight when the whole question was shelved owing to the departure from the Conference of the Chinese delegate, and since then the matter had remained in suspense.

The Advisory Committee had last year expressed a hope that the Powers having extra-territorial rights in China would proceed with the matter on their own account, and had recommended the adoption of certain regulations by those Powers for controlling their own subjects. He hoped the Committee would take the matter up again when it came to discuss Item 9 of the agenda, and would express a strong desire that such regulations should be adopted.

The diplomatic negotiations between the Chinese Government and the diplomatic representatives at Peking to which the Chairman had referred were of a different order, being negotiations for a general agreement between the Chinese Government and the Powers concerned, whereas the present question was a matter for individual action by each Government separately.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) wished to emphasise the fact that the initiative of the Swiss Government, to which he had referred, was directed towards the same end: the control of individuals. This control could be carried out on the spot, owing to the special position of certain countries in China, but it would probably be effective to do it also in these countries. He had referred to this point as the Chinese delegate had welcomed the initiative of the Swiss Government.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the Chinese Government had agreed to the import and export certificate system, but, owing to the unequal treaties existing in China, his Government had been obliged to refer the matter to the diplomatic corps in Peking, from which it had not yet received a reply.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with his Swiss colleague as to the utility of taking steps at the source of the danger, namely, in the exporting countries in Europe.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed with M. Dinichert as to the importance of the measures taken at home. Such measures, however, would not control, in certain respects, the action of the foreign nationals in China. The bulk of the traffic carried on by foreign nationals in China was illicit. Moreover, Chinese subjects desiring to carry on this traffic frequently obtained foreign protection, getting themselves registered at foreign consulates and thus, for all practical purposes, changing their nationality.

Import Certificate System.

On the proposal of Sir John CAMPBELL (India) and Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), it was decided to place on the agenda the general question of the adoption and working of the import certificate system.

Annexes to the Report.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India), referring to Annex VII (Portuguese Law No. 1687, August 1923), thought the Committee would like to be informed by the Portuguese representative as to the precise extent of the operation of the Portuguese law relating to narcotics and as to the regulations relating to export and import certificates. He would like, in particular, to know what the position was in Goa.

Dr. RODRIGUES (Portugal) said that all the Portuguese laws, after publication in the *Official Gazette*, were applied in the colonies, and that the law referred to was one of general application.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that this law had in fact been published in August 1923. Was it now in operation in Goa or not?

Dr. RODRIGUES (Portugal) said he did not know.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands), referring to Annex IX (List of Departments authorised to issue import and export certificates in various countries), said that the statement at the end regarding the Netherlands East Indies was not in order. He had already informed the Secretariat.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) enquired whether the statement in Annex IX in regard to the Japanese territories was still correct.

M. KUSAMA (Japan) replied in the affirmative.

11. Advisability of declaring, at the Time of Importation, the Morphine Content of Opium destined for Uses other than the Manufacture of Prepared Opium for Smoking : Memorandum by the Secretariat. (Document O. C. 425.)

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said he did not quite understand the purport of the proposal contained in the memorandum. Was it proposed to introduce these particulars into the import and export certificates or was the proposal merely made with a view to guiding the Secretariat in preparing statistics for the information of the Committee? It would be very difficult to apply in practice a system under which all exports or imports of opium would be declared as having a certain morphine content. Such a system would imply uniformity in sampling and analysis upon a uniform system.

The object of the proposal appeared to be to exercise control over the manufacturer, who, in the absence of an elaborate system of control in the factory, might, it was alleged, dispose clandestinely of possibly one-third of his annual production. Surely, however, such a control was a matter for the Governments and not for the Advisory Committee; this, indeed, was definitely stated in the various Opium Conventions. Any system of governmental control, to be effective, must take account of the morphine content of the raw opium imported. He would deprecate any suggestion which tended to make the Committee or the exporting Governments responsible for a control which could only be exercised by the Government of the country where the manufacture was carried on.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Blanco to explain to the Committee the precise object of the proposal.

M. BLANCO explained that the proposal was merely intended to secure for the Secretariat information which would enable it to present in a more accurate form the statistics which it submitted annually to the Advisory Committee.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that there was never any opium on the market containing more than 14 per cent of morphine, and such a percentage was rare; manufacturers using raw opium to manufacture morphine used an opium with a morphine content of from 11 to 12 per cent. Turkish opium and opium from Asia Minor, which had a content of more than 12 per cent, was manipulated with apricots and other fruits in order to bring the content down to 12 per cent. During manufacture there was a loss of one-tenth. In these circumstances, he did not think it was necessary to change the method of estimating the morphine content.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked how it was proposed that the exporting country should ascertain the morphine content of the exported opium.

M. BLANCO said that the Secretariat had received annual reports in which the percentage of morphine in the opium exported was given.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked how the Secretariat expected Persia and Turkey to ascertain the morphine content of opium before it was exported.

M. BLANCO said that, according to the *Chemist and Druggist*, the percentage of the morphine in the opium was given at the time of the sale, so that there was evidently a system of analysis.

The CHAIRMAN said it would be interesting to know how far this analysis was approximate. He understood that no chemical analysis was made in the laboratory but that the morphine content was merely given as a commercial approximation. The accuracy of the figure would depend to a certain extent on the honesty of the trader.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that he used to sell the raw opium which came from India during the war and which was the source of morphine for all the Allies. Consignments of raw opium were sampled very carefully by a firm which specialised in this branch of chemical analysis. Every chest was sampled and the contents analysed according to a standardised process accepted by the trade; the results were often controlled by a check analysis on the same method made by a second firm. The opium was sold on the basis of so many units of morphine contained in it, determined by this special process. This process, however, was probably not the standard process as used in Germany or the United States; and there might easily be a difference of 1 per cent in the analysis.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that there was a difference between the various methods of analysis. There was, for example, a difference of 2 per cent between the Harrison method and that used by the German Pharmacopœia. The German sellers, however, sold only on the basis of an analysis made according to the Harrison method.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there might be differences of 2 per cent due to methods of analysis and that the problem, therefore, was to define morphine contents which might differ among themselves from 2 to 3 per cent. This degree of accuracy was not for the moment of great importance, though it was well that attention had been called to the point. The Committee was not proposing to ask the Governments to introduce any measures which, at present, appeared to be superfluous.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) insisted that in present circumstances it was quite impossible to expect the Governments of the exporting countries to state the morphine content of opium at the time when an export authorisation was granted. Analysis was frequently made, however, on the arrival of the opium in the importing country, as, for example, by the firm of Harrison and Self in London, which analysed samples of opium not only for England but for countries on the Continent. It might, however, be possible for the Governments to obtain from the manufacturers returns of the morphine content of the opium which they used in the manufacture of the drugs. Every manufacturer must ascertain the morphine content of the opium which he purchased. In the first place, he must know the content in order to fix a price with the seller, and, secondly, he had exact information from the process of manufacture which he carried out. In England, a return of the morphine content of the opium used during the year in the manufacture of morphine and other drugs was obtained annually from the manufacturers, and it might be interesting for such information to be communicated to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. Such indications given by the Secretariat might be very useful to the Committee, since they might serve as a check upon the statistics. The Committee might perhaps observe that a certain factory returned 10 per cent of morphine content, whereas another returned 12 or 13 per cent. For the present, however, the data were insufficient to justify the Committee in asking the Governments to take any general step or to require the morphine content to be indicated in the statistics.

He would add that a control of this character was authorised by the Hague Convention and by the new Convention. Each country must ensure that the percentage indicated by a firm was really correct. The control of this figure involved a verification not only of the quantity of raw material received but of the content of that raw material. He could assure the Committee that, in practice, this control was very strictly carried out in France.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the Committee was discussing a minor detail. The really important problem was that of clandestine opium. The opium in question was not clandestine, but opium which the Governments knew to have been exported or imported and which had been put on record. Correspondence had been exchanged between the Netherlands Indies and British India about the morphine content of opium in which there was, according to his recollection, a difference of from 3 to 4 per cent. The point, however, was only of small importance, in view of the fact that there was no mention in existing statistics of the great bulk of opium that was distributed over the world clandestinely.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether the Committee agreed to his suggestion that the countries in which drugs were manufactured should be invited to state in their annual reports the average morphine content of the opium used. The information could quite easily be obtained and would have a certain interest.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would also be well to indicate the margin authorised for manufacturers and traders between the content as established in the laboratory and the content admitted by commercial houses. This margin should be fixed by each Government in order to prevent abuse.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) doubted whether it would be of any use to have from Great Britain and from the Netherlands, for example, a statement of the percentage of morphine content, in view of the fact that the methods of calculating this content differed in the two countries.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) believed that the Harrison method of analysis was almost universally used.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there were two classes of figures. There was a figure representing the chemical morphine content in the opium and there was a figure representing the percentage of morphine commercially extracted. M. van Wettum, speaking of cocaine at the Opium Conference, had given some very precise data which showed that there was a fairly considerable difference between these two classes of figures. This difference amounted to as much as $\frac{3}{10}$ or $\frac{4}{10}$ as between the cocaine chemically present in the raw material and the cocaine which was extracted by an industrial process. It would accordingly be necessary to specify that the figures required were not those giving the real chemical content of the opium but the content of morphine extracted during the industrial process.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that at the International Conference on Powerful Drugs which had been held in Brussels in September last, a Sub-Committee had been asked to make experiments in order to discover the best method of estimating the morphine extracted from opium. A method which was generally acceptable had not yet been found, but it was very probable that it would be established very soon.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the whole question should be dropped.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) supported that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of an example quoted by M. van Wettum last year. It was theoretically possible to extract from the coca leaf of Java 1.26 per cent, but the factories extracted only 0.7 per cent.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) moved that the consideration of the subject should be adjourned to the next meeting and that Dr. Anselmino should meanwhile be asked to prepare a report on the question.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) withdrew his proposal in favour of the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) opposed Sir Malcolm Delevingne's amendment, which he did not think would carry the Committee any further.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. van Wettum that the question was of secondary importance. He proposed, however, that Dr. Anselmino should be invited to submit a memorandum on the subject.

The Committee agreed to the Chairman's proposal.

THIRD MEETING

Held on Thursday, May 27th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

12. Morphine Content of Opium used in Great Britain for the Manufacture of Morphia.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the average morphine content of opium used in the manufacture of morphia in Great Britain during the year 1925 was :

| | Per cent |
|---|----------|
| Turkish opium | 11.03 |
| Persian opium | 9 |
| Indian opium | 9.07 |
| Miscellaneous opium of unknown origin | 10.4 |
| General average | 9.13 |

In the previous year the general average was 10.12 per cent. He did not know whether these figures represented the amount actually extracted or the morphine content as determined by analysis. He would obtain that information for the

Committee. The figures confirmed the estimate hitherto adopted by the Committee of a 10 per cent morphine content as a fair general average.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Sir Malcolm Delevingne for his information, which confirmed the conclusions reached by the Committee on this subject.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the morphine content of Indian opium as ascertained by analysis was 9.57 per cent.

13. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments.

The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion of the annual reports was of particular interest, since it enabled the Committee to estimate the general movement of drugs throughout the world.

The ACTING SECRETARY read the first part of the summary of annual reports as far as the chapter on Austria (Annex 3).

Mr. S. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said that the annual report from the United States of America for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1924, and a similar report for the year ending June 30th, 1925, had been sent in the usual manner to the Netherlands delegation on April 29th, 1926. It was hoped that an annual report for the year ending June 30th, 1926, would be transmitted in a similar manner by next October.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there had not been sufficient time for the annual reports from the United States of America to have reached the Committee. He thanked the United States representative for his statement. It was indispensable for the Committee's work that it should be able to estimate the whole movement of drugs throughout the world.

In reply to an observation of Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE, M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) promised to telegraph immediately to his Government asking it to forward the reports from the United States of America for the years 1924 and 1925 if they had already been received.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) noted that no reports had been received from the Government of Portugal for the years 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924 and 1925, and that reports had been received from Macao for the years 1922 and 1924 only. No report had been received regarding the Portuguese possessions in India.

Information had reached the Indian Government showing that attempts were being made to use Goa as a base for illicit traffic. In these circumstances, he hoped that the Portuguese Government would forward a report regarding the position in Goa, its imports and exports, and the manner in which the drugs which had entered the territory by land or sea were disposed of. The report might be preceded by a statement as to the actual legal position in Goa regarding the drug traffic.

Dr. RODRIGUES (Portugal) said that, as he had already pointed out during the last two opium Conferences, no illicit traffic in drugs was known to exist in Portugal or in its colonies, and opium was not used for anything but medical or scientific purposes. Any information, therefore, regarding the traffic in opium and drugs in Portugal and her colonies would be merely of a scientific kind, except in the case of Macao.

The facts concerning Goa were quite new to him. He had lived for seven years in that colony, and he could say that, during that time, traffic in opium was absolutely unknown. Now, however, according to Sir John Campbell, an attempt was being made to establish in Goa a centre for that traffic. He could not at the moment give any information on the point, as he had no knowledge of it. He would, however, bring to the notice of his Government the information laid before the Committee by Sir John Campbell.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) emphasised the fact that the information had only recently come to the knowledge of the Government of India. It suggested that persons interested in the illicit traffic were attempting to utilise Goa as a base for their operations. He desired to bring this fact to the knowledge of the Portuguese Government, so that measures might be taken to prevent this new development on the part of smugglers from proving successful.

Dr. RODRIGUES (Portugal) thanked Sir John Campbell for his information, which would be of great service to the Portuguese Government. Such information showed the importance of the work of co-ordination performed by the Committee.

In reply to Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire), who had asked for details concerning the nature of the drugs which were being illicitly introduced into Goa, Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the particular case he had in mind related to charas or Indian hemp. Arrangements had been made for exporting Indian hemp from Goa. Other elements justified the suspicion that an attempt was being made to use Goa as a centre for illicit traffic generally, not only for Indian hemp but also for opium and other drugs.

Dr. RODRIGUES (Portugal) had thought that Sir John Campbell had only referred to opium in connection with Goa. The question of Indian hemp was entirely new, and the attention of the authorities in Goa had not, he thought, been drawn to it. There was a law in existence in the colony regulating the distribution among chemists of opium and its alkaloids as well

as cocaine and its derivatives. He knew that the authorities applied the regulations most strictly.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the evidence at the disposal of the Indian Government was complete in the Indian hemp case, but not so complete or definite with regard to other drugs. It had evidence, however, of an attempt to smuggle cocaine into India through Goa. Letters had been seized showing that such an attempt was under consideration and, in these circumstances, the actual law in force in Goa, and the details of the preventive system followed there, were of special interest to the Government of India.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that unfortunately the traffic in Indian hemp was not as yet prohibited by any existing convention. In the Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1912 there was a mere reference to the view of the Conference that the question of Indian hemp should be investigated from the scientific and statistical points of view with the object of regulating abuses in connection with it should such abuses become apparent. In any case, this showed how useful it would be for the Committee to submit to Governments certain provisional measures which might be adopted by them pending the putting into force of the 1925 Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) raised the question of Mexico. The summary of annual reports stated that Mexico was prepared to co-operate in the campaign against the opium traffic provided it was allowed to supply any information and statistics required to an institution independent of the League. Mexico had ratified the Hague Convention and was therefore under the obligation to furnish certain information annually to the Netherlands Government. He would have thought that the communication of such information to the Netherlands Government would have satisfied any scruples entertained by the Mexican Government with regard to communicating with the League. He asked whether the point had been raised with the Mexican Government through the intermediary of the Netherlands Government.

The ACTING SECRETARY stated that the attention of the Netherlands Government had been drawn to this point in a memorandum submitted to M. François, of the Dutch Foreign Office, who had attended the special session of the Assembly in March 1926. M. François had informed the Secretariat that he thought there would be nothing to prevent the Netherlands Government from drawing the attention of the Mexican Government to this point. A further communication had been sent to M. François, and a reply was awaited.

After a short exchange of views between M. VAN WETTUM and the ACTING SECRETARY, M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) undertook to ask his Government if it had approached the Mexican Government on the matter and if any reply had been received.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) informed the Committee that the German Government would submit a complete report for the year 1925, the annex to which would contain detailed figures of the trade with the various countries, colonies, etc. That report would, he hoped, be in the possession of the Committee before the end of the session.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that, as the summary stated, the Swiss Government had given statistics on the international traffic for the last five months of the year 1925. The summary, however, was not quite accurate, since it stated in the same paragraph that the Federal legislation was not in force, with the result that "the information in the possession of the Swiss Government was not sufficiently accurate to permit of a report being drawn up", while in the next sentence it stated: "The Federal law came into force on August 1st, 1925." As Switzerland, prior to 1925, had not been a party to the Hague Convention and had possessed no legislation regulating international traffic, it had naturally not been able to furnish exact statistics. The moment it had ratified that Convention and promulgated legislation on the subject, it had hastened to draw up as complete a report as possible and to send it in good time, so that it could be examined during the present session of the Committee.

The ACTING SECRETARY said that the report from Switzerland would shortly be distributed to the members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Dinichert for his explanations. The Committee would undoubtedly appreciate the speed with which the Swiss Government had sent in its report.

He would also thank Dr. Anselmino for stating that the report from Germany would probably reach the Committee during the session.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) had listened with great satisfaction to the statements of the representatives of Germany and Switzerland. Dr. Anselmino had previously given the Committee, from his own information, statistics for the manufacture of drugs in Germany in 1921. Would it be possible to include in the report now under preparation figures for the manufacture of drugs not only for 1925 but also for the intervening years between 1921 and 1925, and thus enable the omissions in the summary before the Committee to be completed? The value of the summary would be increased by the possession of these comparative figures, for it would then be possible for the Committee to judge the course

of manufacture in Germany over a period of years. Statistics for Germany could also be compared with similar statistics from other manufacturing countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the figures for 1922 had already been communicated. He was unable to say whether his Government could furnish figures for 1923 and 1924, but he would ask it to do so.

Austria (1924) ; Belgium (1924 and 1925).

No observations.

Chosen (1924).

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the sentence "The smoking of prepared opium is *still* prohibited in Chosen" might have been more happily expressed as "such smoking was absolutely forbidden".

The CHAIRMAN said that this amendment would be made.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) drew attention to the fact that the yield per acre in Chosen appeared abnormally small. It was approximately 3.71 lb. per acre. In India the yield for the same year had been approximately 16 lb. per acre. The average yield in India was from 11 to 12 lb., or about three times higher than the yield in Chosen. It was probable that there were physical reasons why this was so, but he would be grateful if the Japanese representative could give the Committee any information on the point.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that undoubtedly the climate was in part responsible for the low yield. The soil of Chosen was not as fertile as that of India. Other factors might also contribute. He would refer to his Government for detailed explanations, if the Committee so desired.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that he was quite satisfied with M. Sugimura's explanation.

Danzig (1924) ; Falkland Islands (1925).

No observations.

Federated Malay States (1924).

In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the registration of customers in the Federated Malay States was compulsory.

Formosa (1924).

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, in the statistics for raw opium communicated to the Committee, it was stated that 726 kgs. of raw opium had been imported by Formosa from Great Britain in 1924, whereas the British report for that year showed that there had been no export of opium to Formosa. In actual fact, no opium had been exported from Great Britain to Formosa for a number of years.

The question of discrepancies between the imports of a country and the corresponding exports from the exporting country had been discussed on a previous occasion. He asked the Secretariat whether any rule had been adopted whereby the statistics of one country were compared with those of another, and whether, when discrepancies occurred, an attempt was made to find an explanation for them.

M. BLANCO replied that in general, when discrepancies occurred, the point was raised. Discrepancies between the figures of imports obtained from the importing country and the figures of export obtained from the exporting country were sometimes due to the fact that the consignment shown in the report of the exporting country had not reached the importing country at the time when that country sent in its report. In such cases the discrepancies were not questioned, but if it were so desired, the Secretariat could make it a rule always to question them in future.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) was glad to note that it was the practice of the Secretariat to examine the reports and compare statistics. He would propose a resolution on the subject at a later stage.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) drew attention to the statistics for the period 1920-1924 given in the Annex to the report, which showed large exports of opium from India to Formosa. According to the Indian figures of export, however, no opium had been sent to Formosa since the year 1916-1917, when 200 chests had been sent.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that Japan purchased at least 50 cases of opium a year from India, which arrived at Kobe and were transhipped to Formosa. This might account for the discrepancy. He quite agreed that measures could be adopted making it possible to

compare the various statistics. As the Secretariat had pointed out, all the consignments did not reach the importing country immediately, which would account for the discrepancies between the statistics.

The CHAIRMAN said that, when the question was being discussed by the Committee, it should examine the extent of these discrepancies. The matter was important if the Committee wished to obtain an accurate estimate of the movement of drugs throughout the world.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought that M. Sugimura's explanation did not cover the whole ground. The import of 50 chests a year to Formosa would mean between 3,000 and 4,000 kgs. a year. In 1923, however, the number of kilogrammes given in the table as imported from India had been 10,800; in 1921, 9,867; and in 1920, 8,776. Had the Secretariat taken any action with regard to this particular discrepancy?

M. BLANCO replied in the negative.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said he would make a proposal at a later stage in connection with these discrepancies.

With regard to the cultivation of the coca plant in Formosa, Sir Malcolm Delevingne asked M. Sugimura if he could give the amount of the production of coca from the 684 acres which had been planted, and if he could inform the Committee for what purposes the product was used.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that in 1923, as the result of drought, all the plants had died. The experiment had therefore had to be repeated in the mountains. It had been carried out with the hope of making it possible to import less Java coca leaf to supply Japanese medical requirements. The planting of coca was, therefore, being carried out on a limited scale, but up to the moment the experiment had not been very successful.

Greece (1924).

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) called attention to the statement that the narcotics imported into Greece appeared to be limited to drugs for the medical requirements of the country. No figures had apparently been given by the Greek Government of the actual amounts of these imports.

He recalled that he had already mentioned at a previous session that the report from France for 1923 had shown that the large amount of 1,719 kgs. of morphine had been exported to Greece. The report for 1924 showed that 370 kgs. of heroin had been exported to Greece. These figures indicated imports which were very largely in excess of any medical requirements in Greece itself. It was somewhat strange that the report furnished by the Greek Government should give no figures of imports and should contain a statement that the narcotics imported appeared to be limited to drugs for medical requirements in the country. Could the Secretariat offer any explanation, or had any enquiry been made regarding the import of manufactured drugs into Greece?

He had circulated a memorandum concerning the position of the drug traffic in Egypt¹. The Egyptian Government had recently promulgated a new law owing to the fact that the illicit drug traffic and the drug habit had become so serious in Egypt that very strong measures had been required to deal with the problem. It was understood that a great deal of the smuggling of drugs into Egypt was carried on by Greek traders. This was an additional consideration, making it important to examine the question of the import of drugs into Greece and the export of drugs from that country. Why were there no figures for imports and exports in the Greek report?

M. BLANCO said that the Secretariat had repeatedly tried to obtain additional information from the Greek Government by making semi-official representations through a Greek member of the Secretariat. As a result, information had been forwarded to the Secretariat and was to be found in document O. C. 23 (c) 4. This information, however, made no mention of the question of alkaloids. It referred mainly to opium. It had been despatched on May 21st—that was to say subsequent to the preparation of the summary.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought that the matter should be emphasised in the Committee's report.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that before leaving Greece he had asked a representative of the Greek Government now at Geneva to obtain information on the point if possible. He gathered that the information was not yet available.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he would be in a position to submit information before the end of the session concerning the exports from France to Greece and Cuba.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the Secretariat should get into touch with the Greek representative, M. Dendramis, now at Geneva, and ask him whether he had been able to obtain any statistics.

This proposal was adopted.

¹ See Annex 11 to the Report of the Committee.

Hong-Kong (1924).

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the fifty chests shown as transhipped for Kobe in Hong-Kong during the year 1924 had been destined for Formosa.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the new ordinance to which reference was made in the first paragraph of the summary relating to Hong-Kong had had the effect of compelling the firm of Nemazee & Co., who had been and still were notorious for their opium transactions in the Far East, to remove the base of their operations from Hong-Kong to another country. This showed the value of the legislative measures urged at the time of the Opium Conference.

In reply to M. van Wettum, he stated that Messrs. Nemazee & Co. had several bases of operations—one in Shanghai, another in Bombay and a third in Macao.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the Indian Government was examining the question whether it should adopt legislation similar to that which had been adopted in England. On that point it had already consulted the local governments. As the Committee was aware, all exports of Indian opium to Persia, Dairen and Macao had been stopped.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) explained that the firm of Nemazee & Co. did not operate in Indian but in Persian opium. It made its arrangements in Bombay, but the opium was exported from Persia to the Far East probably without touching any Indian port.

He would call attention to the very large figure of seizures in Hong-Kong during 1924 : 11,904 oz. of morphine, 5,280 oz. heroin, 2,000 oz. of cocaine. These figures, which were only for a single port, showed the enormous scale on which the illicit traffic in drugs was still being conducted.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) referred to the sentence in which it was stated : " This marked decrease (in the sales of Government opium) coincides with the appearance on the market of a bountiful crop of Chinese opium. " He thought that it was unjustifiable to attribute the blame for this fact to the Chinese. The fact that the sale of opium in Hong-Kong had decreased showed that the stipulations of Article 9 of the Hague Convention were being fulfilled, and that the Hong-Kong Government realised its duty gradually to reduce the consumption of prepared opium in accordance with the terms of that article.

It was also the duty of that Government to prevent smuggling, and, while it should be congratulated on the amount of morphine, heroin and cocaine which had been confiscated, the Committee should not lose sight of the unknown amount which had been successfully smuggled—an amount which had not been estimated by the Hong-Kong authorities. He had been informed that the Customs officials considered themselves unable to seize more than 10 per cent of the total amount of goods smuggled. He would therefore like the Committee to call the attention of the countries manufacturing dangerous drugs to their grave responsibilities in the matter.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) thought that the complaint of M. Chao-Hsin Chu was unjustified. The passage to which he had referred was a mere statement of fact, as was shown by the following sentence of the report : " Prepared opium of superior quality was smuggled in large quantities from Amoy and was sold at a very cheap price, from \$3 to \$5 a tael. " The fact that there had been a bountiful opium crop in China at that time was undisputed, as was also the fact that large quantities had been smuggled from China into Hong-Kong. To report such smuggling was the duty of the Hong-Kong Government.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) enquired whether the opium stated to be smuggled from Amoy to Hong-Kong and sold at from \$3 to \$5 a tael was Chinese opium or foreign opium smuggled into China.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) replied that, according to the report of the Hong-Kong Government, it was Chinese opium.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the opium referred to was stated to be of superior quality—that was to say equivalent to Indian opium. He was sure, however, that the Chinese native opium was not of such superior quality as the Indian opium sold by the Hong-Kong Government.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the report had not stated that the opium was of better quality than Indian opium or even that it was of as good a quality. It merely said that " prepared opium of superior quality was smuggled in large quantities from Amoy ". There was no reason to doubt the statement of the Hong-Kong Government that this opium was of Chinese production. The price at which it was sold was an indication of the fact that it was Chinese and not foreign opium.

The CHAIRMAN recalled the fact that the representative of China had referred to the danger of the import of heroin, morphia and other European-manufactured drugs into the Far East. The countries manufacturing these products had realised the necessity of taking measures to control their export. Such control was one of the objects of the Convention which had been signed by the manufacturing countries and it was this Convention that the Committee desired to see ratified and put into force as soon as possible. He hoped that

proof would shortly be furnished to China of the efficacy of the measures adopted in that Convention.

India (1924).

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) asked Sir John Campbell whether the Government of India had any information concerning the export of opium to Bushire. What had been the real destination of that opium? Had it been re-exported, and who had handled it?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that when the Government of India discovered that opium which had been exported to Bushire (under the usual import certificate furnished by the Persian authorities to the effect that the opium was required for legitimate purposes) was being sent to China, and that it was finding its way into illicit channels, the Indian Government had at once stopped all export of opium to Persia. In future, whether an import certificate was furnished or not, the Government of India would refuse to allow the export of Indian opium to Persia. Exports to Persia had begun in 1920, when the amount sent was 20 chests, in 1921-22 it had been 65 chests, but the traffic had not become considerable until 1923.

He gave the Committee the following supplementary statistics regarding India.

Area under Cultivation.

| | | | | | | | Acres |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---------|
| Prior to 1922 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 200,000 |
| 1922-23 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 141,000 |
| 1923-24 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 134,000 |
| 1924-25 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 116,000 |

For the season 1925-26, arrangements had been made for the cultivation of 74,000 acres only.

With regard to the cultivation of the coca plant, one of the assessors at the previous session had expressed some doubt as to the accuracy of the information supplied by the Government of India. A detailed enquiry had therefore been made, the result of which was to be found in document O. C. 381. The substance of that document was that the coca plant was not cultivated in India and that there was no intention whatever of cultivating it.

With regard to a second point raised during the previous session, also by the same assessor, concerning exports from India to British North Borneo (which, it was maintained, did not show that progressive diminution which might reasonably have been expected), he would submit the exact figures:

| | | | | | |
|---------|----|----|----|----|---|
| In 1920 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 176 chests had been exported. |
| „ 1921 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 240 „ „ |
| „ 1922 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 60 „ „ |
| „ 1923 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 84 „ „ |
| „ 1924 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 84 „ „ |
| „ 1925 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 50 „ „ |
| „ 1926 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 36 had been asked for and agreed to by the Indian Government. |

There were two further points—one relating to an important announcement of policy, the other to the question of opium production in the Shan States—which he would lay before the Committee at a later stage.

FOURTH MEETING

Held on Thursday, May 27th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

14. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (*continuation*).

India (1924) (continuation).

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the steps taken by the Government of India: in particular, the considerable reduction effected in cultivation, and the restrictions on export.

Indo-China (1924).

The CHAIRMAN read a document containing supplementary information.

It was decided that this document should be distributed to the members of the Committee (Document O. C. 443).

The CHAIRMAN added that the increase in smuggling was due to the special situation existing in the neighbouring provinces of China and to the high price of the monopoly. Smuggling syndicates possessing enormous capital operated in the Gulf of Tonkin, with Hong-Kong and Shanghai as their headquarters. He believed that the most effective way of dealing with the position would be for the interested authorities to exchange views and information on the subject, not only by official correspondence but, if possible, by direct contact. This exchange of views, moreover, was provided for in Article VIII of the Convention, which had been ratified both by the British and French Governments and which should enter into force next July.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the system of direct exchange of views would be heartily welcomed by the British Government and the authorities at Hong-Kong, who had already received instructions to co-operate in this way with the authorities of the French possessions. The operations of the wealthy syndicates in the Gulf of Tonkin would require the efforts of both the French and British authorities to put them down.

The CHAIRMAN added that an agreement had just been concluded with the Government of India to the effect that purchases should be made between Government and Government and not by public auction.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) enquired whether the 780 kgs. of prepared opium offered for sale in the province of Kwang-Chow-Wan should be added to the raw opium sent to that province.

The CHAIRMAN said that he believed this to be the case.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Committee would be interested to know what was the actual amount of opium sent to Kwang-Chow-Wan from Indo-China.

The CHAIRMAN said that the sales were indicated in the statistics which he had just read and which would be distributed to the Committee.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said he would like to emphasise the extent of the illicit traffic in Indo-China as shown by the quantity seized. If it were assured that 10 per cent of the smuggled goods were seized, this traffic amounted to one-third of the total imports and to approximately one-half the total quantity consumed.

With regard to the remarks concerning smuggling from particular countries, there was one obvious mistake in the summary, which referred to opium-producing countries, "such as China, the Shan States and Burma". There was no opium production of any kind in Burma. The case of the Shan States was rather a special one. He had asked the Government of India to supply the Committee with exact information on the position, and he had now received its reply. The Shan States were divided into two main regions: Cis-Salween and Trans-Salween. The production of opium in the Cis-Salween States was placed under control in 1923. The position in the Trans-Salween States and in the Shan States generally was described in a letter from the Government of Burma. The Government of India had accepted the conclusions contained in this letter.

Sir John Campbell then read the letter from the Government of Burma, which he proposed should be distributed to the Committee (Document O. C. 444).

He had also received information emanating from the Consul-General at Chingmai in regard to the position in Siam. It was pointed out that opium was being produced in enormous quantities in Southern China and that a great deal of this was exported to the Shan States. The authorities in those States were therefore in much the same position as the Siamese authorities. If they desired to stop the local production of opium, they must prevent its import from abroad. This, however, was impossible, as the frontier between China and the Shan States and other dependencies of Burma was almost one thousand miles in extent and ran through mountainous country. It was impossible seriously to limit smuggling.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the assumption that one-tenth of the smuggled opium was seized by the authorities, said that this calculation was based upon normal conditions—obstructions, value, character of the frontier, profits, requirements, etc. In the special case of Indo-China, this coefficient was of practically no value.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) agreed.

Italy (1924).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the reference to the control exercised by the Italian Government over consignments in transit was extremely interesting. He would refer in this connection to a letter from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Rome distributed last year (Document O. C. 272), in which the Italian Ministry for the Interior called attention to the fact that it had granted a transit licence for 12,000 kgs. consigned from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the Comptoir Central des Alcaloïdes in France.

The Italian authorities had drawn the particular attention of the Swiss and French Governments to the necessity of exercising supervision in this case owing to the large quantity involved.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Comptoir Central des Alcaloïdes had set up a morphine factory two years ago, but that the factory had only begun to work last year, a fact which explained the amount of its purchases.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) drew attention to the fact that there was no mention of this export in transit from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to France in the figures given by the delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that the figures which had been circulated had been received by telegram and must be regarded as provisional. He would ask for the necessary information.

Japan (1924).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), referring to the discussion on the production of cocaine in Japan which had taken place in the previous year, said that it had been noted that there was a very large production of cocaine, which was apparently in excess of the medical requirements of the country. He observed that, though there had been a considerable reduction in 1924 as compared with 1923, the figure was still fairly high.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the Japanese Government was also of opinion that the figures for the average consumption were high, but the policy of his Government had been to decrease the quantity and to lower the average consumption. He added that the Japanese doctors did not use novocaine, which meant that the consumption of cocaine was higher.

Kwang-tung Leased Territory (1924).

No observations.

Netherlands (1924).

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that at a later stage he would have certain information to give to the Committee in regard to the coca leaf.

Netherlands East Indies (1924).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked how the 791 tons of coca leaf shipped to the Netherlands was redistributed, as he understood that these leaves were not used in the Netherlands.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he would give that information later on, and he would also make a statement on the policy of the Netherlands East Indies.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) noted that in the report of the Netherlands East Indies the smuggling had been ascribed largely to China and especially to South China, the total amount seized being given as 616 kgs. Could M. van Wettum tell the Committee what percentage of the total amount smuggled this figure was estimated to represent? Did it, for example, represent roughly the total amount or only a small proportion?

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he thought it was a small proportion of the total amount smuggled and that it was a very high figure for the Netherlands East Indies.

Palestine (1924).

The CHAIRMAN observed that the reports from mandated territories might be included in the document now before the Committee.

The ACTING SECRETARY said it would be possible to do so.

Poland (1924).

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was now considering the summaries of the annual reports of each of the countries. These summaries were followed by statistical tables. Unfortunately, however, there were neither comments nor explanations nor graphs indicating the movement of international trade. It was very difficult to draw conclusions from reading the statistical tables only. It would be necessary for the Committee, after examining the annual reports, to ascertain the precise bearing of the statistics.

Portugal: Macao (1924).

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that before referring to the report on Macao he would reply to the observations made at the previous meeting by Sir John Campbell. Sir John Campbell had said that attempts were being made to use Goa as a base for the illicit traffic. He was happy to be able to confirm the explanations given on this subject by Dr. Rodrigues, who had

replaced him at the previous meeting. The laws in force in the Portuguese Indies were sufficiently strict to prevent any such attempt being successful.

As to the paragraph of the report by the Secretariat concerning Portugal he would observe that the report for 1925 was in course of preparation. He could say at once that, except at Macao, where there existed a fairly considerable Chinese population, there was not, either in Portugal or in her colonies, any cultivation, preparation or consumption of drugs and narcotics which were used only for medical and scientific purposes.

Document O. C. 417 mentioned a fact which, from the way it was presented, made an extremely unpleasant reference to Portugal. He felt it necessary to explain the information contained in the report in order to prevent the attribution to Portugal of a responsibility which should not be attached to his country. It was stated on p. 11 of document O. C. 417 that the vessel *Mowinckel* left Bushire with 100 cases of opium destined for Keelung and 813 cases destined for Vladivostock. "According to the Gazette of Macao", ran the document in question, "the s.s. *Mowinckel* arrived at Macao on August 5th and departed on the same day for Keelung. On August 15th the vessel was at Keelung and unloaded 100 cases of opium.

It would be seen that no further reference was made to the 813 cases taken on board at Bushire, or to Vladivostock, the port to which the 813 cases were consigned. As, on the other hand, attention was drawn to the fact that the s.s. *Mowinckel* had touched Macao on August 5th, it was left to be presumed that the 813 cases had remained at Macao.

He must protest against this way of reporting facts, which would lead the reader to attach a responsibility to Portugal which she had not actually incurred.

All the imports of opium made at Macao were communicated to the Chinese Customs authorities of the Isle of Lapa and to the Government of Hong-Kong. Why, therefore, had this information been introduced from the Macao Gazette, particularly as there was no publication of that name at Macao?

He would also draw attention to the following fact. The s.s. *Mowinckel* had touched at Macao on August 5th and had left on the same day. He was informed that it would be impossible to unload 813 cases of opium at Macao in a single day, as vessels cast anchor some five miles from the coast and the unloading had to be conducted in an extremely primitive manner.

The ACTING SECRETARY said that the passage in question was based on a report received from the British member of the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he would take full responsibility for document O. C. 417 (a) if that were the document to which reference was being made. The case of s.s. *Mowinckel* would have to be discussed later. He would say at once, however, that though the *Gazette de Macao* might be a wrong title, he had an extract from the official paper of Macao containing the imports into Macao during the month of August 1925. This statement, which came from the office of the Opium Superintendent in Macao, was to the effect that, during August, 190 cases of Benares opium were imported, together with 380 cases of Persian opium, making a total of 570 cases in the month during which the *Mowinckel* touched at Macao.

He would further point out that, in the summary of the annual report for Macao for 1924, it was stated that the contract made with the farmers fixed the amount of opium to be imported for preparation and sale at 360, 330 and 300 chests respectively for the next three years. Could M. Ferreira give the Committee the total figures of imports into Macao for 1925?

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that the report for 1925 was in preparation and that he hoped to submit it before the close of the session.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether M. Ferreira had any fresh information as to the re-exports.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that this question had been dealt with in the previous year. He had referred on that occasion to a declaration which he had made at the First Opium Conference to the effect that the Portuguese authorities, being aware that exports had not reached their destination, would prohibit them if their destination was not certain.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether any exports at all were allowed from Macao.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said he could not reply until he had received the report for 1925.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that, if no information for 1925 were available, consideration of the subject would have to be postponed till the next session of the Committee. He would point out, however, that it was nearly twelve months since the Committee had last discussed the subject and that, according to the information received by the British Government, there were still large quantities of opium going to Macao.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said he would like to explain to M. Ferreira what he had said that morning to Dr. Rodrigues with reference to Goa. The Government of India had information showing that attempts were being made to use Goa for the contraband trade. It was the obvious duty of his Government to communicate this information to the Committee, and particularly to the representative of the Government of Portugal, in order that that Government might be aware of the facts and might be in a position to supply the Committee with

precise information as to the laws in force in Goa and as to the traffic in narcotics, if any. His only motive in raising the question was, of course, to assist in taking all possible steps to prevent the creation of a new centre of contraband traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Committee was anxious to discover whether there was any legitimate export of opium from Macao. Instances had last year been given of ships which had left Macao with consignments of opium for Paraguay which never reached Paraguay, and the Portuguese Government had undertaken in future that exports to doubtful destinations should not be allowed. He was now anxious to know what became of the opium which went to Macao. The Government of Macao, in its contract with the farmer, had limited his imports to 300 chests per annum, but, according to the information received, this was by no means the full amount which had been imported into Macao from Persia and elsewhere.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) suggested that the Committee should await information which he had asked for from Lisbon.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should pass to the next chapter. M. Ferreira would be able to modify the note contained in the summary of the annual report when he had received the necessary particulars.

Sarawak (1924).

No observations.

Siam (1923 and 1924).

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that the Commission which was to have been set up to study the opium question in co-operation with the League of Nations had been instituted, but owing to the death of the King, its work had been postponed; the Commission would meet, however, as soon as normal conditions were restored. The majority of the Powers had agreed to revise their treaties, and the French and English treaties were now actually in force, as well as the Danish and American treaties. He hoped that all of them would be ratified by next March.

If the revenue derived from opium was to cease, it would be necessary to find a substitute, which could only be done when the economic position of Siam was stabilised.

He did not quite see how smuggling could be overcome owing to the extent of the Siamese frontiers. Smuggling was increasing enormously and would be a most difficult problem to solve.

As soon as all the treaties had been ratified and Siam had complete jurisdiction in the matter, all offenders would be judged under Siamese law. At the present moment, one of the difficulties in the campaign against smuggling was that the Treaty Powers had consular courts which inflicted different penalties.

Straits Settlements (1924).

The CHAIRMAN noted that the total population was 498,547 and that the number of men above 21 was 247,846. The Committee had had occasion to adopt the figure of one-quarter as the proportion of males above 21 years of age to the total population.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) explained that the Chinese population of the Straits Settlements was largely composed of temporary immigrants who came to work and did not bring their families.

Swaziland (1925).

No observations.

Unfederated Malay States (1924).

No observations.

Union of South Africa (1925).

No observations.

Statistical Tables.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether any member of the Committee desired to present any observations on the form in which the statistical tables were drawn up.

There was one point on which he felt some doubt. When no figures were given in the tables, it was impossible to know whether the omission was due to the fact that the figure was small or whether it was because the Government had not supplied it.

M. BLANCO explained that when no figure was given it meant that a report had been received by the Secretariat but that it did not contain any data relating to the drug dealt with in the table. When a country had reached the minimum figure fixed by the Subcommittee which had decided on the procedure to be adopted in drawing up the tables,

particulars were given in the table to make it possible to compare the figures over a five-year period, and in that case the figures were included, even if they were below the minimum. The only reports which had been received but which did not appear in the statistics were the reports of countries which had never attained the minimum.

The CHAIRMAN said that a note on the way in which the annual reports were prepared would be distributed later. It would therefore be better to discuss this question to-morrow. He would ask, however, whether any members of the Committee desired to make any observations on the figures themselves. He would suggest that, as the statistics were of great interest, it might be useful to appoint a sub-committee of three members to examine them.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he had one observation to make on the statistics given by the delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Out of a total production of 120,000 to 125,000 kgs., it was stated that 100,000 kgs. had been exported to Greece. This would appear to mean in reality that 100,000 kgs. were sent to Salonica, either in transit or for re-export. The report from the Greek Government did not seem to take any account of these exports of opium from Serbia to Greece, and there was no information concerning the final destination of the bulk of the Serbian production of opium. He would therefore ask the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes whether it would be possible to give the Committee any information as to the ultimate destination of these exports.

FIFTH MEETING

Held on Friday, May 28th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

15. Method of Preparation of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments.

The following note, prepared by the Secretariat, was read:

"In conformity with the instructions contained in the 'Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to study the question of the form of the summary of annual reports from Governments', the grammes have been eliminated in all tables. However, when it has been necessary to show not only a total but subdivisions of a total, according to the main countries of destination, figures when necessary have been rounded, so that, when added together, they equal exactly the gross total given in the annual report.

"In conformity with the same instructions, and for the purpose of comparison, the tables in the summary have been made to show figures for countries whose reports have at any time attained or exceeded the minimum figure fixed by the Sub-Committee. For instance, although the importation of morphine in the Netherlands East Indies during the year 1924 amounted to but 3 kgs. and did not reach the minimum of 25 kgs., the Netherlands East Indies is made to appear in the tables owing to the fact that the importations of morphine in the year 1922—which amounted to 46 kgs.—exceeded the minimum fixed by the Sub-Committee.

"The only countries for which reports have been received, but which do not figure in the tables, are countries whose imports, exports or consumption, as shown by their annual reports, have never reached the minimum fixed by the Sub-Committee.

"Whenever possible, the figures for exports—from opium and coca-producing as well as from drug-manufacturing countries—have been to show countries of destination as well as the total exports."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked why information as to the countries of destination was not given in the case of exports from distributing countries as well as in the case of exports from opium- or coca-producing and drug-manufacturing countries. Distributing countries were just as important as manufacturing or producing countries.

M. BLANCO explained that this paragraph had been inserted in the note to draw attention to the fact that the instructions of the Sub-Committee regarding the preparation of the summary had not covered distributing countries but only countries which manufactured drugs.

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, the Committee deleted the words "from opium- and coca-producing, as well as from drug-manufacturing countries" from the last paragraph

of the Note, which should read as follows: "Whenever possible, the figures for exports have been made to show countries of destination as well as the total exports."

M. BLANCO explained, in answer to the CHAIRMAN, that the Secretariat gave figures for distributing countries whenever possible. This practice had only been adopted with regard to the last report.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be possible to prepare graphs which would enable the Committee easily and quickly to appreciate the general movement of the international trade in drugs. He would not press the proposal, but he hoped that the Secretariat would bear it in mind.

16. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (*continuation*).

Statistical Tables (continuation).

Raw Opium.

France.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) referred to a discrepancy illustrating the point to which he had called attention at the previous meeting. As regards France, the export of 1,700 kgs. of raw opium from France to Norway in 1923 was shown, but no corresponding import of raw opium into Norway was shown. It was exactly this kind of discrepancy which should be enquired into by the Secretariat. Norway had submitted a report, for in the second table, under the heading "Medicinal opium statistics", a figure was given showing Norwegian imports of medicinal opium. In general, any large discrepancy discovered called for enquiry.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would have the figures verified by the French Department concerned. It would be of interest to examine the statistical tables with the object of discovering whether the discrepancies were considerable. It would be possible to draw from this study useful conclusions concerning the measures to be taken to ensure the accuracy of statistics (uniformity of nomenclature, etc.).

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, since members only received the summary on their arrival at Geneva, it was obviously impossible for them to examine closely a document of over 50 pages containing many statistics. He felt strongly that that work should be done by the Secretariat, which should enquire into discrepancies, examine the statistics and summarise the results, so that a clear picture might be submitted to the Committee. It was quite impossible for members to do this for themselves during the short duration of a session.

The CHAIRMAN agreed. The statistics submitted to the Committee were of great importance to its work. When could the Secretariat prepare the summary suggested by Sir Malcolm Delevingne?

M. BLANCO replied that, in the case of reports received two months before the date of a session, it would be possible to make a comparative study and point out the discrepancies. At the moment, as many reports as possible were included in the summary. As regards the present summary, only one report was excluded—that on Madagascar.

If the Secretariat were empowered to exclude from the summary reports received after a certain date, it would be possible for it to carry out the comparison. The reports for Europe should be sent in July and for other countries in October.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in that case the Committee should not hold a session before March.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the Committee had decided after considerable discussion that its session should take place in January. Reports from far distant countries, if sent out by October 1st, would reach the Secretariat before the end of November and thus allow nearly two months for completing the tables.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that its sessions ought normally to take place at the end of January.

Formosa.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the statistics for Formosa showed an import of 726 kgs. from Great Britain in 1924. Great Britain, however, had exported no raw opium to Formosa in that year, nor, indeed, for some years. Was there any explanation of that figure?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the figure probably referred to opium bought from British traders and exported from Turkey. He would cause enquiry to be made.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that in that case the amount ought to have been shown as an export from Turkey.

Macao.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that, under the heading "Macao", there was an entry of 2,608 kgs. of opium exported from Kwang-Chow-Wan. The Committee had noted this at the previous session and the French representative had undertaken to make enquiries.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had no information at his disposal for the moment but that he would ask the authorities concerned to supply it.

Persia.

In reply to Sir John CAMPBELL (India), who said that there were no statistics from Persia later than 1922, Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that there was ample information to be obtained regarding the production of opium in Persia from the annual reports of the American Financial Adviser to the Persian Government. The Committee might consider that, when sufficient data could not be obtained from an annual report, the information available from other official sources should be used. In all cases the source of information should be stated.

The CHAIRMAN thought that this question had already been settled when the Committee had decided that only official documents should be used by the Secretariat when drawing up statistical tables.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed, but pointed out that in the case of Persia the annual report of the American Financial Adviser was an official document. There might be similar official information available for other countries. Turkish Customs reports, for instance, might be available.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it might be possible for the statistical tables to be prepared from official sources, as was the practice, and for other additional information, prepared on the lines suggested by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, to be included in an annex to the summary. Would the Committee agree to the adoption of such a principle?

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thought that, at first sight, the proposal was a happy one. If, however, the Committee published in an annex to an official publication of the League, based on official information, figures which had not quite the same character—for distinction would have to be made between statistics coming from Governments and statistics coming from any other sources—it might run the risk of finding its conclusions disputed. In that case it should be quite understood that, if the Government concerned saw fit to comment on any information contained in the annex, its comments should be taken into consideration.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) fully agreed with the Swiss delegate. His remarks also applied to information on China sent to the Advisory Committee by unofficial organisations without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese Government.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that great prudence was necessary. No document prepared in this manner should be published without the approval of the Advisory Committee.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that certain information regarding China, and in a sense which was insulting to the Chinese Government, had been officially circulated by the Secretariat without the consent of the representative of that Government on the Committee. No Government would permit a private organisation to write letters to the Committee insulting that Government.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) thought that there was a misunderstanding. His proposal referred only to official statistics officially published but not communicated to the Committee in the form of an annual report. It in no way concerned any unofficial information such as that to which M. Chao-Hsin Chu had referred. The reports of the American Financial Adviser to the Persian Government were official in every sense of the word, for they were published with the authority of the Persian Government. The same remark applied to the Customs reports published under the authority of the Government concerned. His proposal would merely make it possible to use official information available in cases where an annual report had not been addressed to the League; he thought it possible for the Committee to take a decision on this point without involving itself in a discussion on the point raised by M. Chao-Hsin Chu.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne could be discussed later on in the session in order that members should be allowed time to reflect on it.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the point which he had raised was used by him in support of the contention of the Swiss representative.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thanked the Chinese representative for his support. He would dissipate the misunderstanding. If the majority of the Committee agreed with the

proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, he would make no objection to it provided that it was adopted with the reserve that, if it published in an annex information not obtained from the reports of Governments, the Committee should undertake at the same time to publish any comment made by a Government regarding such statistics.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question was an important one and would have to be settled before the end of the session. In the case of Persia, however, no difficulty would be experienced in obtaining information, since a Committee of Investigation had been at work in that country and would shortly submit a report to the Advisory Committee on the whole problem of opium in Persia.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that no information could be accepted by the Committee which criticised or insulted a Government.

The CHAIRMAN thought that every member of the Committee would agree with the Chinese representative. The Committee should very carefully consider Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposal but should take no immediate decision regarding it.

The Committee agreed with the view of the Chairman.

Turkey.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire), referring to the figure of 565,826 kgs. shown as the amount of opium produced in Turkey for 1924, asked how that figure had been obtained, in view of the fact that Turkey had not submitted an annual report.

M. BLANCO replied that the figures had been officially communicated to the Secretariat in a letter dated January 30th, 1925, from the Turkish Legation in Berne. The letter had stated that, in 1924, 303,374 denumes had been sown with poppy and had produced 441,018 oks of opium.

Switzerland.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) drew the attention of the Committee to the figure 5,983 kgs. shown as having been imported by Switzerland from Greece in 1925. He had already been asked what became of the opium exported from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to Greece, and he had explained that it was not possible to supply this information in view of the fact that the figures given by his Government were based on the Customs returns and did not come from the competent office controlling the production of opium. Since the Greek Government had shown that production in Greece was from 1,500 to 2,000 kgs., it was probable that the excess of its opium exports came from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and formed part of the 5,983 kgs. imported by Switzerland from Greece. There was a close connection between Greek traders in Salonica and Serbian producers in Macedonia, and many Greek firms purchased opium and exported it. The destination of these exports was a matter rather for the Greek Government than for the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, although the opium had been bought in Serbia. Further, the United States of America were shown as having imported 11,016 kgs. of opium from Greece. This opium had probably also been obtained from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the reply of M. Fotitch showed that he had been right in his criticism that there was no information in the Greek report showing the destination of the opium imported from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to Greece. This was a point to which attention should be drawn in the Committee's report.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne referred to the figure of 10,000 kgs. of opium shown as having been imported by Switzerland from Persia and China in the year 1923. Was there any explanation of the way in which that opium had left China? He was under the impression that the export of opium from that country was contrary to the policy of the Government.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that Sir Malcolm Delevingne was correct. China had prohibited the production of opium, and any quantity produced had been grown illegally and without the knowledge of the Chinese Government. That being so, no figures for the total production of opium in China were available, for no Government could send official figures of a production which it did not recognise legally.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that he was unable to explain the above figure. He would endeavour to obtain information. In any case, the figure in question could not have been contained in an annual report, for Switzerland had not yet presented one, since the legislation making it possible to exercise control in this matter had only come into force in August 1925, whereas the figure mentioned referred to 1923. In any case, any explanation which he might find possible to make at a later date would in no way compromise the position of China.

Preparation of a Summary of Statistics concerning Raw Opium: Proposal by Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that in the present report no summary of the figures had been attached to the table of raw opium statistics. He would suggest that

in future a table of this kind should be appended summarising the results of the statistics. There ought, for instance, to be a summary of the total production of raw opium in the different countries so far as their production had been reported. It would then be possible for the Committee, without having to make the calculation for itself, to obtain the figures for the total production of opium throughout the world as far as reported. At the same time, the summary might show how much had been retained for local consumption and how much had been exported.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that a certain quantity of raw opium was retained in producing countries not for consumption but for keeping up the stocks for sale in the following year. It would seem impossible, therefore, to obtain the total in the way Sir Malcolm Delevingne had suggested. The total figure for production could be shown but not the figure for consumption.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that at any rate the total exports could be given.

The CHAIRMAN thought that some such proposal as that made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne should be adopted. When the whole table of statistics had been examined, perhaps it would be possible to agree on a general proposal of that nature.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) hoped that the Committee would not once more discuss the form of the statistics, which had already been exhaustively dealt with at previous sessions. Something would have to be done, but further discussion would not enable the Committee to reach any conclusion. It was for the Secretariat to decide the question.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) agreed with M. van Wettum and Sir Malcolm Delevingne. At the same time, the statistics hitherto submitted were merely in the nature of a mine from which the ore would have to be quarried. They gave no concrete idea of the movements of trade. The Central Board established by the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference would be unable properly to carry out its duties unless it could get much closer to realities than the Committee had hitherto been able to do.

The general lines to be followed were clear. A certain number of countries produced raw opium, for example. It was the Committee's duty to find out the amount of their production. To assist in eliminating the effect of stocks, this might be done for a period of five years. The question of stocks referred to by M. van Wettum would thus be avoided to a considerable extent. This opium would then have to be followed, by means of statistics, to its ultimate destinations, and the net result shown. For instance, India would be shown as producing so much, Persia so much, Turkey so much, etc. When these figures had been obtained, a calculation would have to be made regarding the amounts sent by those producing countries to the importing countries, e.g., X quantities of opium to British North Borneo, Y to the Straits Settlements, Z to the Dutch East Indies, etc. Even at the moment it was possible to do this with rough accuracy. A further step would then be taken. The imports into countries would have to be stated and the amounts re-exported would have to be deducted. Figures would then be given showing that the opium thus imported into drug-manufacturing countries, with such-and-such a morphine content, had produced so much morphia, and that this morphia was exported to such-and-such destinations. Tables on these lines would be prepared showing, as far as possible, the world traffic. Once this work was carried out, it would be possible to give, in a small space, a more or less complete statement of the whole narcotic position.

He had drawn the attention of the Secretariat on several occasions to this point; and, despite the practical difficulties, he thought that some advance could have been made. The Committee should, he suggested, instruct the Secretariat to deal with the statistics in this manner. He felt certain that the Secretariat would be able to elaborate statistics on these lines, which would be of great interest to the Committee and to the world at large.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir John Campbell. He suggested that the Secretariat should be instructed to draw up a plan for submission to the Committee at its next session.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

The plan outlined by Sir John Campbell should be put into practice with regard to a period of five years, ending with the summary of the annual reports to be submitted to the Committee at its next session.

Medicinal Opium.

Japan.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) asked the Japanese representative what was included in the Japanese figures of imports from Great Britain. Note 8 to the table stated that these imports were medicinal opium contained in preparations. On referring to Note 17 appended to Table III, he found that it was stated that "the quantities of drugs containing morphine, such as solutions, powder and tablets of pantapon have been imported" by Japan. He thought that the word "imported" must be a mistake for the word "included". Exports from Great Britain to Japan had consisted almost entirely of tincture of opium and Dover

powder. Were the exports of these substances from Great Britain included in Table II or in Table III, and were these exports to be compared with the Japanese import figures in Table II or Table III?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that it was a question of the method of classification, on which he would obtain further information.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he understood that tincture of opium and Dover powder were classified in Japan under the heading "Medicinal opium". In Great Britain, on the other hand, they were classified under the heading "Preparations containing morphine". The figures for Great Britain in Table III regarding exports to Japan ought therefore to be compared with figures for the imports into Japan in Table II.

This fact suggested the desirability of considering whether some uniform classification with regard to these preparations should not be adopted in order to compare like with like. One set of figures given in terms of morphine content could with difficulty be compared with another set of figures given in terms of medicinal opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would return to the subject of a uniform classification at a later stage.

Morphine and Salts of Morphine.

Great Britain.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) called attention to the entry in the fourth column under the heading "Great Britain" for the year 1924. No figure was inserted, but reference was given to a footnote No. 10. That footnote stated: "The net amount of morphine manufactured during the year cannot be exactly stated." This was a repetition from an entry in the summary prepared in the previous year, against which Sir Malcolm Delevingne had strongly protested. It was based on the following paragraph of the British report:

"The net amount of morphine manufactured during the year (*i.e.*, gross amount manufactured less the amount subsequently converted into diacetylmorphine, codeine, etc.) cannot be exactly stated. The total amount manufactured during the year, less the total amount converted during the year (see below) gives a figure of 1,229 oz. of the alkaloid and of 104,165 oz. of the salts. Some of the morphine used for conversion may have been, and probably was, taken from stocks in the hands of the manufacturers at the beginning of the year (which amounted to 2,229 oz. of the alkaloid and 12,968 of the salts), but, on the other hand, some of the morphine in stock at the end of 1924 would probably be used for conversion purposes in the following year; and the figures therefore may be taken as giving the quantity of morphine manufactured during the year for use as morphine."

He had stated at the previous session that this must be the case with regard to every country manufacturing morphine and using part of it for conversion into codeine and other drugs. He was surprised to find that the entry was still repeated in its old form, and he would repeat his protest. The statistics furnished by Great Britain were as accurate as it was possible to make them. He would like an explanation why column 4 had been left blank.

M. BLANCO expressed the regret of the Secretariat for this omission. When the summary was reissued the mistake would be rectified.

Switzerland.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) referred to the 1,317 kgs. of morphine shown as having been exported from Switzerland to Japan in 1925. He had understood that the Japanese Government had now adopted the policy of making no further imports of morphine. Had this quantity of morphine been imported in the form of alkaloid, salts or special preparations?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that explanations of this statement would probably be found in the report for 1925. He did not possess the information himself but would communicate with his Government, which would endeavour to insert the explanations in that report.

United States of America.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked the representative of the United States of America whether the figure 555 kgs. shown as morphine manufactured in the United States in 1923 was correct. The quantity seemed very small.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said he would obtain this information for Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

M. BLANCO said that the figures for the United States as contained in the annual report for the year ending June 30th, 1923, showed a manufacture equal to 555 kgs. 600 gr. of morphine.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) explained the error. The quantity in the report had been given in ounces, which had been incorrectly converted into kilogrammes in the report. The number of ounces was 195,577, which gave an approximate amount of 6,000 kgs.

17. Annual Reports from the Government of the United States of America for the Years 1924 and 1925.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) informed the Committee that he had received a telegram from The Hague to the effect that the reports for 1924 and 1925 from the United States of America had been despatched to Geneva on the previous day.

SIXTH MEETING

Held on Friday, May 28th, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

18. Consideration of the Summary of Annual Reports from Governments (continuation).

Statistical Tables (continuation).

Heroin and Salts of Heroin.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the figures would require revision in several instances from the arithmetical point of view. He noted that the figures for these drugs available for consumption in Belgium were given for one year but not for the other three years.

The CHAIRMAN said that the word "nil" was inserted when the Government itself had replied to that effect.

The statistics for France showed the prudence with which any inference should be drawn. The mean imports amounted to about 350 kgs., but there were years in which, on the contrary, the exports exceeded the imports as indicated by the figures.

Was it to be inferred that the absence of any indications concerning France meant that France had not supplied statistics ?

M. BLANCO said that, if any figures had been provided, even below the minimum, they would have been inserted.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) noted that in three places the population of the Netherlands was not given.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the population of the Netherlands was seven millions.

Coca Leaves.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, since November 1925, there had been a Coca Producers' Association in the Netherlands, the object of which was to promote the interests of its members in connection with the production and sale of coca leaves. This Association had sent him a copy of its rules and regulations, which he would hand to the Secretariat for distribution to the Committee. The greater part of the 125 coca-growing estates in the Dutch East Indies were already members of the Association.

The Association had recently made an arrangement with the majority of the cocaine manufacturers in Europe in order to keep the prices of coca leaves on a level with cocaine prices and to eliminate competition. He thought the Committee would be glad to hear of this Association, as it would be easier to decrease the consumption and production of cocaine if the Committee had to deal with a syndicate than if it had to deal with individual producers or manufacturers.

Some producers had already diminished the area of their coca plantations and had decided this year to grow only a partial crop. He would mention that the stocks of coca leaves in Amsterdam had never been so large, amounting to some 860,000 kgs. The amount of these stocks was ascribed to lack of buyers. The export of coca leaves from Java in 1925 and 1926 was as follows :

| 1925 | Kgs. |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| To the Netherlands | 279,166 |
| To Japan | 96,431 |
| To Germany | 4,300 |
| Total | <hr/> 379,897 |
| | |
| 1926 (First quarter). | |
| To the Netherlands | 217,000 |
| To Japan | 126,500 |
| To Germany | 12,550 |
| To France | 18,800 |
| Total | <hr/> 374,850 |

The CHAIRMAN asked at what time the harvest was reaped.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the greater part of it had already been reaped and exported.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, on his recommendation, a convention had been concluded between the manufacturers of cocaine in September 1924. He had been asked to furnish some information concerning this convention. He had supplied this information in a letter, which would be translated and distributed to the members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would wish to thank M. van Wettum and Dr. Anselmino for the information they had just given. The Advisory Committee would be happy to note the conclusion of arrangements of this kind, which seemed to furnish a guarantee against illicit traffic.

Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the figures for Bolivia, said he thought the Committee, in its report, should express regret at the absence of the Bolivian representative.

France.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked the Chairman whether he could give the figures of the imports and exports of coca leaves into and from France.

The CHAIRMAN said that the French Government was ready to furnish these figures. They were not included in the tables, probably because coca leaves did not come under the Hague Convention. He saw no objection, however, to furnishing the figures, even before the 1925 Convention came into force. In any case, this Convention would be signed and ratified by France within the next three months. Since, however, the Convention was not already in force, he must ask that the departments concerned should be given time to collect the necessary information.

Cocaine and Salts of Cocaine.

China.

The CHAIRMAN said that all the producing countries attached great importance to the exports to China. The Committee would be obliged if the Chinese Government could furnish figures relating to morphine and cocaine.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) made a note of this request and said he would make enquiries of his Government.

France.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) enquired whether statistics could be obtained concerning the countries to which cocaine was exported from France. The same remark would apply to all other cocaine-exporting countries which had not yet given such data.

The CHAIRMAN replied that France would certainly endeavour to set an example. He would point out, however, that the old Convention only required a total figure. He nevertheless appreciated the great importance of obtaining figures giving the principal exports by countries.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) reminded the Committee that it had passed a recommendation some years ago to the effect that detailed figures regarding export should be given.

The CHAIRMAN said that this only showed how necessary it was to press the Governments to ratify the new Convention.

As regards the French statistics, he would emphasise that it was necessary to have figures for several years, as no conclusion could be drawn from figures for one year only. For example, the French exports amounted to 2 tons in 1920 and only 23 kgs. in 1924. He had more than once emphasised the speculative and variable nature of the trade in drugs, which was even more marked in the case of opium than of cocaine.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) noted that there were no figures given for the manufactures in France.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the French Government would for the future supply figures regarding manufacture. The only cocaine factory in France had been obliged temporarily to cease the manufacture of cocaine owing to an explosion.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that it appeared from Table V that France had imported from Great Britain in 1923 48,000 kgs. of coca leaves, and in 1924 36,000 kgs. Could Dr. Anselmino say when the explosion to which allusion had been made occurred?

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it was in 1923 or 1924.

The CHAIRMAN said that the figure of 48 tons of coca leaves imported into France corresponded roughly with the French manufactures, which amounted to 450 kgs. This, moreover, was approximately the figure fixed by the syndicate.

Netherlands.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) noted that the imports to Japan in 1923 were said to be nil, whereas in the same year, according to the Netherlands figures, 215 kgs. of cocaine were exported to Japan. This was another instance of the kind of discrepancy which called for enquiry.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed that an enquiry seemed to be necessary.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) thought that such enquiries should be made before the Committee met.

He would also point out that, for the purposes of the Committee, the table under discussion was largely useless, because there were no figures of manufacture for any of the important manufacturing countries except Japan. Neither France nor Germany nor the Netherlands had given any figures. The figures for Switzerland were given down to 1923.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) pointed out that the Swiss report gave information in regard to manufacture for the last five months of last year.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) reminded the Committee of his Government's attitude in regard to this matter. The Netherlands Government still maintained that attitude, but the figures would of course be given if the Netherlands Government came under the second Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said he had already informed his colleagues that the French Chamber would probably ratify the Convention within the next two or three months. All the Ministerial departments concerned had, since the signature of the Convention, prepared the decrees, regulations and measures necessary to put this Convention into force. France would therefore be shortly in a position to give these statistics, which would be placed at the disposal of the Committee as soon as they were ready, even before the Convention came into force.

Raw Cocaine.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the figures given for France appeared to confirm the information already given to the effect that at one time the manufacture of cocaine in France had ceased.

Prepared Opium.

India.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that Note 25 as regards India — "No statistics of prepared opium for smoking" — gave a false impression. No prepared opium was made by the Government of India or allowed to be sold. The only prepared opium in India was opium prepared for smoking by private individuals for their own use.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat to note this point.

Malay States and Straits Settlements.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that under the heading "Straits Settlements" the amount available for internal consumption during 1921, 1922, 1923 and 1924 was the same as the amount manufactured locally. No account appeared to have been taken of the fact that a large part of the amount locally manufactured was used in the Malay States. The table further gave the amounts locally manufactured in the Malay States and the amounts available for internal consumption.

He had explained on previous occasions that all the prepared opium used in the Straits Settlements and in the Malay States was made in the central factory at Singapore. Accordingly, the amounts given as locally manufactured in the Malay States were erroneous, as also

the amounts given as available for internal consumption in the Straits Settlements, because they included the amounts used in the Malay States.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat to note this point.

Macao.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) noted that in the summary of the annual reports reference was made to a population of 120,000 in Macao, whereas in the table under discussion the population was given as 74,000.

M. BLANCO explained that the population of Macao in 1920 was 74,000, whereas it had risen to 120,000 in 1924.

Switzerland.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said he would refer to the question raised at the morning meeting in regard to suspect trade between China and Switzerland in 1923. He had found an explanation regarding the 10,000 kgs. of opium said to be introduced from China into Switzerland in that year.

Dr. Carrière had, in July 1924, addressed a letter to the Secretariat stating that he had only very general indications in regard to opium which had been obtained from the Customs statistics. There was no special rubric for opium, which fell under a general heading, including, among other things, the juices of plants concentrated by evaporation. The Swiss authorities knew that the greater part of the imports from Turkey under this head, which amounted to 595 metric quintals for 1923, consisted of opium. There might be added to this figure 100 quintals coming from Persia and China. It would be seen that these figures were very vague and that they were obtained from statistics which did not deal especially with opium or with consignments from China.

The CHAIRMAN said that the examination of the statistical tables was now concluded.

Two points appeared to emerge from their examination. First, these statistics were inadequate to enable the Committee to follow the movement of the international trade in drugs. This again showed not only the utility but the absolute necessity of applying the 1925 Convention. Under the Hague Convention, it was impossible to follow the international traffic; it would perhaps be well to emphasise this point in the report and perhaps also in a resolution to be submitted to the Council.

Secondly, the tables presented did not make it possible to reach any conclusions. The Committee had examined some forty pages and had only been able to draw attention to certain errors or omissions. No conclusions could be drawn as to the general movement of drugs from the figures at the disposal of the Committee. The Committee might therefore think it well again to recommend the Secretariat to furnish the Committee at its next session with a synoptic summary showing clearly, in graphic form, for example, the movement of the international trade in drugs.

The Committee had been struck by certain divergencies noted in the tables, although its examination had not been sufficiently thorough for any definite conclusions to be reached.

The examination of these tables was perhaps the most important part of the task of the Committee, and the Secretariat should be asked to devote the utmost attention to their preparation. The present tables could only be regarded as an experiment, since at the moment some of the countries had not yet contracted obligations to furnish figures and were not prepared to give statistics. The Committee should not, however, be discouraged. It would probably be several years before a uniform presentation of the necessary statistics could be achieved.

He would thank the representative of China for his undertaking to bring the question of statistics to the attention of his Government. The lack of information from the Far East would render the efforts of the Committee almost vain. It was known that the smugglers were making great efforts in the Far East, and were endeavouring, as fast as China took measures to combat opium, to replace it by drugs which were still more dangerous.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he was sure that at the next session the Chinese report would be before the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Committee recognised the imperfection of the material supplied to it by the Governments, but a great deal more might be done with the material available, and he was sure the Committee felt that the Opium Section of the Secretariat required to be strengthened. The statistics were very difficult to handle, and the bulk of the work must be very great. He did not intend to make any criticism of the staff, which was extremely hard worked. He was sure it would be of assistance to the Opium Section if the Committee were to suggest to the Secretary-General that the staff of the Opium Section needed to be reinforced.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) enquired whether it was the custom of the Advisory Committee to discuss the budget of the Opium Section of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the question of the budget should be placed on the agenda. He would draw attention to the fact that there was a note from the Secretariat in which it was stated that the Secretary-General contemplated increasing the staff of the Opium Section in connection with the institution of the Central Board.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that this note referred to the supplementary budget which should have been voted by the Special Assembly in March.

The ACTING SECRETARY said that, owing to the fact that Germany had not been admitted to the League on that occasion, the supplementary budget to which the Chairman had referred had not been discussed by the Special Assembly.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the proposals for extra staff contained in the note to which the Chairman had referred had not yet been approved either by the Supervisory Commission; by the Council, or by the Assembly. A resolution from the Committee might help to secure the proposed additions.

19. Agreement concluded by the First Opium Conference (Geneva 1925).

The ACTING SECRETARY said that, as a result of the question raised by Sir Malcolm Delevingne concerning the coming into force of the Agreement concluded at the First Opium Conference, the Secretariat had asked the Legal Section for an opinion. The answer from the Legal Section included a draft letter which the Secretary-General proposed to send to the Governments concerned. This letter was to the effect that, as the Agreement had been ratified by France, Great Britain and India, it would, under Article 14, come into force on July 28th, 1926.

20. Opium Policy of the Government of India : Statement by Sir John Campbell.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) made the following statement regarding the opium policy of the Government of India :

“ As many of the members of the Committee will probably be aware, His Excellency the Viceroy made an important announcement in February of this year regarding the opium policy of the Government of India. That announcement was naturally made in a very condensed form, and His Excellency stated that definite proposals would shortly be placed before the two Houses in India in order to give effect to it. In the course of his announcement, the Viceroy mentioned that the Government of India proposed to discontinue altogether the system of auction sales of opium in India as soon as the agreement for direct sales now being negotiated with the Government of French Indo-China is concluded. The actual resolution which, in pursuance of that announcement, was placed before the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly in India reads as follows :

“ ‘ This Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that immediate steps should be taken to give effect to the policy of progressively reducing the exports of opium from India, except for strictly medicinal or scientific purposes, so as to extinguish them altogether within a definite period. ’

“ This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly. .

“ The reasons which induced the Government of India to adopt this policy were two in number. In the first place, the Second Opium Convention of Geneva—a Convention which has hitherto been ratified only by countries belonging to the British Empire—placed upon India a definite responsibility. In the first article of the Protocol of that Convention the following sentence occurs :

“ ‘ The States signatory to the present Protocol, recognising that under Chapter I of the Hague Convention the duty rests upon them of establishing such a control over the production, distribution and exportation of raw opium as would prevent illicit traffic, agree to take such measures as may be required to prevent completely, within five years from the present date, the smuggling of opium from constituting a serious obstacle to the effective suppression of the use of prepared opium in those territories where such use is temporarily authorised. ’

“ In the view of the Government of India, this obligation undertaken by India had to be carried out in the fullest and most complete manner possible. In considering the method to adopt, the Government of India took account also of the fact, which emerged from the Conference discussions, that the countries in the Far East where opium-smoking is still temporarily authorised have now definitely expressed their desire to terminate the practice of opium-smoking in their territories as soon as possible. In the opinion of the Government of India, this created a new situation. On the one hand, there was India's definite obligation to do

everything possible to prevent smuggling. On the other hand, there was the expressed desire of all the countries, where opium-smoking is at present permitted, to suppress that practice at the earliest possible date.

“ There was also another consideration. The Government of India felt that, in order to control adequately the licit exports from India, it would be necessary in the last resort to proceed to what one might call the rationing of the individual countries which draw their supplies from India. That measure might again in the last resort be necessary in order to prevent possible abuse in some cases. The new Convention obligations were so strict that the Government of India could no longer maintain the view that the obligation of seeing that the supplies of opium obtained from India were used solely for licit purposes rested exclusively upon the importing Governments.

“ Rationing other countries obviously presents the greatest possible administrative and political difficulties. The political difficulties will be clear to everyone. It is a most difficult and delicate task to say to another country : ‘ Although you have given me a certain certificate, I am not disposed to recognise that certificate at its face value.’

“ There is a further point. The Government of India clearly could not be in possession of all the information necessary in order to enable it to ration, with close approximation to the facts, the actual licit requirements of the importing countries. The position as a whole was very clearly put by the Hon. Mr. McWatters in presenting the resolution to the Council of State. He said :

“ ‘ We have given the most careful consideration to the means necessary to carry out that promise. We desire to carry out our obligations not merely in the letter but in the spirit. Indeed, even before this obligation was undertaken, we did in some cases prohibit the export of opium to certain countries when not satisfied with the measures taken to stop smuggling. We prohibited the export of opium to Macao and to Dairen, and also to Persia, but what we have now undertaken goes much further and imposes a general obligation upon us to see that Indian opium in no case enters into the illicit trade. If we are going to carry out this obligation in the spirit, it is incumbent upon us to make the most far-searching enquiries into the ultimate destination of all our exports of opium, even after it has passed through the hands of the Governments to whom we consign it. The House will realise that it is impossible for us to scrutinise the internal arrangements of all these countries, which are in most cases either British possessions or possessions of some of the most important Western Powers. Therefore, after careful consideration, the Government of India has come to the conclusion that the only practical and certain method of carrying out its obligations is to prohibit as soon as possible the export of opium altogether, except, of course, for medicinal and scientific purposes. This policy which we are recommending is not a mere gesture. It is intended to be a practical contribution towards a grave international problem, and the Government of India recommends this resolution to the House because it is convinced that it is not only a practical policy but the right policy, and by adopting it we shall be fulfilling, and more than fulfilling, the international obligations which we have undertaken and the declarations which we have repeatedly made in the face of the world.’

“ There is one other point—the question of the period within which this undertaking is to be carried into effect. That question is complicated by political, administrative, and physical difficulties. The Government of India has obviously to arrange the question of cultivation. It has also to consider the question of the cultivation of opium in the native States in India. It has agreements with certain foreign Governments which preclude any hasty action, and it has to take into consideration the stocks of opium which exist at the moment. Without insisting on all the details, which are obvious enough to anyone who has administrative experience, Mr. McWatters pointed out that ‘ for all these three reasons—the administrative, the political and the technical—we are unable at present to name a definite date when exports can finally be stopped ; but it is our intention that the period shall not be unduly prolonged ’.

“ It is possible that I may be able to make a further statement on this point before the present session of this Committee is ended, but, if not, I have reason to think that the Government of India will probably fix the period definitely in the near future.

“ My duty perhaps ends here, after communicating to the Committee the decision of the Government of India and the reasons for which that decision was taken, but I should like to add a few further remarks. As the members of the Committee are aware, the Government of India's policy has always been to restrict and control, by all possible administrative measures, the abuses connected with the opium and drug traffic. I would call to the recollection of the Committee the fact that the original arrangement made with China—an arrangement made two

years before the Shanghai Conference of 1909 and five years before the Hague Convention of 1912—provided for the gradual suppression of the export of opium from India to China. That arrangement involved an annual loss of approximately £4,000,000 to the Government of India. The Indian taxpayer had to be taxed in order to make up the difference. That was a sacrifice—and I should like to insist on this point—made by the Government of India before there was any question of international pressure of any kind.

“ The sacrifice which the Government of India is now making involves a loss of net revenue of approximately one and one-third million pounds a year. That, again, is a sacrifice which is being made before the obligation which the Government of India has undertaken—and which constitutes the main reason for the decision I have just communicated—comes into force. As I mentioned before, the Second Opium Convention has at the present moment only been ratified by the British Empire and by countries forming part of the British Empire, and it is still uncertain when that Convention will come into operation.

“ My own hope is that this very striking evidence of sincerity—the most striking and the most practical evidence which could, I think, be supplied—will for ever dissipate the unfounded suspicions and charges—I should say the ungenerous and unfounded suspicions and charges—which have frequently been expressed regarding the motives and the policy of the Government of India. I think it will make it clear, beyond all possibility of doubt or dispute, that the Government of India's statement that it has not been actuated by financial motives has been correct. India has not perhaps moved as quickly as the impatient idealists desire, but those who know the facts—and they are an increasing body—will, I feel sure, be thoroughly convinced that India has not only fulfilled all her obligations but has performed much more than she was under any obligation to perform. Her policy throughout has been consistent, honest, and energetic, and she has in its execution, if I may say so, been admirably efficient. India's latest contribution to a solution of this grave international problem will, I hope, be accepted by this Committee, and by the world at large, as adequate and satisfactory.”

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Sir John Campbell for his communication, which would mark an important step in the campaign against the abuse of opium.

21. Opium Policy in the Netherlands Indies : Statement by M. van Wettum.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) made the following statement regarding the policy of the Netherlands Indies on the opium question :

“ For some considerable time, the sale of opium in the Netherlands Indies has been steadily decreasing, whereas at the same time the quantity of contraband seized has increased progressively.

“ The relevant figures are the following (quantities stated in thousands of taels.)

| | Sale | Contraband seized (all of it converted into prepared opium) |
|--------------|-------|---|
| 1918 | 2,336 | 2.928 ¹ |
| 1919 | 2,376 | 0.790 |
| 1920 | 2,607 | 0.589 |
| 1921 | 2,194 | 5.275 |
| 1922 | 1,695 | 6.128 |
| 1923 | 1,386 | 7.511 |
| 1924 | 1,304 | 14.635 |
| 1925 | 1,368 | 25.104 |

“ When criticising the figures as regards sale, it must be kept in mind that in the years mentioned the number of Chinese immigrants, among whom there is presumably an increasing percentage of smokers, was considerable ; the trifling increase in sales during 1925 is due to the larger number of coolies employed in the cultivation of rubber.

“ As is well known, the principal means by which the Government of the Netherlands Indies tries to reach the ultimate object of Article 6 of the Hague Convention are, besides the establishment of areas where the use of opium is prohibited, the enforcement of systems of licensing and rationing and the increase of prices.

“ When in 1920, as a consequence of the high consumption perceptible also elsewhere, the legitimate sale largely increased, the Government, in order to check the sale, saw itself obliged to try all available means—and not only to enhance the prices but also to enforce systems of licensing and rationing in those centres of the population where up to that time, for fear of smuggling and its sequels, the Government had waived the enforcement for the time being².

¹ This quantity included 2,658 taels of raw Persian opium confiscated at Sabang on a steamer which had been in that port for more than four years already. The destination of the opium was Canton.

² See *The Opium Policy in the Netherlands Indies*, para. VII. At the end of this paragraph, the fear of increasing smuggling in those centres was already emphasised.

"The results of the measures taken fell short of expectations. The sale, which, after the enforcement of the Opium Regie throughout the Netherlands Indies (1914), had always surpassed 2,300 chests, fell to 1,368 chests; at the same time, the quantities of contraband seized increased considerably. Other symptoms likewise pointed to an enhanced turnover of the smuggling trade, as well as to a gradual extension of its market. The Government ascribed the cause of those symptoms mainly to two factors, *viz.*, the large quantity of contraband available in China and the restrictive measures which, in view of the prevailing circumstances, had been pushed on with too much vigour.

"One of the leading principles of the restrictive system of the Opium Regie being the keeping of smuggling within reasonable bounds, the Government has decided to take the following measures in order to check that trade:

"1. A review of the licensing and rationing systems already in force in a great part of the Netherlands Indies, in such a way that these systems may be maintained in those regions where enforcement is possible, but be superseded by less stringent measures, such as, for instance, identification systems, wherever this maintenance is impossible. A similar review has to take place with regard to those parts of the territory where the use of opium has been wholly prohibited officially. In one of them, for example, owing to a change in economic conditions, the smuggling trade has penetrated to such a degree that a successful checking of the trade would be impossible, and consequently opium should here be offered for sale legitimately to as limited an extent as possible.

"2. The putting at the authorities' disposal of a practically unlimited amount of money in order to enable the police and the Customs to check smuggling more efficiently.

"3. If, however, after both the above measures have been put into practice for one year, *i.e.*, about January 1st, 1928, it turns out, contrary to expectations, that the smuggling trade has not been suppressed sufficiently, and at the same time that the quantity sold legitimately has not come round to its norm, the Government proposes to enforce the measure of lowering prices as a third remedy. The Government of the Netherlands Indies does not deem it justifiable to take this measure immediately, as it is contrary to her policy, adhered to during tens of years, according to which the consumption of opium is checked by enhancing prices. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the Government will reduce the prices, as an ultimate remedy in order to combat the smuggling trade, if conditions require it.

"By enforcing the above measures, the Government of the Netherlands Indies is not only acting in accordance with her own principles but is also pursuing the opium policy laid down in the Convention of February 11th, 1925 (in addition to the Final Act and Protocol, see also the Preamble and Articles 8 and 10). Indeed, this latter policy aims at checking the smuggling trade effectively, and at the same time at ascertaining, as far as possible, the number of smokers and preparing for the system of rationing at the beginning of the well-known period of fifteen years.

"I want to add that the further development of the stated policy can be ascertained by consulting the future annual reports to the League. It is worth mentioning that this policy includes the intention henceforth of not using a higher amount of the gross proceeds of the monopoly to cover the ordinary expenditure than has been estimated for the year 1926. The surplus of revenue over the fixed amount will be left out of account as far as the balancing of the budget is concerned."

22. Information concerning the Opium Policy in Japan : Statement by M. Sugimura.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he would like to take this opportunity to give the Committee some recent information in regard to Japan.

Japan was at present at a turning-point in the carrying-out of the new policy based on the Geneva Agreement and Convention. Japan wished, above all, to advance methodically. Before starting upon international collaboration, it was necessary to strengthen the collaboration between the different branches of the administrations in the various territories and colonies belonging to Japan. Moreover, before putting into force the provisions of the law, it was necessary to take the administrative steps which would enable these provisions to be carried out.

The Japanese Government, with this object in view, had appointed a Supreme Council. At the head of it was the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and it was composed of the Directors of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Ministry for the Interior, the Ministry for Justice and the Ministry for Finance, together with the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and the higher officials of the Governments of Korea, Formosa and Kwantung. The object of this Council was, first, to prepare for the application of the Geneva Agreement and Convention and the application of the system applied in Formosa to the various territories and colonies belonging to Japan. It was also the duty of the Council to study and examine the question of the most effective control of the illicit traffic. In particular, the Council would study the question of the control of smuggling by Japanese ships outside the jurisdiction of Japan—a form of smuggling which was dealt with in Article 2 of the Final Act of the Geneva Convention. Briefly, Japan would study, in a general way, the question of the control of the illicit traffic. Japan was thus working zealously towards the realisation of her policy.

It was true that the education of public opinion played an important part, but it was, above all, necessary to take account of the administrative point of view. Good administration and organisation would facilitate the solution of the problem. For this reason, the Japanese Government desired to create administrations which would be well equipped, well organised and which would work with entire satisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN said that the declarations which the Committee had just heard were particularly important. All of them dealt with practical steps, the object of which was to achieve a limitation and finally the suppression of the consumption of opium.

23. Omission of Certain Governments to furnish Information under Article 21 of the Hague Convention.

The ACTING SECRETARY read the following letter, dated January 6th, 1926, from the Mexican Government to the Netherlands Legation in Mexico with regard to the supply of information on traffic in opium. This letter had been forwarded to the Secretary-General by the Netherlands Government :

[Translation.]

" I have duly received Your Excellency's communication No. 1240, dated December 4th last, in which you enclose a communication from the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and offer to forward to the League, through the Netherlands Government, particulars of the annual traffic in opium.

" In reply, allow me to state that, as the United States of Mexico does not belong to the League of Nations, the Mexican Government considers every action taken by it as "*res inter alios acta*" and therefore cannot agree to forward to the League any information. Nevertheless, in view of the importance for humanity of the campaign against the traffic in opium, Mexico is prepared to help in this campaign and to supply all the information and statistics required to any existing institution for that purpose, provided that it is independent of the League of Nations. "

(Signed) Aaron SAENZ.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that, as regards Powers which were not Members of the League, the Committee might ask the Netherlands Government to forward to it automatically the reports sent by these countries to The Hague. The Committee might also ask the Netherlands Government to request these States to send reports, which would enable statistics to be established.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the position in regard to countries which did not furnish information had continued to be very much the same, in spite of the fact that the Committee had passed a resolution on the subject every year. He observed that six countries which were represented on the Committee had either not sent in any reports at all or had sent them only with considerable irregularity or delay. He was glad to note that the position had much improved during the session. The Committee had had positive and satisfactory assurances from Germany and Switzerland. It had also been assured by the representative of China that, in future, reports from China would be received. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had furnished information, and the Committee understood that reports would be forthcoming in future from Portugal and its colonies. There remained Bolivia, from which no reports had been received for the last three years. Bolivia was a very important factor, being one of the chief producers of the coca leaf, and special representations should, he thought, be made to the Council with a view to getting from Bolivia a full report in the future, particularly as Bolivia had accepted a seat on that Committee.

The position was not so satisfactory with regard to certain other States. The South American States were becoming increasingly important from the point of view of the drug problem. South America was one of the largest producers and consumers of the coca leaf, and considerable quantities of opium were exported legitimately or illicitly to the countries of South America. He believed, for example, that there had been considerable exports to Chile, but no report from Chile had been received for the last two years. Opium also went to Nicaragua, while Peru was a producer and a considerable consumer of the coca leaf.

He proposed that the Council and the Assembly should be asked to take what special steps they could to secure reports from these countries. The Committee should ask the Council to make an effort to bring all the countries into line in the matter of supplying complete data. Without such information, it was impossible for the Committee, or for any Central Board set up under the new Convention, to reach any satisfactory conclusions or take any effective action.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) pointed out that Switzerland was neither irregular nor late in the despatch of her reports, since it had only been a party to the Hague Convention since last year. From the moment that Switzerland had assumed the obligation to send a report, that report had been sent in advance of the other Governments.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had been instructed by his Government, when the Committee was dealing with matters concerning the new Opium Convention, to take no part in the discussion but to regard himself as in the same position as the official observer of the United States of America.

He would assure the Committee that the Chinese Government would fulfil its obligations under the Hague Convention in regard to the furnishing of annual reports.

M. FORTICH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said this was the first time that the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had had to furnish statistics. These statistics were incomplete and had been provided by the Customs Service. He would give an assurance to deal seriously with the subject so that the statistics might henceforth be complete and detailed.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he would at the present stage of the discussion make two proposals: (1) that the Netherlands Government should be asked to forward automatically on receipt reports from the States non-Members of the League of Nations; (2) that the Netherlands Government should take steps similar to those taken by the Committee in approaching Governments which did not furnish reports and which were contracting parties to the Hague Convention.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Netherlands Government already forwarded the reports of the Governments regularly. The second proposal of M. Sugimura raised a rather delicate point.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that, from the legal point of view, the Chairman was correct, and he would withdraw his suggestion. He would insist, however, that the Netherlands Government should feel itself morally bound to do its utmost in the interest of the Committee and in a spirit of friendship towards the League of Nations.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee might perhaps draw the attention of the Netherlands Government to the absence of certain documents which would be of great use to the Committee; the Netherlands Government would then consider what it was possible for it to do.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the matter before the Committee merely concerned the Mexican Government. The Netherlands Government had fulfilled its obligations under the Hague Convention. He therefore proposed that no letter should be sent to that Government. He had written to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at The Hague asking what had been done with regard to the question of Mexico.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) drew attention to the fact that there was another State which was a party to the Hague Convention and not a Member of the League, namely: Ecuador. It was the obligation of all States which were parties to the Convention to send statistics annually to the Netherlands Government for communication to all the other States. M. Sugimura had simply suggested that the Netherlands Government should, year by year, if that information were not supplied, call the attention of the States in question to the fact.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that it was open to the Netherlands Government to take what course it considered best in such cases. He did not think the Committee should write to the Netherlands Government asking it to do something specific.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he would be quite content if M. van Wettum would act as intermediary between the Committee and his Government and induce his Government to take the necessary steps.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that all responsibility in the matter should be left to M. van Wettum.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he would willingly act as intermediary.

SEVENTH MEETING

Held on Saturday, May 29th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

24. Annual Reports from the Government of the United States of America for the Years 1924 and 1925.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said that his Government had authorised him to submit informally to the members of the Advisory Committee, while awaiting the copies which were on the way from the Dutch Government, copies of the annual reports of the United States for 1924 and 1925.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Tuck.

25. **Reservation made by the Austrian Government when Signing the Opium Convention of 1925.**

M. Pflügl (representative of the Austrian Government) came to the table of the Committee.

M. PFLÜGL (Austria) asked the representative of the British Empire to explain the motives which had led the British Government to submit to the Committee the question now under discussion.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) spoke as follows :

" Mr. Chairman, I have pleasure in complying with the request of the representative of the Austrian Government. The British Government felt it necessary to raise the question of the Austrian reservations for two reasons. The first was a juridical reason: is it possible, in a multi-lateral Agreement or Convention such as the convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference, concluded under the auspices of the League, for a Government to ratify or to adhere to it subject to reservations? Obviously, unless those reservations are put forward at the time when the Convention is concluded and are accepted by all the other parties signatories to the Convention, a very difficult situation arises, because it is well understood that a Convention or an Agreement cannot be ratified subject to reservations unless those reservations are accepted by all the other Powers who are parties to the Convention or Agreement. It will be necessary, therefore, in the case of the multi-lateral Convention of the Second Opium Conference, to secure the approval of all the other Powers who are parties to the Convention before the reservations of a particular Government are regarded as valid. That is a juridical question which has been remitted by the Council of the League, at the suggestion of the British Government, to the League Committee for the Codification of International Law.

" There was a second reason which had led the British Government to raise the point. It was a reason based on the actual working of the system which it is proposed to set up by the Convention of the Second Conference. The Austrian Government felt a difficulty about two points in the two central chapters of the Convention—Chapter V, which deals with the control of the international trade, and Chapter VI, which deals with the Permanent Central Board—and relating to the provisions which were agreed upon for the purpose of establishing an effective control of the international trade. They seemed to the British Government to be points regarding which, possibly, the Austrian Government had somewhat exaggerated the amount of trouble and work to which it would be put.

" One point related to the fourth paragraph of Article 13 of Chapter V, which requires that when a Government gives an authorisation for the export of a consignment of any of the drugs, a copy of the export authorisation shall accompany the consignment, and the Government issuing the export authorisation shall send a copy to the Government of the importing country. In practice, once the authorisation has been granted, this is merely a piece of clerical work. The authorisation has to be duplicated in a certain number of copies; one of them will be given by the Department of State issuing the authorisation to the trader who applies for the authorisation, and the trader will send it with his consignment to his client in another country. The Government issuing the authorisation will also have to put a copy of that authorisation into an envelope and address it to the corresponding department of the Government in the importing country. This seemed to us to be such a very small matter (since no work other than clerical work of a very simple kind and very small in amount was involved) that we felt convinced that there was some misunderstanding on the part of the Austrian Government regarding the obligations which that provision entailed.

" The other point on which the Austrian Government felt difficulty was the second paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention. That is a much more important point and, as most members of this Committee will remember, it was one of the most controversial points in connection with the framing of this Convention, around which the storm of war raged for many days, in which our President and myself took an active part. But although it was a very controversial point, the provision in this paragraph was finally accepted almost unanimously. The difficulties that were felt in regard to it by those who opposed the three-monthly period were not the difficulties that the Austrian Government feels but difficulties connected with the collection of statistics in the case of countries where the officials from whom the statistics would have to be collected were at great distances from the seat of the Central Government. The case of Indo-China was very much pressed upon the Conference because of the difficulty which the Central Government at Saigon would have in collecting the necessary particulars from its Customs officials on the distant frontiers. But no difficulty was raised on that score in countries where the administration has the whole matter much more closely under its hand; and such would be the case as regards Austria.

" The machinery for giving effect to this provision is really extremely simple. It implies the system of import and export authorisation—that is, a system under which a licence or an authorisation has to be obtained from the Government for each import into the country and each export from the country. This point is accepted by the Austrian Government, which raises no objection to it. But when once that point is accepted, the rest follows almost automatically. This is really the important part of the machinery, and it is the part which gives a certain amount of trouble, because every consignment has to be considered separately. But no difficulty is raised by the Austrian Government in regard to this matter.

“ What follows ? When authorisation has been granted, the next step is again a matter of a little clerical work, which is required for collecting and tabulating these three-monthly statistics. What happens ? The Government of a country issues, for instance, a licence for the import of a certain quantity of morphine to a particular trader. The morphine arrives at the frontier. The trader takes or sends his licence or his authorisation to the Customs authority at the point on the frontier at which the morphine arrives. He presents it to the Customs officials, who verify the particulars, and, if all is in order, they allow the morphine to enter the country. They retain the authorisation and endorse it with a statement to the effect that the morphine has arrived and has been admitted. They then return the authorisation so endorsed to the Central Government Department. There it is received by a clerk, who records the fact that morphine in such-and-such a quantity has been imported ; and this is all that is needed for the compilation of these quarterly statistics. In Great Britain the figures so recorded are the basis of those statistics, and nothing more is wanted. The same system would be applied as regards exports. I think, therefore, that the difficulty which the Austrian Government feels about the supply of the quarterly statistics is due, again, to some misapprehension as to the nature of the work involved.

“ This point was frequently insisted on at the Conference, which agreed to the system of separate authorisations for the import and for the export of those substances. All the rest is merely a matter of simple organisation, simple departmental arrangement, and simple clerical work. Each import as it comes into the country or each export as it leaves the country is endorsed on the authorisation which is presented to the Customs. The Customs officials return the authorisation so endorsed to the Central Authority, which files it and, if necessary, enters it in a book ; and that is the end of it. At the end of the quarter, the figures are tabulated and sent to the League. This is purely a matter of very ordinary clerical work, which could be done in a very short time each quarter by some clerical officer. At the Home Office in London we should regard it as a very small part of the business of administering our legislation on this subject.

“ The obligations which the Austrian Government is prepared to undertake under the Convention are much more important, if I may say so, and involve much more trouble and responsibility than the one to which that Government has raised objection.

“ May I urge a further consideration upon the representative of the Austrian Government, who has been good enough to come here to meet us for the purpose of clearing up these points. Austria is not, in this matter, a big importer or a big exporter. Austria, I think, does not manufacture these drugs. She imports what she requires for her own medical and scientific needs and appears to carry on a little export with neighbouring countries. I find in the statistical tables which have been prepared for the use of the Committee that under the heading of “ Raw Opium ” there are no entries for Austria at all. She apparently imports no raw opium and exports none. Under the heading of “ Medicinal Opium ”, Austria is shown as having imported in 1923 1,054 kilogrammes and as having exported 698 kilogrammes. These are not very large quantities, though I admit they are quite substantial. As regards morphine, Austria in 1924 imported 264 kilogrammes—not a large quantity—and exported only 31 kilogrammes. As regards heroin, Austria’s figures are much smaller still. In 1924, she imported only 27 kilogrammes and exported none at all. As regards cocaine, Austria, in 1924, imported 290 kilogrammes and exported only 14 kilogrammes. I think, therefore, that it is fair to infer from these figures that Austria does little else, apart from the re-export of a small quantity of medicinal opium, but import these drugs for her own medical and scientific needs. The export trade is very small and the only question is that of the import trade.

“ I should judge from the above figures that the clerical work involved under the two provisions in the Convention to which the Austrian Government has referred in its letter would be comparatively small and, I should think, would not even occupy half the time of a single clerical officer. Those same provisions will certainly not involve in England the provision of any additional clerks. We shall do the work with the staff we had before the Convention came into force, and I should imagine that that work will not involve the Austrian Government in the additional expenditure of any considerable amount of money. ”

M. PFLÜGL (Austria) spoke as follows :

“ I wish to thank the representative of Great Britain for his interesting and explicit explanations. I hope I shall be permitted to send these explanations *in extenso* to my Government. I am happy to see that the point of view which Sir Malcolm Delevingne takes is really the point of view which prevails in the mind of my Government. It was perhaps a sense of over-anxiety to be entirely conscientious and not to undertake a work which we felt we might not be able to carry out which made us enter the reserve ; but in view of the spirit of comprehension and full understanding of the representative of Great Britain, and also, I presume, of the rest of the Committee, my Government has given me instructions to withdraw its reserve altogether. ”

M. Pflügl read the note sent by his Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations withdrawing the reservations made by the Austrian Government when signing the Opium Convention of 1925.

The CHAIRMAN, in the name of the Committee, thanked the representative of Austria for the spirit of conciliation which the Austrian Government had shown.

He added that during the meetings of the Conference he had himself on several occasions expressed the view that it was essential to send to the Government of the importing country a copy of the authorisation to export or of the certificate of diversion, for he had been of the opinion that this was the most effective way of controlling the international trade in drugs.

With regard to the despatch of quarterly statistics, he had throughout the period of the Conference been of the same opinion as the Austrian Government. Since that date, however, he had felt bound to yield to reasons which had been put forward by his colleagues, especially by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. Since those reasons had been accepted by everyone, quarterly statistics had now become one of the essential features of the new Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the British Government would be extremely sensible of the courteous and obliging manner in which its views had been met by the Austrian Government. It would much appreciate the decision of that Government to withdraw its reservations.

M. Pflügl withdrew.

26. Question of Co-operation between the Union catholique d'études internationales and the Advisory Committee.

The ACTING SECRETARY read two letters from the Union catholique d'études internationales.

The CHAIRMAN said that the requests contained in the two communications might be summed up as follows: (1) to be heard by the Committee; (2) to receive information collected by the Committee; (3) to send information to the Committee.

The first request must be disallowed. The Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium had no precedent for hearing representatives of organisations other than Governments.

With regard to the second request, the Committee might perhaps forward its reports and certain other documents to the Union. It could not ask that organisation to undertake an enquiry on any particular point as it appeared to desire to do.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) wished that it should be made clear that any information sent by such organisations which was in any way insulting to the Chinese Government or criticised the work of that Government should not be accepted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was impossible to prevent any organisation from sending any remarks it liked to the Secretariat. If the information received was of importance, the Secretariat would be obliged to distribute it to the Committee, but documents containing a series of insults would obviously not be distributed. This question could be left to the tact of the Secretariat.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) thanked the Chairman and hoped the Secretariat would use its judgment.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) proposed that in the letter to the Union it should be emphasised that any information sent by it to the Committee should be limited to statements of fact so as to avoid any possibility of criticism or insult as feared by M. Chao-Hsin Chu.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) doubted whether the Committee could forward direct information to a private association. The reports of the Committee were public and were available everywhere. Was it necessary to communicate them specially to this organisation?

The CHAIRMAN stated that he would draft a letter to the Union in as general terms as possible and would take account of that proposal. No organisation should imagine that it was instructed by the Committee to proceed to any form of enquiry or that it was entitled to receive any information from the Committee.

The terms of the reply would therefore be extremely prudent, and the Committee should confine itself to thanking the Union and referring it to documents which were universally available and on occasion sent free of charge by the Secretariat to a certain number of organisations.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) desired to refer to the question of principle involved, for it was of the greatest importance.

This question of principle was perfectly clear. Co-operation with the Committee in its work was always desirable. The Second Opium Conference had accepted the co-operation of private organisations. Such co-operation should, however, only be carried on in connection with the education of public opinion and not in connection with administrative matters or enquiries.

The Advisory Committee derived its authority from the Council, and it was its duty, in the last resort, to suggest measures of an administrative kind.

The Union catholique had not made any concrete proposals in its letters. It appeared to be waiting for the Advisory Committee to do so. Therefore, on any occasion when co-operation with a private organisation might prove necessary, it was for the Committee itself

to decide its nature. Co-operation with private organisations, especially religious organisations, with regard to the education of public opinion, was of the utmost importance.

In the particular case of China, however, any enquiry was very difficult unless the Chinese Government co-operated. Without such co-operation, no organisation, public or private, could really collect any very accurate information. Consequently, he proposed that the Committee should ask the organisation in question to continue its work, especially in the field of education, with the object of bringing about a change in public opinion. That, he thought, was the principal mission of such an organisation.

He agreed, therefore, with the terms in which the Chairman proposed to draft the Committee's reply. In his view, however, it would be necessary to add details regarding the precise kind of co-operation which the Committee might consider desirable. Any information obtained from private organisations should be essentially of a humanitarian character and should have nothing whatever to do with politics.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed with M. Sugimura.

The Committee decided to send a reply to the Union catholique d'études internationales, drafted in accordance with the suggestions of the Chairman. The draft reply would be considered at a later meeting.

27. Situation as regards the Ratification of the Hague Convention of 1912.

The ACTING SECRETARY informed the Committee that no new ratification of the Hague Convention of 1912 had been recorded since the last session of the Committee.

28. Consideration of the Position as regards the Application in Turkey of the Hague Convention of 1912.

The ACTING SECRETARY read Article 100 of the Treaty of Lausanne, which stipulated that, among other international treaties and agreements, Turkey should undertake to ratify the Hague Opium Convention of 1912.

In reply to Sir John CAMPBELL (India), Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Treaty of Lausanne had come into operation on August 6th, 1924. The article in question made no mention of any time-limit within which ratification was to take place.

Statements had appeared in the technical press in the previous year regarding the policy of the Turkish Government towards the cultivation of opium. Those statements had no official character and had not been confirmed. His attention had been drawn to them by the Secretary-General, and he had made enquiries without obtaining any very definite result. The position of Turkey, however, was a matter of considerable importance. The League had sent a Commission of Enquiry into Persia with the object of devising means by which the production of opium in that country could be restricted to the amounts required for medical and scientific purposes. If the work of that Commission were successful and if the Persian Government put into practice the measures proposed by it, the position of Turkey would be very different from what it was at the moment, and it was to be feared that persons and syndicates engaging in the illicit traffic in opium would have recourse to other markets which were still open, when the Persian markets were closed. The only market in that case would be the Turkish market.

A statement in the technical press reported that the total production of opium in Turkey in 1925-26 had been estimated at 4,800 cases. A certain amount of Turkish opium found its way into the illicit market. In this connection he would refer to the case of the vessel *Komogala Maru*. What had already begun was likely to continue on an increased scale if the plans regarding Persia matured.

The Committee ought therefore to consider whether it should not immediately adopt a resolution asking the Council to address a communication to the Turkish Government urging in suitable terms the ratification by that Government of the Hague Opium Convention of 1912 and enquiring as to its intentions regarding the Geneva Convention of 1925. Turkey had been represented at the Second Opium Conference, and that Conference had been given to understand by the Turkish representative that his Government was disposed to take adequate measures for controlling the production and export of Turkish opium. Turkey, however, had not yet signed the Convention of 1925.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed with the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

As regarded the unfortunate case of the vessel *Komogala Maru*, he informed the Committee that the Japanese captain had been punished under the provisions of the Marine Criminal Code, although the act of smuggling had taken place on the high seas. Although the vessel concerned had been a Japanese ship flying the Japanese flag, it had been chartered by a foreigner, and this had made the case a very difficult one from the legal point of view.

Co-operation between the Japanese and British Governments was necessary in this matter, as the person who had chartered it was a British subject belonging to the firm of Nemazee & Co., of Shanghai.

The CHAIRMAN thought there would be no objection to the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed entirely with the view that the co-operation of Turkey in the work of the Committee would be of great use. He would, however, point out that

no resolution of the Committee should in any way be based on a provision of the Treaty of Lausanne. The Committee should take as a basis of its resolution the actual facts of the Turkish position. He wished to state that he could not associate himself with any resolution which was dependent upon the Treaty of Lausanne.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) entirely agreed with M. Dinichert. His Government was not a party to the Treaty of Lausanne.

In reply to Sir John CAMPBELL (India), M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) explained that, although during the discussion reference had been made to some kind of engagement entered into by Turkey as a result of the Treaty of Lausanne, the Committee could only specify that the resolution which it proposed was based on the present position of Turkey.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that in his view the most important argument that could be urged by the Advisory Committee and the Council was the fact that Turkey had undertaken an international obligation to ratify the Hague Convention. To omit any reference to the Treaty of Lausanne in the resolution would greatly weaken the Committee's case.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) did not agree with Sir John Campbell. The members of the Committee represented their Governments. According to admitted international practice, however, a Government which was not a party to a Treaty had not to remind another Government of any duties or obligations which it had incurred as a result of that Treaty. As Swiss representative, therefore, it would be impossible for him to agree to any opinion based on a Treaty to which his Government was not a party.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that from the technical point of view he quite agreed with M. Dinichert. India was not a party to the Treaty of Lausanne. This fact, however, did not in his view hinder him, as a member of the Committee, from suggesting not that the Indian Government but that the Council of the League should draw the attention of Turkey to an international obligation resulting from a Treaty registered with the Secretariat of the League. That was the essential point. The Council had cognisance of the Lausanne Treaty, and all the Committee need suggest was that the Council should call the attention of Turkey to the obligations imposed on it by a Treaty registered in the archives of the League.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that if the Committee submitted a general recommendation to the Council asking it to consider the manner in which it could induce the Turkish Government to associate itself with the Committee's work, the Council would be quite free to use any arguments it thought good. It was within the powers of the Council to invoke the Treaty of Lausanne, for it was a political body. The Advisory Committee, however, was composed not of experts chosen by the Council but of representatives of Governments and therefore did not possess the same right. If the Committee considered that it was able to base its resolution on the Treaty itself, he would have to make reservations in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should instruct him, together with the Vice-Chairman and the Secretariat, to find a formula to meet the objections of M. Dinichert.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that it would be very difficult to find such a formula. He desired to know whether reference would be made to the Lausanne Treaty, for in that case he would have to ask for instructions from his Government before declaring his attitude.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether the representative of Switzerland objected to mentioning the Treaty of Lausanne in the report. He had merely proposed to call the attention of the Council to the extreme importance of the early ratification by Turkey of the Hague Opium Convention and her adhesion to the Geneva Convention. He had also proposed to refer to the fact that Turkey had already undertaken an obligation to ratify the Hague Convention when she had adhered to the Treaty of Lausanne, which had been in force for nearly two years. He had proposed, further, that the Committee should ask the Council to address to the Turkish Government such representations on the subject as the Council might think desirable. He thought that such a procedure could not offend even the most sensitive diplomatic conscience. The Committee was in no way proposing to draft the actual terms of the Council's letter to the Turkish Government.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a reference could be made in the Committee's recommendation to the clearly expressed intention of Turkey to ratify the Hague Opium Convention.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that only the contracting parties to the Treaty of Lausanne had the right to call on Turkey to respect her obligations. If the contracting parties did not do so, it was for the Conference of Ambassadors to take a decision. He did not know whether the Council of the League could claim the right to do so.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that when a formula was before the Committee it would be possible to see whether a compromise could be reached between the various points of view.

The CHAIRMAN undertook to submit a formula to the Committee which would satisfy all the views expressed by the members of the Committee.

29. **Consideration of the Position as regards the Application in Central and South America of the Hague Convention of 1912.**

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there were only three States which had not signed the Protocol for the entry into force of the Convention—Argentine, the Dominican Republic and Paraguay. To obtain the co-operation of these three Powers, the Committee might either make a recommendation to the Council or instruct the Secretariat to approach those countries through the intermediary of the Latin-American Bureau.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) referred to document O. C. 434, which contained a certain amount of information obtained by the British Government in connection with cases which had come under its direct notice and which concerned the position of certain South American States. He suggested that the Committee should adjourn the consideration of this subject until its next meeting, for it was of considerable importance. Though the majority of the South and Central American States had, he thought, ratified the Hague Convention, none of them, except Guatemala, had accepted or put into force the system of import and export certificates. Information in the document which he had distributed threw a considerable amount of light on the South American situation and showed that it was of considerable importance, especially from the point of view of the traffic in opium.

The discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.

EIGHTH MEETING

Held on Monday, May 31st, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

30. **Measures taken in the United States of America to Control the Drug Traffic : Statement by Colonel Woods.**

The CHAIRMAN asked Colonel Woods to make a statement on the measures taken in the United States of America to control the drug traffic.

Colonel Woods spoke as follows :

" It has given me great pleasure to comply with your request to present for your consideration a brief statement of the essential features of the enforcement provisions in the United States and the methods of operation under them. I must, however, make it quite clear that in doing so I make no claim that these methods are superior to those in operation in other countries or that they are themselves perfect. On the contrary, I am well aware of the fact that, both as regards the substantive law and the methods of operation, there is room for improvement. It is a fact, however, that the United States has been attempting over a period of a great many years to adopt legislation looking to the ultimate restriction of the use of opium and its derivatives to the proper medical and scientific needs of the country.

" A brief review of the development of this legislation might be helpful in understanding the laws under which we now operate and the reasons that have led to the inclusion in these laws of certain of the specific provisions.

" History of the Restriction by the Federal Government of the Narcotic Drug Traffic in the United States.

" Treaty with China, November 17th, 1880.

" In the year 1880, a treaty was concluded between the United States and the Emperor of China the purpose of which was to control the traffic in opium between the two countries. In 1887, Congress passed an Act the purpose of which was to prohibit the importation of opium into the United States by citizens of the Chinese Empire and the importation of opium into China by citizens of the United States—a purely reciprocal arrangement.

" United States Revenue Act, October 1st, 1890.

" In 1890, the American Congress passed an internal revenue bill, the principal provisions of which were as follows :

" (a) It placed a tax of 10 dollars per lb. on all prepared opium imported into the United States ;

“ (b) It placed a tax of 10 dollars per lb. on all prepared opium manufactured within the United States ;

“ (c) It prohibited the manufacture of prepared opium by aliens.

“ It was felt at the time that this tax would be found to be so heavy as to be prohibitive, but experience proved otherwise and more drastic legislation was necessary.

“ *United States Revenue Act, January 17th, 1914.*

“ In 1909, the importation of prepared opium was forbidden by Act of Congress, and in 1914 Congress passed an Act under the terms of which the amount of the tax on prepared opium manufactured in the country was increased from 10 to 300 dollars per lb., and, moreover, it was provided that prior to undertaking the manufacture of prepared opium a bond in the minimum sum of 100,000 dollars must be filed with the Government. These provisions have proved to be prohibitive and no one has qualified to manufacture under this law. In other words, the authorised and legitimate manufacture of prepared opium has not taken place in the United States since this legislation was passed. As a matter of fact, opium is not smoked by citizens of the United States except in instances so rare as to be negligible, and the smoking of opium in the United States proper by foreigners is not extensive.

“ So much for prepared opium.

“ *Legislation by the Individual States, 1890-1909.*

“ During the period from 1890 to 1909 the legislatures of some of the individual States in the United States passed restrictive legislation, the details of which are not of importance at the present time because they have since been superseded to a large extent by Federal legislation.

“ *Narcotic Drug Importation Act, February 9th, 1909.*

“ In 1909, the Federal Congress enacted legislation which purported to limit the importation of opium and preparations and derivatives thereof to medicinal purposes. The law further authorised the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate the necessary regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this law.

“ *International Opium Convention of 1912 concluded at The Hague and the United States Internal Revenue Act of December 17th, 1914.*

“ As you, Mr. Chairman, are well aware, under the terms of the International Opium Convention of 1912, the signatory Powers were obliged, upon ratification of the Convention, among other things :

“ (a) To enact effective laws for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium and to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry ;

“ (b) To take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture, internal trade in and use of prepared opium, and prevent its export to countries prohibiting its entry ;

“ (c) To enact regulations to limit exclusively to medicinal and legitimate purposes the manufacture, sale and use of morphine, cocaine and their derivatives, and use best endeavours to control persons manufacturing, importing, selling and exporting morphine, cocaine and their derivatives *as well as the buildings in which these persons carry on their trade.*

“ I emphasise the restriction as to the buildings because of the importance that it has in the manufacture of derivatives.

“ The United States was a party to this Convention. Acting under the obligation thereby incurred, the Congress of the United States in 1914 amended the Act of 1909 already mentioned so as to restrict the exportation of opium and cocaine and the derivatives of either to those countries which had ratified the Hague Convention of 1912 and which had passed laws regulating the importation of these drugs. In addition to this, in order more completely to carry out the provisions of the International Convention and to give effect to the measures that experience under previous legislation had indicated as being desirable, Congress passed the Act of December 17th, 1914, which is generally known in the United States as the Harrison Law. This law, subject to the amendments that have been adopted from time to time since for the purpose of strengthening or clarifying its provisions, is still in force and is the basic law under which the traffic in narcotic drugs is controlled. This legislation is in force not only in the United States proper but in the territories of Alaska, Costa Rica, the Hawaiian Islands, and also in the Philippine Islands.

“ The new provisions in the Harrison Act and the features which have been found most effective are :

“ (a) In order to deal lawfully in opium or coca leaves or their derivatives a person must obtain a licence from the United States Treasury Department. In other words, no person not holding such a licence is permitted to import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense or give away opium or coca leaves or any derivatives of either ;

“ (b) The holder of the licence must account for all opium, coca leaves or their derivatives received, on hand, or disposed of. He must keep complete books and records in the forms prescribed by the Government and must render a monthly report covering all transactions ;

“ (c) Any drugs not bearing the Government stamp are *prima facie* illicit ;

“ (d) The penalties provided for the violation of this law are a maximum fine of 2,000 dollars, or five years' imprisonment, or both.

“ *The Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, May 26th, 1922.*

“ In order to provide for a more comprehensive and detailed control over the importation, exportation and in-transit shipments of opium and cocaine and their derivatives, the Federal Congress enacted in 1922 the so-called Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act. Under the provisions of this law, there was established a Federal Narcotics Control Board consisting of three members of the Cabinet, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce. Under authority of this law, this Board prohibits the importation of derivatives of opium or coca leaves, and by virtue of an amendment adopted in the year 1924 it prohibits the future importation of opium for use in the manufacture of heroin. It prohibits the exportation of crude opium, prepared opium, and coca leaves, and it limits the exportation of narcotic drugs to the medicinal and scientific purposes of countries that have ratified the Hague Convention of 1912. Moreover, it permits such exportation only :

“ (1) When such country has instituted and maintained, in conformity with the Hague Convention, a system of permits or licences deemed adequate by the Federal Board for the control of such importation ;

“ (2) When the narcotic drug is consigned to an authorised permittee ;

“ (3) When adequate proof is submitted to the Federal Narcotics Control Board that the drugs are to be applied exclusively to medicinal and legitimate uses and only *within the country* to which they are exported, and that there is a need for such drugs in that country.

“ Each individual shipment is made on the basis of certificates covering the above information. No exports are permitted by post, and all narcotic drugs exported must be duly sealed with the internal revenue stamp of the Treasury Department.

“ Under the provisions of this law, importations are restricted to crude opium and coca leaves and are limited to such quantities thereof as are considered necessary by the Federal Narcotics Control Board for legitimate and medicinal uses. Importations can be made only on individual import licences for specified countries. The Federal Narcotics Control Board, having decided on the amount necessary for the medicinal and legitimate uses of the country, will issue, on application, licences for the importation of opium or coca leaves up to the amount of the country's requirements. In order to expedite matters, the fact of the issuance of such certificate is cabled to the consul at the port of exportation, and the consul will not certify the invoices unless advised of the issuance of such a permit.

“ All narcotic drugs arriving in the United States without due authorisation are subject to seizure and confiscation. As had been noted, no one has qualified for the manufacture of smoking opium in the United States, and since, under the provisions of the United States Pharmacopœia, the standard for deodorised, granulated and powdered opium is not less than 10 per cent nor more than 10½ per cent of anhydrous morphine, and for opium not less than 9½ per cent, the result is that opium containing less than this amount of morphine cannot be legitimately imported.

The Federal Narcotics Control Board has taken the position that in-transit shipments must comply with all the provisions already stated as applicable to exportations. As a matter of practice, the result of this has been that there are practically no in-transit shipments through ports of the United States of America.

“ *Organisation and Methods of Enforcement of the Narcotic Drug Laws.*

“ I will now describe the work of the enforcement officers under the provisions of the Harrison Act and of the Import and Export Act. At this point, I might say that it is the general census of opinion of those Government officials most familiar with the matter that

these laws have proved extremely effective in controlling the legitimate importation, manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs, and, moreover, that practically no drugs which are made from legitimate imports find their way into illicit channels.

“ In addition to the Import and Export Act and the Harrison Act, practically all the States of the Union have passed laws substantially the same as the Harrison Act, under the terms of which violations may be prosecuted in the State courts as well as in the Federal Courts. The bulk of the enforcement work, however, is done by the Federal authorities. As is the case with all other Federal legislation, the President is the chief executive and administrative officer; but as a matter of fact the Federal enforcement laws are based on their revenue provisions and are therefore primarily within the scope of the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury in turn assigns the duties of the enforcement of these laws to one of the assistant secretaries of the Treasury.

“ This official has under him all enforcement officers, organised as follows :

“ (a) At the ports of entry and along the borders the work is in charge of the general Customs service. This force is supplemented by :

“ (b) The United States coastguards who patrol the entire coast-line; and

“ (c) The special agency division which operates from Washington through the seventeen subdivisions into which the United States has been divided for this purpose. The personnel of the special agency division, which is in effect a detective force charged with the prevention of smuggling of all kinds, is upwards of 200 men.

“ In addition to these forces, there is an organisation known as the ‘ Prohibition Unit, Narcotic Division ’, under the control of a Treasury official, who makes his headquarters at Washington. This unit confines its operations solely to the enforcement of the Harrison Act—in other words, to internal enforcement.

“ Through years of operation, a force of something over 300 highly skilled officials has been organised. Since arrests are prosecuted in the Federal courts, this unit has divided the United States into subdivisions corresponding with those of the Federal courts. The results obtained from the operation of this unit have been increasingly effective. Within the last two years, Congress has increased the annual appropriation for the support and operation of this force from approximately 770,000 dollars to 1,250,000 dollars per annum. The force has been organised in such a way as to retain flexibility, and the personnel is subject to transfer from point to point as the necessities of the situation may indicate as being desirable.

“ In considering the operations of this unit, it should be remembered that as recently as 1914 morphine and other narcotic drugs could be freely purchased in the United States of America by anyone without restriction. The Government reports indicate that in 1900 there were in the United States possibly as many as 264,000 drug addicts, and that by 1925 they had been reduced to approximately 110,000. In 1920 the importation of opium into the United States amounted to 682,979 lb., and the exportation to 230,268 lb.—a net of 452,711 lb. For the year ending June 30th, 1925, the imports were reduced to 99,603 lb. and the exports to 189 lb. of opium, and 1,646 oz. of derivatives. The importations seem to have been standardised during the past two or three years by the Control Board at approximately 100,000 lb. of opium per year. The Federal Control Board believes the average medicinal requirements of the nation to be not over 7/8 gr. of morphine (corresponding to approximately 7.8 gr. opium) and 1/4 gr. cocaine per year *per capita*. As the future importation of opium for the manufacture of heroin has been prohibited, it is deemed probable that this will lead to an increased use of codein for medicinal purposes, with a slight increase in the amount of opium imported.

“ Under the provisions of the Harrison Act, cases involving a mere technical violation, obviously without criminal intent—such as, for instance, a failure to notify the authorities of change of address on the part of the licensee—may be compromised. All other cases are subject to trial, and the record for the year ending June 30th, 1925, is as follows :

| | |
|---|--------|
| “ Number of violations, all cases for which arrests were made, including technical violations | 10,297 |
| “ Cases tried in courts | 5,803 |
| “ Convictions | 5,600 |
| “ Acquittals | 203 |
| “ Percentage of convictions | 96.5 |

“ Penalties :

“ Aggregate prison sentences imposed—that is, the sentences all added together—6,361 years, 11 months, 7 days.

“ I may explain that all these years were distributed among a large number of prisoners.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| “ Total fines imposed | \$453,330.27 |
| “ Total sums accepted in cases compromised | \$86,669.90 |

“ For the benefit of any who might desire to become familiar themselves with the provisions of the laws that I have been describing and the official forms under which the legitimate business is conducted, I will file with the Secretariat :

“ (a) Copy of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act of May 1923, together with forms for application to import and export ;

“ (b) Copy of the United States Internal Revenue Act of December 17th, 1914 (known as the Harrison Law), together with the subsequent amendments thereof ;

“ (c) Copy of the forms to be used by importers, manufacturers, producers or compounders in making the required monthly returns to the Treasury Department ;

“ (d) Copy of the forms required in making the monthly returns by wholesale dealers in narcotic drugs and preparations ;

“ (e) Copy of Inventory Report ;

“ (f) Report forms of seizures and attempts to import unlawfully ;

“ (g) Form of report for seizures as a result of illicit operation within the country.

“ *International Police Regulations.*

“ In welcoming me here to serve as assessor on your Committee, the Chairman graciously alluded in a very kindly way to my experience as Police Commissioner in New York City. I am mentioning this now to show you what my approach has been to the subject of narcotic drugs.

“ I first became confronted with this question in 1907, in which year I became a Deputy Police Commissioner in New York under General Theodore A. Bingham, one of the ablest Police Commissioners New York City has ever seen. My assignment was in charge of the detective work. At this time there was practically no control over the use of habit-forming drugs in the city. It became so clear to us that one city could not of itself protect itself against the inroads of these drugs that we took the matter up with Congress for Federal and later for international action.

“ After going out of office as Deputy Commissioner in 1909 I took office again as Police Commissioner in 1914. It was my job to protect life and property in a large city populated with great numbers of people of many different races. My interest in habit-forming drugs arose not from an academic reason but because the effect of these drugs was so clearly to increase crime directly as well as indirectly, and to make life and property correspondingly less safe. My approach to the whole drug question, therefore, is a practical one from a police standpoint.

“ As the years have worn on, it has become perfectly clear that only international action can be successful against this international curse. In suggesting to you some of the measures that my experience indicates to be wise and necessary in order to meet this situation, I realise that probably many countries have already adopted such measures or better ones. But this is not enough. The vital necessity is concerted action. My excuse for very possibly not being up to date in this respect is that no documents with reference to the work of this Committee reached me from Geneva until my arrival in Paris, so that I have not had the chance to familiarise myself with the history of the matter as completely as I should have liked.

“ It is clear to me, however, that this Committee unanimously—and, I believe, every country in the world unanimously—agrees as to the dangers of the opium and coca-leaf derivatives and that they have set as their goal the absolute and definitive limitation of these derivatives to the medical needs of the world. This makes the whole matter easier from a police point of view, for police forces everywhere can go ahead to fight the criminals, who attempt to violate these laws, in complete confidence that they have the backing of all Governments and all peoples, and that this backing is sincere and genuine and not perfunctory and hypocritical. The stream can rise no higher than its source, and a police force cannot be expected to enforce a higher degree of compliance with law than is approved by the inhabitants of the country it represents.

“ Those of you who have not had the good fortune to be policemen can hardly realise what a difference it makes to a police force to know that the community is unanimous in approving the unmitigated enforcement of a given law.

“ I have not been able to escape the impression during the few days during which I have had the privilege of sitting with this Committee that there may be too much diplomacy and too little rough-shod direct police action in the fight against these narcotic outlaws. It is not a diplomatic question, Gentlemen, but a pure police task, and in the contest with law-breakers as rich, as powerful, as well organised and as far-reaching as these, the police must act strongly and must be free from unnecessary diplomatic entanglements. I cannot help feeling that perhaps the biggest difficulty in the whole question is the lack of realisation or

the failure to act on the realisation that, at least in so far as the derivatives are concerned—and they constitute our most serious problem—we have a pure and simple police question, which should be treated as such.

“ There are really three elements to all police work. One is that the laws shall be adequate; the second is that those in charge of the police shall be intelligent; and the third that they shall be honest.

“ Let us assume that the laws are adequate to meet the situation. This assumption is justified in some countries, I am sure, and notable progress is being made in others. A prevailing weakness, however, seems to me to be that the penalties imposed are far from commensurate with the gravity of the offences. In the United States of America prison sentences of from five to fifteen years are frequently imposed.

“ Let us assume also a national police force of intelligence and honesty. To meet this international traffic we must have international action. The first step toward bringing this about, which I should strongly urge for your consideration, would be the periodic calling together of an international conference of the officials in the different countries represented on this Committee who have to do with the direct enforcement of these police laws. They are the men who have to do the actual work of apprehending the offender. Bring them together! Let them confer, let them get acquainted with each other and consult as to what powers or other arrangements they now have, and those they may need, in order to enable them to carry out the laws of the people of their countries for the control of the legitimate and the suppression of the illicit traffic.

“ Arrangements should be made for direct communication between these officers by cable or letter as the case may call for. Right here is an illustration of the way in which diplomacy has been too much expected to do the work of the policeman. Communication in many cases, even to-day, with reference to violation of the narcotic laws takes place through the tortuous and clogged-up channels of diplomacy. An expected shipment of cocaine may be despatched from one country to another. The official in the country of export may attempt to notify the country of import of the expected arrival, giving the date of sailing, the name of the ship and all pertinent particulars. This information goes decorously and composedly from the Foreign Office of one country to the Ambassador, from him to the Foreign Office of the other country, and from there to the Department in that country which has to do with the enforcement of the law, and arrives, if it has the good fortune to be unusually rapid, some two or three or four weeks after the expected shipment has arrived and been cleared. Direct communication from the exporting country to the importing country by cable would result in the seizure of all such shipments.

“ But it is nothing like enough to seize shipments. There are plenty more where these came from. The only effective thing to do is to run down the people who are making the shipments. This can be done only by intelligent and honest police methods with quick and direct communications between the different countries.

“ I believe that measures like this, intelligently and honestly carried out, will go far toward giving the results we all desire.

“ When we come, however, to the question of smuggling morphine and cocaine, we are up against a difficult question, since the bulk of these articles is so small as to render smuggling possible in an infinite variety of ways.

“ Another difficulty is the great profit that awaits the successful smuggler and tempts him to take risks, and makes it good business for him to continue his smuggling in spite of many a loss. On the other hand, an advantage that the police have is the fact that cocaine and morphine cannot be manufactured in the kitchen or backyard. The manufacturers have to have extensive and expensive plants which cannot escape the cognisance of the police. That this belief is true is demonstrated by the fact that, notwithstanding the great demand for this drug and the large prices that reward illicit traffickers, the number of plants producing morphine and cocaine in the whole world is very small.

“ This gives us our best point of attack on the traffic in derivatives. We are at the source. We know where these drugs are made; we know that they cannot be made in other places. In the public interest, we should control the manufacture and distribution to whatever extent is necessary for the public welfare. There will be nothing but public approval for measures of whatever strength may be necessary to control this poisonous traffic, and in my mature judgment, as a result of many years of practical experience, I wish to state emphatically that I do not believe that any country can successfully protect its citizens and do its part to protect the citizens of other countries from the ravages of these habit-forming drugs unless it nationally owns and operates, or nationally adequately controls, the factories producing these drugs. By control I mean that the Government shall know exactly what goes in and what comes out of every plant and shall see to it that nothing goes in or comes out except what is expressly allowed by the Government for medical purposes, and that it goes only to places and persons authorised by proper authority.

“ If the supply of raw material continues to be easily available, however, and if the profit

from the sale of the derived material grows greater and greater, we must expect to have a continuation of this evil. This points inevitably to the need for controlling supplies. The arrangements which, as I understand it, have been recommended by this Committee, looking toward the complete control of export and import of opium and coca leaves, should go far toward this end if put in force by all the nations concerned, and in the interests of all I cannot but feel that the pressure of public opinion in each country, when informed of the situation, will be such as to make certain that all countries join in hard-and-fast regulations for export and import. There are other points that might be taken up to pursue still further this question of production, but perhaps we have gone into the matter now far enough for the immediate purpose about which you asked me to inform you.

"I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this all too lengthy report has not tried your patience too sorely. I trust, further, that what I have said may prove of value. I have ventured to go into these details, in the first place, because of your request made on the first day of this session, and, secondly, because of my confidence in the sincerity of purpose of this Committee and in my consequent belief that you wished to hear a plain unvarnished statement of the matter as it appears to one who has had years of experience in trying to combat the evil practically."

The CHAIRMAN thanked Colonel Woods for his interesting communication, which would confirm the Committee in its view that he would be of great assistance to it.

Colonel Woods had been right in pointing out that the Committee ran the risk of dealing a little too much with the diplomatic aspect of the drug problem and of neglecting its police aspect. It had realised this, and it was for that reason that it had decided, on the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, that it should recommend the Council to appoint an expert in police matters. As the result of this recommendation, Colonel Woods had been appointed.

The Committee should note the remarkable results achieved in the United States as recounted by Colonel Woods. The repressive measures had led to a reduction in the numbers of drug addicts from 264,000 to 110,000.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed with what the Chairman and Colonel Woods had said regarding the importance of the police side of the Committee's work.

Japan had been represented at the two Opium Conferences by M. Kaku and on the Advisory Committee by Dr. Tsurumi, who were experts rather than diplomats. The fact that Dr. Tsurumi was at the moment being replaced by a diplomat was due to exceptional circumstances, but the diplomat in question sincerely desired to co-operate with his colleagues and to express the point of view of his Government honestly and loyally.

NINTH MEETING

Held on Monday, May 31st, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

31. Application of the Hague Opium Convention of 1912 in certain States.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said he wished to call attention to a document which he had circulated (O.C.407) relating to a new Egyptian law¹. The document threw light on the present situation in regard to the drug traffic in Egypt and on the position with regard to the extra-territorial rights of the Powers.

The ACTING SECRETARY read an extract from this document.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) doubted whether it would be wise for the Committee to put forward any suggestion or make any proposal. The passage which had just been read, however, drew attention to a point which had several times been discussed in connection with other countries and which should be borne in mind by the countries having capitulatory rights. He would suggest that the Committee should print in its report, or as an appendix to its report, the whole or part of the relevant passage.

After some discussion, *it was agreed that extracts from the letter should be published.*

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, on November 6th, 1925, he had written a letter to M. Petrovitch, representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. In this letter he had drawn the attention of the Government of the Kingdom of the

¹ See the Report of the Committee, Annex 11.

Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the fact that it had agreed to issue import certificates in respect of exports of dangerous drugs from Great Britain, and that these certificates were being issued by the Sanitation Service Department of the Ministry of National Health at Belgrade. This arrangement, however, was not in force with any other country, so that the traders of those countries might export dangerous drugs to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes without having to forward to their own Governments a certificate from the Government of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. He had asked the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes whether his Government could not see its way to accept the import certificate system for all countries.

He had also not been able to ascertain that any licensing system was in force in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes for the export or import of opium and other drugs.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said he had not a copy of the letter to which Sir Malcolm Delevingne had referred, and that he would reply on the following day to the question which had been raised.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said it was correct that there was no arrangement as regards import certificates between Germany and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The exports from Germany, however, were normal.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that the question was not of very great importance as regards the imports into his country. Opium and other drugs were only imported for medical requirements, and the illicit use of drugs was almost unknown in the country.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said it would be of value to the Committee to be informed as to the nature of the control exercised by the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes over the export of opium and other drugs from that country or over the import of such drugs.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that he would deal with these points on the following day.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, according to his information, the Free City of Danzig had put the Hague Convention into force and was applying the import certificate system. This was also true of Latvia.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat to note this information.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the Committee should repeat the recommendation made to the Council in former years calling attention to the importance of the putting into force of the Hague Convention.

32. List of the Conditions regulating the Import, Export and Despatch by Post of Narcotics in all Countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) explained that this list (document O. C. 392) was not an official document from his Government. He had drawn it up himself, thinking it would be useful to draw the attention of the Governments to the system of certificates in order to enforce its application. A complete knowledge of the postal regulations was very necessary in the campaign against illicit traffic. The list of prohibited objects came from the International Postal Bureau at Berne.

He proposed to revise and complete the list according to information furnished by the Secretariat in order that it might be sent to the Governments for transmission to the competent authorities, more particularly for the use of exporters.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked from what sources of information Dr. Anselmino had compiled the list.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the information came from the Secretariat and from the International Postal Bureau at Berne.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that no distinction was made in the periodical publication of the Central Office at Berne between the regulations governing letters and registered letters, on the one hand, and postal packages of declared value on the other. The Stockholm Convention did not prohibit the import of opium in postal packages of declared value. The regulations of the Netherlands East Indies prohibited the import of opium by letter post in accordance with the Stockholm Convention, and opium might only be imported by means of packages of declared value for medicinal purposes. He did not think this point was clear in the list before the Committee, which left the impression that raw opium might be imported into the Netherlands Indies by post, which was not correct. He thought that the Central Bureau at Berne should be asked to distinguish in future between letters and registered letters and postal packages of declared value.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, under the Stockholm Convention, the transmission of opium or drugs by letter post, whether plain letter post or registered-letter post, was absolutely prohibited. Two classes of parcels were recognised by the Convention: packages of declared value and postal parcels. The transmission of opium or drugs in packages of declared value was prohibited under Article 10 and in postal parcels under Article 14 of the

Convention. An exception, however, was made in respect of opium or drugs transmitted in packages of declared value or postal parcels in cases in which a country of import allowed the drugs to be sent in such packages for medical purposes only. The point of interest for the Committee was to ascertain what countries allowed the transmission of drugs in packages of declared value or in postal parcels, and under what conditions.

After a short exchange of views between M. VAN WETTUM and Dr. ANSELMINO, the CHAIRMAN suggested that M. van Wettum and Dr. Anselmino should discuss the matter between themselves. The Committee would then take a decision as to the publication or non-publication of the document. The Committee might perhaps ask the Central Office at Berne for an official document which it would examine at its next session, in connection with the indications given by Dr. Anselmino.

Agreed.

33. List of Seizures of Drugs reported to the League since August 1925.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said he did not understand why mention should be made in the document before the Committee (O.C.294 (a)) of a seizure of poppy seeds. Poppy seeds were not a dangerous product.

The ACTING SECRETARY said this seizure had been included because it was mentioned in the report received.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that there was information in the reports which should not be inserted in the list. There was, for example, a reference in the document to a seizure of peronin. Peronin was a derivative of morphine but not a dangerous drug. The object of the Committee was to combat the use of narcotics, not to suppress the use of valuable remedies. The export of peronin was subject to no control and was legal in all the countries of the world. He would protest against the illegal seizure recorded in the document and against the communication made in Annex 2 in regard to peronin. He would also protest against the seizure of a preparation of dionin, which was also a harmless drug.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thanked Dr. Anselmino for having drawn attention also to this latter seizure. The drug referred to was tuberkulsin, which contained 50 per cent of dionin and did not appear to be subject to any restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that possibly the attention of certain authorities might be drawn to the fact that these substances did not come under the terms of the Convention.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that, before examining seizures in detail, he would like to make a general statement on the question of the illicit traffic.

Illicit traffic was being conducted on a large scale. The continents of America, Europe and Asia were all concerned in the matter. It was a problem which also concerned manufacturers, wholesale traders, agents and traffickers down to mere "boys". The illicit traffic raised the question of transport, since it affected railway and shipping companies, as also agents and traders who freighted ships, or captains who had relations with smugglers.

It was necessary to take account of the position in Russia, and more especially in China. There were also the Governments of the various colonies. The position was therefore complicated, and in this connection he would refer to the suggestion made by Colonel Woods at the morning meeting as regards the necessity for concerted action between the authorities of the various countries.

He would deal only with the various aspects of the question so far as Japan was directly concerned. He would consider the illicit traffic from Japan to India and from Japan to China, and from Europe or America to Japan.

As regards the illicit traffic from Europe or America to Japan, he would like to thank the Governments concerned for their collaboration in controlling this traffic. He would thank, particularly, the Governments of Switzerland and Germany.

His thanks were specially due to the British authorities as regards the illicit traffic from Europe towards Asia.

In his opinion, it was necessary to suppress smuggling at the source, and for this purpose international collaboration was very desirable. The smugglers had large sums of money at their disposal, and they had agents who were in close touch with them. He referred to an example on page 34 of the document before the Committee, in which reference was made to the case of a person called Greene, who was an American. The British authorities had confiscated the goods in question. The Japanese Consul at Vancouver had telegraphed to Tokio and at the same time the British Ambassador had warned the Japanese Government. Greene, on his arrival at Yokohama, had been met by the police authorities. Enquiries had been made, but no evidence was found against him. Greene had probably been warned by wireless or by some other means. He had subsequently gone to Tientsin, to which place he had been traced, but it was impossible for the Japanese authorities to bring home the offence.

M. Sugimura considered that some further arrangement was necessary to control the offenders besides the confiscation of the goods. This control might be facilitated by arranging further telegraphic exchanges of information between the competent authorities. Colonel Woods had referred at the morning meeting to the necessity for this international co-operation. It was essential that the Governments and the competent authorities should make more vigorous efforts to put down the traffic.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether, in view of the fact that reference was being made to specific cases, the Committee should not go into private session.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the case referred to by M. Sugimura had already been described in Document O.C.385, which had been communicated to the Council and to the States Members of the League.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he did not think that such cases should be discussed in public, but he was prepared to agree to a public discussion if the Committee so decided.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) expressed himself in favour of the public discussion of such cases.

After a short exchange of views, *the Committee decided to continue the meeting in public.*

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) then continued his statement. He said that certain of the cases mentioned in the list of seizures at the Indian ports were cases of illicit traffic carried on by the ships' boys. They involved only small quantities of drugs. In other cases, much larger quantities were seized in ships other than Japanese, and no arrest had been made in the majority of cases.

Then there was the question of trade-marks or labels. It often happened that smugglers did not give the real trade-mark or origin of the goods. Under the Japanese system, manufacturers sold their products to authorised wholesale dealers, who sold the products to authorised retailers. When an endeavour was made to verify the trade-mark or label, it was difficult to do so, as there was a very great number of retailers. If, however, investigations were made from the smuggler to the retailer and thence to the wholesale dealer, it would be easier to discover the origin of the traffic. For this reason, it was very necessary that the authorities who seized contraband should as far as possible indicate the relations existing between the smugglers and the retailers. In other words, more importance should be attached to the smugglers than to the goods which were seized.

In this field, the collaboration of the British authorities had so far been excellent. It was necessary that such collaboration should be ensured between the Governments, not omitting those of Russia and Macao. It was particularly necessary that there should be collaboration between Japan and the Dutch East Indies and Indo-China.

There was another very important point. It was easier for the Japanese police to discover crimes committed by Japanese or even by Chinese than crimes committed by Europeans and by Americans. The case was probably reversed for the British and Dutch authorities when they endeavoured to discover smuggling conducted by Japanese or Chinese. The original difficulties were increased by difficulties of language and habits. That again was a reason for insisting upon close co-operation between the various police authorities.

There were two small points of detail to which he would draw attention: the case mentioned on page 12 of Document O.C.294 (a) of the *Haruna Maru* and the case mentioned on page 16 of the same document of the *Matsumoto Maru* were referred to as two different cases. They were, however, really the same case, as the consignment in question had been transhipped from the *Haruna Maru* to the *Matsumoto Maru*. Further, there was the case of the *Nagpore* mentioned on page 12. This vessel did not only touch at Japan but also at China and the Straits Settlements, and there was no proof that the goods were of Japanese origin.

It should also be noted that the institution described on page 47 as the Imperial Hygienic Laboratory was not a factory but a Government institution which inspected and certified drugs.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) pointed out that the quantities of illicit cocaine seized in India, though not perhaps large as compared with the huge quantities recorded in the illicit traffic elsewhere, were relatively considerable. Four items chosen more or less at random from the list of seizures amounted to 17 kilogrammes, which should be compared with the total licit imports into India, which were only 21 kilogrammes. The question of the smuggling of cocaine into India had already become a very serious problem for the Government.

The general conclusions which he drew from the report were the existence of a very large volume of illicit traffic and the extraordinary complexity of that traffic. The only remedies appeared to be much closer control of manufacture and export by the Governments of the manufacturing countries and closer co-operation between Governments, as had been suggested by Colonel Woods. His own view was—and always had been—that, if the nations concerned would effectively put into force the international obligations which they had already undertaken under the Hague Convention of 1912, the drug problem would be solved immediately. There were adequate powers to stop the illicit drug traffic under the legal position as it now stood. The number of factories was small, and there was no reason why the most rigid control should not be established.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he had just received a despatch from Peking, including a list of seizures of Russian opium for the last six months of 1925 which were not included in the printed list. This document would be translated and distributed to the Committee.

He had further been instructed by his Government regarding the smuggling of Russian opium into China, and he had submitted to the Committee a summary of a despatch sent to the Soviet Ambassador at Peking (document O. C. 449).

The Committee agreed that these documents should be discussed at a later meeting.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said there were several seizures of drugs bearing German labels. He would refer in this connection to a note from the German Government (document O.C.416).

He would also draw attention to extracts from the report of the Presidency of Bombay submitted by Sir John Campbell (document O.C.436). It was stated in this document that a large quantity of German cocaine continued to be sold as contraband in Bombay. There was no proof that this cocaine was of German origin. There was, on the contrary, proof that the labels had been forged.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of labels would be dealt with later.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the excise authorities in India had not gone beyond the labels which appeared on the drugs.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought it would be more convenient to postpone the general discussion of the illicit traffic until the particular problems placed on the agenda had been exhausted. There were two points, however, which he would raise immediately.

Colonel Woods had referred at the morning meeting to the importance of international co-operation and the exchange of information. He had himself insisted on this matter for several years, and the Committee had passed periodical resolutions and recommendations on the subject. The practice of exchanging information was growing but was far from being complete. It would be seen from the document under consideration that the communications originated almost entirely in one or two quarters. The bulk of the report of seizures came in fact from the British authorities. The Netherlands Government had contributed a considerable number, but, apart from these two countries, the number of seizures reported was very small. There were five from Japan, three from Germany, one from Switzerland and none at all from any other country represented on the Committee. It was known that many seizures were made by other countries. For example, the French authorities, as shown by their report for 1924, were very active in the matter. Those authorities must have obtained a considerable amount of valuable information regarding smuggling which would be of great use both to the German Government and to other Governments represented on the Committee.

The second observation referred to the seizures reported on page 29 of the document before the Committee as coming from the International Opium Association at Peking to which M. Sugimura had alluded in his observations. The amounts involved were very large. On September 29th, 275 ounces of cocaine hydrochloride had been seized at Shanghai on the *Asa Maru*. During the quarter ending September 30th, 412 ounces of cocaine and 878 ounces of heroin had been seized on the *Haraka Maru*. During the same period, 66 ounces of heroin had been seized on the *Kasuga Maru*, 245 ounces of heroin on the *Nanrei Maru* and 725 ounces of heroin on the *Busho Maru*.

He wished that M. Sugimura had been in a position to say how far the Japanese Government had been able to push enquiries in regard to seizures of such importance. Such quantities could not be obtained from a retail dealer. Unless the Committee could trace contraband on so large a scale, its efforts would be of very little practical use. The statement of the Inspector-General of Customs at Peking showed that the seizures made by the Chinese Maritime Customs for the last three years (document O.C.429) were tremendous. The seizures of morphia alone for 1923 and 1924 amounted to 30,000 ounces, which was equal to or exceeded the total consumption in Great Britain for a single year. Would it be possible for the Japanese representative to state what measures were taken when seizures of this kind were reported?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he had reports from his Government on each of the cases, but the documents were voluminous and had not yet been translated into English and French.

Generally speaking, when goods were not accompanied by the persons engaged in the traffic, and particularly when the firms sending the goods were not known, the Government addressed enquiries to the steamship company and to the traders. To search for the criminal was always difficult—above all, when the smuggling was very extensive. The Japanese authorities would endeavour to collect information, but it must not be forgotten that the police had a very difficult task to perform.

Persons accompanying the goods often gave a false name, and the difficulty in such cases was very great. It was hoped that, in the course of time, the police authorities would be able to improve their methods of investigation.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, when large seizures were made of drugs bearing the labels of particular firms, enquiry should be made at both ends. Investigation should not be limited to the steamship company or the crew of the ship but should extend to the manufacturers.

If the British Government were informed that large quantities of drugs bearing the label of a British firm had been smuggled, it would want a very clear explanation from the firm in question as the means by which the drugs got into illicit channels. Consignments on a large

scale could not be obtained without the connivance of people who were either manufacturing the drugs or dealing in them in a wholesale manner.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the Japanese Government realised the necessity of enquiries in regard to the manufacturers, but such enquiries were difficult. Manufacturers sold to authorised wholesale dealers, and it was difficult to go further and to pursue enquiries from the manufacturers to the wholesale dealers and from the wholesale dealers to the retailers.

The Japanese Government urgently desired that foreign authorities should assist it and furnish it with information which would enable it to deal with the traffic at its source.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that a system of control under which it was possible for 500 ounces of cocaine or 700 ounces of heroin to slip into the illicit traffic could not be satisfactory and would never put any serious obstacle in the way of illicit traffickers. The Committee would remember that when, some years ago, a British manufacturer could not give a satisfactory explanation of his transactions, his licence was cancelled and he was not again allowed to manufacture or deal in drugs.

The CHAIRMAN said he would urge upon the French departments concerned the utility of exchanging information with other countries. In France, active measures were taken to repress the traffic. The number of persons prosecuted amounted to 298, but the importance of the drugs seized was inconsiderable from the point of view of the international trade: it only amounted to 54 kilogrammes of opium, 15 kilogrammes of cocaine, 6 kilogrammes of morphine, 0.917 kilogrammes of heroin.

He would draw attention to a point which had arisen in regard to other statistical tables examined by the Committee. Such tables, presented without any commentary or summary, conveyed no very clear idea to the mind and did not make it possible to draw any important conclusions. He suggested that in future the figures relating to seizures should be arranged so as to give the totals of the various substances seized with reference to the more important centres of smuggling. In this way the Committee would be able to form a clear impression of the extent, the nature and the channels of the illicit traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed. He would point out, however, that the figures in the list of seizures did not represent the total quantity of the drugs seized, which in a single year would very vastly exceed those mentioned in the list. He thought it would be of advantage if the Governments were asked to state in their annual reports the total quantity of the different drugs seized by their authorities during the year, in the same way as the Hong-Kong Government had done in its report for 1924 and also the Chinese Maritime Customs in the table before the Committee.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that it was necessary to emphasise the moral importance of the problem of the illicit traffic. It was the duty of all the Governments to do their utmost in this field. The question had also an economic side. For example, as between Japan and China, the import of Japanese goods was not regarded with favour. Every case was opened at the Customs, and goods suffered damage as a result of this. It was to the commercial interest of Japan to supervise its own smugglers effectively. Here, however, the Japanese authorities contended with very serious difficulties. Information was available to the effect that smuggled goods were often taken on board at the very moment when the Japanese ship was raising the anchor. Control or supervision in these circumstances was almost impossible.

Japanese traders entertained feelings which were somewhat hostile to the officials of the Chinese Maritime Customs — a fact which the Chinese delegate would probably admit. It appeared that Japanese goods were unjustly mishandled. For example, according to the information of Japanese consuls and traders, a large portion of the smuggling was done by foreign ships, which were tolerated. The proof of this was that their cases were not opened in the same way as the Japanese goods. He did not desire to diminish the responsibility of the Japanese Government. He thought, however, that confiscation and enquiries should be conducted on a footing of complete equality and applied quite impartially to the goods of all countries.

He would make a further observation concerning the mark or label under which the goods were exported. It had recently been proved that certain cocaine sold under a Japanese label could not have been manufactured in Japan, as was proved by its inferior quality.

TENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

Held on Tuesday, June 1st, 1926, at 10 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

34. Request by the Netherlands Government for Information from the Mexican Government regarding the Drug Situation in Mexico.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) informed the Committee that he had received a telegram stating that his Government had written to the Mexican Government on March 24th, 1926, asking whether any information concerning the position of narcotics in that country would be forwarded to the Dutch Government. No reply had yet been received.

35. List of the Conditions regulating the Import, Export and Despatch by Post of Narcotics in all Countries (continuation).

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) stated that he no longer had any objection to the document drawn up by Dr. Anselmino provided the words "by post" in the title were omitted. Dr. Anselmino had supported his objection to the list of prohibited objects drawn up by the Central Bureau at Berne. He would propose that a letter should be drafted asking for information from that Bureau and pointing out that the list was not intelligible, for it was impossible to ascertain from it what were the regulations in each country regarding packages of declared value.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

On the proposal of Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), the order of the columns in document O.C.392 was changed, column 8 becoming column 7, and *vice versa*. It was understood that the heading of column 7 would not be altered.

The Secretariat was instructed to revise the document in accordance with the decisions of the Committee.

36. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs at Singapore.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that he had received a further note from the German Government concerning the seizure of morphine on board the s.s. *Sarvistan* referred to in document O.C.351.

On his proposal, *the Committee decided that the German note should be distributed immediately.*

37. Position of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes with regard to the Import and Export of Narcotics.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) desired to explain the position of his country regarding the import of drugs. At the moment, as the result of an agreement concluded between the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and Great Britain, due to the initiative of the latter Power, a certificate of importation was required for products coming from Great Britain. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was ready to conclude similar agreements with other countries.

His Government had not put the principle of import certificates into general application for the following reason. This system was provided for in the Second Convention adopted at Geneva in 1925, but his Government did not wish to take any decision regarding this particular provision before definitely deciding whether or not to ratify the whole Convention.

He would like to reassure Sir Malcolm Delevingne regarding the import of drugs into the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It should not be thought that such import was unrestricted. Properly certified persons such as druggists and chemists were required to apply to the Ministry of Health in order to obtain an import licence. They were required to indicate the quantity of the drug which they desired to import. Only on receipt of such a licence could they import, and their authorisation had to be shown to the Customs authorities.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thanked M. Fotitch for his information but would like further details regarding the control of exports. Was a Government licence or authorisation to export necessary ?

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) did not think that, for the moment, an export licence was required from exporters. Production in the country itself was controlled by the Board of Trade and export by the Customs authorities at the frontier.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the Hague Convention, to which the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was a party, required States to take certain measures for the control both of the import and export of opium and drugs. The adoption of the import and export certificate system had, in addition, been recommended by the Committee and approved by the League. It was not compulsory, although it had been very strongly recommended and had been adopted by most States. The Hague Convention, however, required States to control both export and import. He had therefore asked the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes what measures his country had adopted, since no information had ever been received from that Government concerning the laws in force for the control of the drug traffic. If there were such laws, it would be useful for the Committee to receive copies.

It was true perhaps that the initiative regarding the import and export certificate system lay to a certain extent with the Government of the exporting country. As, however, most Members of the League had agreed to adopt the import certificate system, he would venture to suggest that the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes could also accept it, and to express the hope that it would issue import certificates for submission to the Governments of exporting countries. When that had been done, countries, such as Germany and Switzerland, which exported drugs to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, would require their exporters to produce a certificate.

He urged such a procedure very strongly on the representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes precisely because the Government of that State had expressed its willingness to adopt it. It was already in force with regard to exports from Great Britain. All that was needed was an extension to cover other countries such as Germany and Switzerland. M. Petrovitch, the former representative of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on the Committee, had urged his Government to take up the matter, and had informed Sir Malcolm Delevingne that it was under consideration.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) took note of the request made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne concerning the despatch to the Secretariat of copies of existing laws and regulations in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. He would do all that was possible to accede to this request.

He would repeat that the reason why the import and export certificate system had not yet been adopted in his country was because it was provided for in the Convention of Geneva, and before applying such special provisions his Government desired, first of all, to take a definite decision regarding the ratification of that Convention. If by any chance the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes did not ratify, it would nevertheless immediately consider the general application of the import and export certificate system. The conclusion of the agreement which he had mentioned with Great Britain showed that it had already accepted that system in principle.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) realised that this was so, and for that reason ventured to press the matter strongly. He thought that both the German and the Swiss Governments were merely waiting to know that the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was prepared to issue such certificates in order to require their production before authorising their nationals to export drugs from Germany or Switzerland to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed with the views of Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The Swiss law provided, in any case, for the production of an export licence for every country, whether or not the importing country required an import licence. It would greatly simplify procedure if such export licences, which involved the responsibility of the Government, could be granted on the production of an unquestionable authority, such as the import licence. For this reason, Switzerland had approached certain countries with a view to obtaining the adoption by them of an import licence. M. Carrière, whose place he was taking, would have been able to explain why the Government of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had not been so approached. It was probably because any Swiss carrying on an export trade with that country was required, before obtaining his export licence, to furnish information regarding the legitimate character of the consignment. Such information perhaps took the form of copies of the authorisation granted to the Serbian importer by his Government. On the production of the copies of such authority, the Swiss service considered that such was equivalent to an import certificate and consequently granted the export licence.

Switzerland could only wish to see the introduction of the system of export and import certificates in all countries with which it had commercial relations.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of Article 21 of the Hague Convention, which urged Powers to communicate the texts of all laws relating to the control of the drug traffic.

38. Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : Question of the Publicity of the Discussion.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that in the documents before it concerning illicit traffic from the Persian Gulf the names of firms were mentioned. If, however, the Committee maintained the point of view which it had adopted at the preceding meeting, the discussion would be held in public. He wished, however, to recall the fact that M. van Wettum and himself were not in favour of this procedure.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) pointed out that, in so far as any Swiss firm was concerned, he saw no objection whatever to discussing the matter as publicly as possible. He did not, however, feel quite so sure about adopting the same view regarding reports and statements coming from other Governments or other sources. It was obvious that anybody submitting a document to the Committee assumed the initial responsibility for what was contained in it. The only responsibility for publicity, therefore, which he could take was for the particular information which concerned Switzerland.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that document O.C.433 was marked "Confidential". It contained accusations, which might or might not prove to be justified, against a certain firm. The firm in question might possibly lodge a protest. In his view, the principle as laid down by M. Dinichert should be admitted, namely, that the Government which was the author of any particular report should take the full responsibility for suggesting whether that report should or should not be discussed in public. When any protests against the Committee's procedure were received—and some had already been received—they could be sent to the Governments responsible for the documents which had given rise to such protests. Thus, the Government making the report would assume special responsibility regarding the publicity of its discussion.

He quite understood how useful publicity was in this matter, but the Committee should also remember the inconveniences and its own responsibilities.

Colonel Woods did not think that the Committee could divest itself of responsibility with regard to publicity. He felt the unanimous view to be that publicity was of value to the Committee and that, except in very rare cases, it could do no harm. Consequently, the procedure, in his opinion, should be that all meetings should be held in public, but if any Government, with reference to a particular matter, felt that the Committee should sit in private when discussing it, the Government in question should state its reasons. The Committee should discuss those reasons and should decide whether or not to give effect to them. In general, it seemed to him to be so important to accept the principle of publicity that only a few exceptions should be allowed, and those only after the whole Committee had decided to that effect.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that document O.C.433 was marked "Confidential" and had been communicated confidentially by the British Government to the Committee. He had no intention of referring to it when speaking of the export of opium from the Persian Gulf. If it were discussed at all, it should certainly be discussed in private. Apart from that, there was no reason why the discussion of the question of the traffic from the Persian Gulf should be held in private any more this year than it had been in the previous year. He understood, however, that the Chairman made no objection to this point but only objected to discussing document O.C.433 in public.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the discussion should be public except in certain particular cases—for instance, when a document was communicated confidentially by a Government.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the question of protests made by certain firms regarding the action of the Committee should first be discussed, since the Committee would then have a concrete case before it. He was unable to agree with Colonel Woods, for, in his view, the damage caused by harming an innocent person through discussing in public affairs which concerned him was greater than the benefits accruing from that public discussion.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. van Wettum. It would be preferable first to discuss a concrete case.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the Committee had decided that the case referred to by M. van Wettum would not be discussed until the end of Item 7 on the agenda. It had decided to discuss the question of the export of opium from the Persian Gulf and it should maintain that decision.

The CHAIRMAN, in order to meet the views of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, withdrew his proposal to discuss the concrete case as suggested by M. van Wettum.

The Committee decided to discuss in public the question of the illicit traffic from the Persian Gulf.

39. Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : General Discussion.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) reminded the Committee of the series of resolutions which it had adopted at the previous session. Its discussion of the matter had been based upon evidence similar to that included in documents O.C. 417 and 417 (a), which had been communicated to the Committee by the British Government. The new document O.C. 417 (a) described a condition of affairs similar in all respects to that which the Committee had considered last year, except in one point. Sir Malcolm Delevingne would not say that document 417 (a) was complete, for it was not likely that all the exports from the Persian Gulf were included in it. He had no doubt, however, that it was fairly complete—at any rate, sufficiently so for the purposes of the Committee.

It would be observed that the export of opium from Persia remained in the same position as in the previous year—that was to say, that such export was conducted almost entirely with the Far East. The table before the Committee showed, in fact, only two destinations other than the Far East to which opium from the Persian Gulf had been sent—one a consignment of 30 cases to New York and another of 10 cases to Marseilles.

Some of the consignments sent to the Far East were, on the face of them, legitimate, being destined for Japan and covered by Japanese import certificates; the remainder were all declared for Vladivostok. The total amount of opium mentioned in the table as exported from Bushire during the period June 1st, 1925, to April 30th, 1926, was 6,669 cases, or approximately 477 tons. Of that, 5,784 cases, or approximately 422 tons, had, according to the information which had reached the British Government, been declared for Vladivostok. The Committee would realise the significance of this fact. It was quite familiar with this export of opium to Vladivostok. The situation was, in fact, as serious now as it had been in the previous year.

The Committee adopted last year the following recommendation, which had been unanimously approved by the Assembly and the Council:

“ The Powers whose flag is carried by ships engaged in trade with the Persian Gulf should be recommended to adopt measures to control the conveyance of opium from the Persian Gulf on such ships and to prevent its diversion into the illicit traffic. ”

Since that recommendation had been made, no information had reached Sir Malcolm Delevingne concerning any actual steps taken by Governments to enforce it. The British Government had taken steps before the adoption of this recommendation, and it was partly in view of those steps that the Committee had adopted it.

The result of the steps taken by the British Government would be seen if the Committee examined the question of the flags under which the ships sailed which had carried the opium to the Far East. The only cases in which British ships had engaged in the trade had been those in which the opium had been consigned to Japanese destinations under Japanese import certificates. In all other cases the opium had been conveyed either under the Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese or Norwegian flag. Thus the result of the introduction of the British regulations had been to transfer the traffic from British ships to the ships flying the flags mentioned above. The action of the British Government had therefore had no effect on the reduction of the total amount of the traffic, which had merely been transferred to other channels. The British Government had foreseen such a result, and so had the Committee. It was for that reason that the strong recommendation which he had quoted had been passed. The importance of the point, however, did not seem to have been appreciated by the Governments concerned. As soon as information of the condition of affairs had reached the British Government, it had communicated with the Secretary-General in order that the attention of the Governments concerned might be called to what was happening. The replies received showed that in some cases Governments did not appreciate the gravity of the situation. In other cases, no reply whatever had been received.

He would appeal to the representatives of the countries in question, who were present at the session, to inform the Committee of the intentions of their Governments in this matter. It had now been before them for some considerable time. In the case, for instance, of the Japanese Government, the British Government had communicated with it some time before the adoption of the resolution. So far as he knew, however, nothing had yet been actually done. In the case of the Norwegian Government, the British Government had asked the Secretary-General to bring the cases of the two ships, the *Mowinkel* and the *Prominent*, to the notice of that Government. The Norwegian Government had under consideration a Bill which would go some way towards remedying the situation.

The following details were available regarding the s.s. *Mowinkel*, concerning which the Norwegian Government had conducted an enquiry. It had carried a very large cargo—100 cases destined for Keelung and 813 cases for Vladivostok. Enquiry had shown that the ship had been chartered by a Norwegian owner, through agents, to the firm of Nemazee & Co., whose name was quite familiar to the Committee. The Norwegian Government had forwarded a statement by the master of the ship regarding what had happened to the cargo of opium, the relevant passages of which were as follows:

“ June 25th, 1925: Took in cargo of 400 cases of opium, of which 200 were loose, the rest being baled in packages of 4 cases per package.

- “ June 27th, 1925 : Loaded 10 packages of opium.
- “ July 1st, 1925 : Loaded 84 packages which contained 1 to 4 cases each.
- “ July 4th, 1925 : Loaded 213 packages of opium.
- “ July 5th, 1925 : Cleared from Bushire for Macao. Total cargo : 557 packages of opium, weighing about 100 tons.
- “ August 5th, 1925 : Arrived Macao, where 357 packages of opium were discharged for the Macao Opium Farm Syndicate, Macao.
- “ August 6th, 1925 : Cleared from Macao for Keelung.
- “ August 9th, 1925 : Arrived Keelung, where 200 packages of opium were discharged for Mitsui Busan Kaisha, Keelung.” (The latter consignment was almost certainly covered by an import certificate from the Japanese Government.)

The final entry was : “ August 19th, 1925 : Cleared from Keelung for Surabaya, Java. ”

It will be noted that the information contained in the ship's log did not tally exactly with the information received by the British Government, to the effect that the consignment had been declared for Vladivostok. There was not necessarily any inconsistency between the two, since it might have been declared for Vladivostok and landed at Macao, for, as the Committee was well aware, nearly all consignments for Vladivostok were not intended for that port at all but were intended to be unloaded at some point in the China seas.

The information tended to confirm the extract from the *Official Gazette* of Macao, which he had quoted at a previous meeting.

The evidence showed that the illicit traffic between the Persian Gulf and the Far East was still continuing, and no steps had yet been taken to control the traffic by any Government whose ships were concerned in it.

He did not think that the Committee could do anything more except by giving wide publicity to the facts, which was very valuable, and by repeating once more the recommendation, made the previous year, to the effect that the Council and the Assembly should urge the Governments concerned to take action quickly.

It was to be hoped that the Committee now investigating the position in Persia would achieve a reduction of the opium traffic there. Any results, however, could only be achieved gradually, and, meanwhile, the traffic in the Persian Gulf would continue to flourish unless something was done immediately. Previous experience would not lead the Committee to hope that any early steps would be taken by the Persian Government to bring exports under control on the lines recommended by the Committee. Until the Persian Government established such control, the only other measure to be adopted was to ask the Governments whose ships were engaged in the traffic to take measures to bring it under effective control.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said he would examine the text of the observations of Sir Malcolm Delevingne before presenting his final remarks. He would observe, in regard to the s.s. *Mowinkel*, that document O.C.417 (a) mentioned this vessel as having unloaded at Macao 530 cases of opium. According to another document (O. C. 417), the same vessel had carried 913 cases, and one was led to suppose that 813 of these cases had remained at Macao. There was here a serious divergence, to which he would venture to draw the attention of the Committee. Document O.C.417 stated that the vessel had left with 100 chests of opium the destination of which was said to be Keelung, and 813 chests the destination of which was said to be Vladivostok. According to the *Macao Gazette*, the s.s. *Mowinkel* arrived at Macao on August 5th and left for Keelung on the same day. On August 15th, this vessel was at Keelung and there unloaded 100 chests of opium.

He would first remark that there was no such publication at Macao as the *Macao Gazette*, and he would again repeat that the Committee could not form any opinions based on information in the Press, and that it should only take into consideration official communications from Macao and from the Chinese Customs authorities or from the Hong-Kong Government. It would be seen from document O.C. 417 that the s.s. *Mowinkel*, which arrived on August 5th, left the same day. As no further reference was made to the 813 chests of opium, the reader was led to suppose that these had remained at Macao. According to document O.C. 417 (a), however, only 530 chests had been unloaded at Macao. This discrepancy was of a nature to involve the Government of Macao in a responsibility, if such responsibility existed, greater than the circumstances warranted.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the statement that the s.s. *Mowinkel* had arrived at Macao on August 5th and had left on the same day had been based on information communicated from Hong-Kong. The fact that the log-book of the vessel declared the date of departure to be August 6th was of very small importance. It was admitted that the vessel had arrived on August 5th and left a very short time afterwards.

There was no discrepancy between the number of cases, as M. Ferreira had suggested, for the following reason : according to the *Macao Gazette* or *Macao Bulletin*, whichever was its name, 360 packages of opium had been landed in Macao during August. The log-book of the s.s. *Mowinkel* contained a statement that 357 packages of opium had been landed at Macao on August 5th. There was only, therefore, a difference of three between the figures of the official statement for the whole of the month of August and of the record of a discharge of cargo by one vessel. The official bulletin showed that a very large quantity of opium had been

discharged at Macao in August, and that statement was confirmed by the log-book of the s.s. *Mowinkel*.

The difference between 357 packages and 813 cases, the figure mentioned in document O.C. 417, was partly, if not wholly, explained by the fact that a number of packages contained more than one case. This was shown by the entry in the log-book, which stated that, on June 25th, 200 packages had been received on board, each containing 4 cases, and on July 1st, 84 packages containing from 1 to 4 cases.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that there was an apparent contradiction and that he could not settle the matter until he had received the reply of the Portuguese Government to a request for information which he had sent to it. He would point out that he had laid special emphasis on the date August 5th, for the reason that, had the vessel left Macao on the same day, it would have been quite impossible for it to have discharged so large a number of cases of opium.

The CHAIRMAN said that the statistics before the Committee were very striking, showing as they did an export of 477 tons during a period of about nine months, and an additional export of 1,000 tons over a period which was not clearly stated. In any case, a very great increase in the traffic in opium in the Persian Gulf was to be noticed.

The British Government had taken very strict measures to control this traffic. He had urged the French Government to do the same, although up to the present only 11 out of 1,500 tons had been involved under the French flag. Every country should take strict measures to prevent persons engaged in the contraband trade from transferring their consignments to vessels flying the flag of Governments which had not taken measures of control.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the Japanese Government was well aware of the gravity of the situation. The export of every consignment from Bushire was notified by telegram to the Japanese Government and a close enquiry instituted. He had submitted a report to the Secretariat in which information was to be found concerning Japan, Korea, Formosa and Kwan-tung, as well as information concerning the ships *Shima Maru*, *Kashi Maru*, *Europa Maru* and *Shikita Maru* (document O.C. 417 (b)). Legal obstacles made it difficult to find an adequate solution. Lawyers maintained that, according to present international law, the territorial sovereignty of a State was limited by its frontiers, and that smuggling carried on outside its jurisdiction could not be dealt with by a court whose duty it was to apply only national law.

The Criminal Maritime Code provided for the punishment of a captain found guilty of smuggling either by conniving at it or by carrying it on himself. Apart from that Code, however, according to the present law in Japan, it was not possible to suppress cases of smuggling committed outside Japanese jurisdiction. Further, respect for freedom of contract, which was a fundamental principle of private law, made it difficult to stop or arbitrarily interfere with a freight contract.

He would be very grateful if the members of the Committee could inform him whether there was any law or decree in their own countries giving the Government power to prevent the conclusion of a freight contract. This would be of great assistance to the Japanese Government, which did not feel capable of taking such an immediate decision, though it was ready to respect the principles of international law.

In his personal view, the Committee was faced with a moral problem. At the moment, the codification of law was hardly possible, since the moment had not yet come to adopt international legislation. This, however, in no way diminished the desire of his Government to deal with the matter. The first difficulty that arose was that Japan had not concluded with Persia any trade convention or convention on navigation, or extraterritoriality, and had no diplomatic or consular agents in that country. In those circumstances, it could not adopt measures similar to those which had been adopted by the British Government. It counted, however, on the co-operation of the British authorities in Persia to suppress smuggling, and every time information reached Tokio an enquiry was immediately instituted.

Smuggling carried on under the Japanese flag and by Japanese nationals was relatively easy to control. The case, however, of vessels flying the Japanese flag and chartered by nationals of another country was more complicated. Unfortunately, in those cases the act of smuggling was committed outside Japanese jurisdiction, as the vessel in question did not touch at Japanese ports. It would be of interest to discuss how such contraband should be suppressed by means of close co-operation between the lawyers of all countries, for it should not be forgotten that this question raised important legal issues.

The Japanese Government had already begun to investigate the question, and would be very grateful to the members of the Committee who were able to communicate to it Bills or decrees concerning measures taken to suppress smuggling carried on by their own vessels chartered by foreigners and therefore completely under the control of foreigners. The Japanese Government would also be very grateful if it could be informed of the procedure followed by Governments in cases where they possessed no diplomatic or consular agents in Persia. He was very anxious to obtain help of this nature from his colleagues. Any general resolution adopted by the Committee would not ameliorate the situation much further in the immediate future, but this would not prevent Japan from co-operating in the common work of the League with sincerity and zeal.

Colonel Woods hoped to be in a position to submit at a later meeting certain suggestions from the police point of view regarding the question under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had drawn the attention of the Council to the measures taken by the British Government concerning the Persian Gulf, the principal of which was that the captain of any British vessel leaving the Persian Gulf with a cargo of opium was required, in order to obtain his clearance papers, to make an affidavit giving the true destination of the opium.

In reply to the CHAIRMAN, M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that Japan possessed no consular agent at Bushire.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that he had listened with profound disappointment to the statements made by the Japanese representative. The position of affairs had been well known for a considerable time. The British Government had made friendly representations to the Japanese Government on the matter as far back as September 1924, and had asked it to adopt similar regulations or some other measures of control equivalent to those which the British Government itself was about to enforce. The British Government had supplied, at the request of the Japanese Government, evidence of Japanese vessels engaged in the traffic. No definite reply had as yet been received from the Japanese Government regarding those representations, and nothing appeared to have been done by the Japanese authorities.

He would emphasise the fact that there was nothing criminal in the use of Japanese ships for this traffic. Such ships presumably took the opium on board in the Persian Gulf as ordinary cargo at the request of the exporters and took it to destinations named by them. This was not a criminal act until the Government under whose flag the ship was plying had enacted legislation or taken measures which would make such an act illegal. The Committee, through the League, had asked all Governments whose ships were engaged in the traffic in the Persian Gulf to take measures to ensure that the "Vladivostok" traffic should not continue, that when a ship took on board a cargo of opium in the Persian Gulf the true destination of that cargo should be stated, that measures should be taken to ensure that the cargo in question reached its stated destination, and that opium should not be taken to any destination where its import was prohibited. These appeared to Sir Malcolm Delevingne to be elementary precautions which every Government taking part in the work of the League might be fairly expected and asked to take.

He fully realised the difficulties to which M. Sugimura had alluded. The British Government was no doubt in a better position for regulating the matter because of the presence in Persia of British consuls. He could not believe, however, that the resources of Government were exhausted by the regulations adopted by the British Government nor that it was not possible to adopt other regulations equally efficient. He was much astonished to learn that the Japanese Government was able to exercise no control and had no jurisdiction over Japanese ships after they had left Japanese waters. It could, at any rate, control those ships when in those waters, and such ships could not fly the Japanese flag or be registered in Japan except under Government control.

He had never suggested that the regulations to be adopted should be the same as those adopted by the British Government. Some countries might find this impossible, but he could not believe that it was quite impossible to adopt any regulation at all, and he moved that the Committee draw attention to the question in its report and reaffirm the recommendation it had made in the previous year.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said, with regard to the principle at stake, that there was no divergence of view. All Governments desired to suppress smuggling. It was merely a question of ways and means. He therefore appealed to the members of the Committee, and asked them to help the Japanese Government to draft laws or regulations which would be effective in practice. The co-operation of the Committee would be of great use to Japan, which required information. A mere recommendation was not enough. Japan must be shown how to suppress the traffic.

As regards ships sailing under the Japanese flag, but controlled by a foreigner, and sailing in waters outside Japanese territorial waters, the Japanese Government did not know what really was taking place in those ships. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had been right in stating that, when the vessel returned to Japan, the Japanese Government would be able to punish the captain. In that case, however, the crime had already been committed. What must be found was means to prevent the commission of the crime, for the Japanese Government could not even punish the captain unless it possessed full proof. He asked, therefore, that the Committee should add to the recommendation certain definite ideas and indications regarding the measures which could be taken.

To prevent all misunderstanding, he declared that the Japanese Government was under the necessity of defending its honour and of doing all that was within its power to suppress this traffic, which, incidentally, was of profit only to foreigners. It would be a grave error to think that the Japanese Government would tolerate the commission of crimes outside its jurisdiction. On the contrary, it was very anxious to suppress them, for they were prejudicial not only to Japanese honour but to Japanese interests.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that last year it had adopted a resolution recommending the Council and the Assembly to make urgent representations to the Persian Government regarding the necessity of taking effective measures to suppress the illicit traffic. The exports of opium from Bushire had amounted to 500 tons in ten months, although the annual

world consumption of opium for legitimate purposes was only about 330 tons. The Committee could therefore repeat its recommendations to the Persian Government, which, moreover, had shown a desire to control more energetically the traffic in opium, since it had been instrumental in despatching a mission which was at the moment in Persia.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said it was obviously a matter for great regret that the traffic from the Persian Gulf should continue. The magnitude of the evil was apparent from the papers before the Committee. It threatened to undermine the whole work of the Committee and to render of no effect all Conventions which had been adopted or which might be adopted on the subject.

A remedy must be found. Such a remedy had been suggested the previous year and had been accepted then as generally applicable. It had not been subjected to any critical examination by the Committee, but it had in fact been applied by one Government and, as statistics showed, so far as that Government's nationals were concerned, it had been completely effective. The inference was that it was a remedy which should, unless there were strong national reasons to the contrary, be applied by other Governments whose nationals were concerned in the traffic. It was not the only possible remedy of course; that had never been contended. The Committee would remember that the Indian Government had dealt with its side of the matter in a totally different way by prohibiting all export of Indian opium to Persia. It was for the Governments whose nationals were implicated in this illicit trade to find urgently a remedy which would be capable of application consistently with their national laws.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne had not suggested that the British method should be applied universally. Sir John Campbell shared his surprise at the statement made by M. Sugimura regarding the legal difficulties. He thought it was a well-established principle of international law that a ship flying the flag of any country was regarded as forming a portion of the soil of that country, and as such was subject to its national laws. The national laws could, he thought, be applied as effectively in respect of offences committed on that ship as if they had been committed on the national territory. If that were so, then possibly M. Sugimura's difficulties disappeared. A clear statement made by any of the Governments concerned regarding the policy which they intended to pursue, couched in the form of a penal law, would, he thought, be sufficient to stop the traffic. The Committee should call attention to the considerations put forward by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and point out the immense importance of this question in connection with the illicit trade. It should make the most pressing recommendation that the Governments concerned take the matter into consideration and enact effective laws to prevent the continuance of a traffic which threatened to destroy the work of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that a letter dated October 8th, 1925, had been sent to the Persian Government on the matter.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) desired that no one should have the least suspicion of the Japanese Government's sincerity. That Government sincerely desired to adopt efficient regulations. There was thus no divergence of view regarding the principle at stake. What the Japanese Government wanted was the intelligent and scientific assistance of the Committee. A recommendation was not sufficient. The Committee must place its experience at the disposal of the Japanese Government. He agreed that a vessel flying the Japanese flag was to a certain degree to be considered as part of Japanese territory. The vessel in question was under the command of a captain who held the sovereign power. From the commercial point of view, however, it was the person who had chartered the vessel who commanded it as far as the trade carried on by the vessel was concerned. If the captain committed the offence of smuggling, he would be punished on his return to Japan, but he thought that it would be very difficult to draft a law arbitrarily interfering with the freedom of freight contracts. He wished to know how a Government could control a vessel flying its flag and sailing beyond its territorial waters when that vessel had been chartered by a foreigner.

He in no way desired to excuse the Japanese Government. He wished merely to obtain information and the co-operation of the Committee. As far as Persia was concerned, he thought it would be difficult to ask for effective co-operation from the Persian Government. The Japanese Government would investigate the question with sincerity and earnestly hoped that it would find a solution.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that, if the Japanese Government, after having considered the matter for nearly two years, had been unable to find any way of dealing with the subject, he did not see how M. Sugimura could expect the Committee in the course of a short session to do so. The question was not so difficult to solve as M. Sugimura suggested. If the Japanese shipowner were to be allowed to retain the fullest liberty of chartering his vessel to any person for any purpose whatever, no doubt the question was difficult to solve. That principle, however, would, he thought, be difficult to justify. The responsibility must rest with the Government of the country concerned, which had a knowledge of the law and practice in its own country, and, while the Committee naturally wished to give any assistance it could, and, if asked to do so, would give it, he did not think it quite fair to the Committee or the Governments represented upon it to charge it with the duty of finding a solution. The main responsibility must rest with the Government concerned.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question was of importance : (1) because of the enormous quantity of illicit exports from Bushire, and (2) because the responsibility of the Committee was concerned, in view of the fact that a mission had been sent to Persia. The League of Nations had made this experiment in the hope that a solution would be obtained.

The present problem was the way in which illicit export from Bushire could be stopped. Three authorities were concerned in the question : the Persian Government, the consuls or consular agents, and the captain of the vessel. There were great difficulties in dealing with the captain, as the remarks of M. Sugimura showed. As regards the Persian Government, the Committee had done all that was possible. It could have confidence in that Government and could renew its representations. As regards the consular authorities, there were only six countries possessing consuls or consular agents in Bushire : France, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands and Turkey.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) asked Sir Malcolm Delevingne whether the Japanese Government was the only Government responsible and whether that Government had legal and moral responsibilities in the case.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) replied that the Japanese Government was not the only Government responsible and that it had no legal but moral responsibility.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed that the Japanese Government had a moral responsibility in the matter, and it felt it deeply. It had been seeking for two or three years for means to suppress the traffic, and he urged the Committee not to confine itself to criticism but to co-operate with the Japanese Government. It was clear that the traffic must be suppressed, but it would be a very grave matter to interfere arbitrarily with the freedom to charter a vessel. Administrative measures would have to be taken.

If the Committee thought that it was very difficult to solve the question, the Japanese Government could on its own account draw up effective measures on its own responsibility. Japan would do so, but the Committee should not forget that the fact that foreigners could charter Japanese vessels complicated the situation. Japan, however, was well aware of her responsibility and would do all that she could to put an end to this illicit traffic.

ELEVENTH MEETING

Held on Tuesday, June 1st, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

40. *Illicit Traffic from the Persian Gulf : General Discussion (continuation).*

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) thought it was very difficult to establish effective control of the illicit traffic by means of international regulations. He agreed with what Colonel Woods had said at a previous meeting, that the manufacturing countries should control the factories producing morphine and other dangerous drugs. The world could not consume the quantity of drugs being manufactured but the factories still continued to turn them out in unlimited quantities, competing with one another for the profit which was obtained by their sale. The non-producing countries, including China, thus became the victims of the manufacturing countries. The manufacturing countries should take steps to limit their production in order to stop the illicit traffic at the source.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) pointed out that the drugs referred to by M. Chao-Hsin Chu, though they were subject to illicit use, were nevertheless required for legitimate and medical purposes. Their manufacture, therefore, could not be suppressed. The problem was to avoid allowing these drugs to be abused. The direct limitation of their manufacture appeared, for the moment, to be impracticable. The remedy for the illicit traffic would be found in the Conventions which had been concluded. If these Conventions were strictly applied, the illicit traffic might be overcome.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that the present discussion was entirely irrelevant to the point on the agenda which was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN recognised that there was some foundation for the observations of M. Chao-Hsin Chu, who could not, however, fail to be aware of the difficulties inherent in the strict application of the Hague Convention. The solution of the problem of the Persian Gulf must be sought in another direction.

He would suggest that further representations should be made to the Persian Government. A new resolution might perhaps be presented to the Council.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) doubted whether it was worth while to approach the Persian Government again at that moment. A Commission of the League of Nations was still making enquiries in Persia. Very strong representations had been made to the Persian representative at the last Assembly, which that representative had undertaken to communicate to his Government. Nothing, however, had yet been done, or was likely to be done by the Persian Government pending the completion of the enquiry by the Commission of the League.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the present discussion should lead to some kind of resolution. The attention of the Council might at all events be drawn to the importance of this illicit traffic.

It was agreed that a resolution concerning the illicit traffic in the Persian Gulf should be submitted to the Council.

41. New British Regulations for British Subjects in Persia.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) explained that these regulations (Annex 4) were intended to control British subjects in Persia who engaged in the traffic in opium or other drugs. The necessity for these regulations was brought to the notice of the British Government last year, owing to the activities of Nemazee, who was then making a tour in Persia in connection with his opium business. Nemazee was a British subject, but the British authorities in Teheran had been unable to restrain him in the absence of any regulations for the control of British subjects engaged in the opium traffic in Persia.

At about the same time, an American subject named Tracy Woodward was also engaged in the illicit traffic in Persia. The American Consul had been able to have this man tried and sentenced to imprisonment, acting under the provisions of the American law which applied to American subjects in Persia. The British Government desired to take similar action and had accordingly drafted the regulations contained in the document under discussion.

He had brought these regulations to the notice of the Committee because they might be usefully applied in the case of other than British subjects, and he hoped the Committee would bring them to the notice of the Council and the Assembly, requesting these bodies to urge upon the Governments with extraterritorial rights in Persia the desirability of taking similar steps.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the British regulations were based on the same principles as those contained in Article 29 of the Convention of the Second Opium Conference, and he did not think his Government would have any objection to taking similar measures.

The CHAIRMAN said that he did not think his Government would have any objection to supporting the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that no one could raise any objection of principle to this proposal. He would suggest, however, that a recommendation should be addressed to the States having no diplomatic or consular agents in Persia or having rights of extraterritoriality in that country, as only these States were affected.

The CHAIRMAN agreed. The proposed action was not a direct application of Article 29 but a recommendation based on the spirit of that article.

He would ask Sir Malcolm Delevingne to submit a resolution on the question.

42. Illicit Traffic : The Case of the Hai Tung Pharmacy (Shanghai). (Document O. C. 340, 340 (a) 340 (b).)

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he wished to protest against the distribution of documents from unofficial organisations containing expressions insulting to the Chinese Government. He would, in particular, draw attention to a sentence in paragraph 3 of document O. C. 340 (b) : "The reply of the Ministry of the Interior is very humiliating to us." He did not think the word "humiliating" was properly used.

The Chinese Government had courteously entered into communication with an unofficial organisation concerning the opium question. The reply of the Chinese Government to that organisation, the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking, was made in the name of the Shui Wu Chu, which was the Chinese Maritime Customs Office in Peking. The 100 kilogrammes of morphia and the 100 kilogrammes of heroin mentioned were supplied by Germany, and the Chinese Government had issued the import certificate officially to the Hai Tung Pharmacy. The whole transaction was legitimate and the quantities of the drugs were not large. The statistics submitted by the Secretariat showed that even a small country imported over 100 kilogrammes of morphia and 100 kilogrammes of heroin from the manufacturing countries. He saw no reason at all for the complaint of the Anti-Opium Association. The Association, in the letter of which he complained, stated "the transaction from beginning to end is of such a nature that we out here can only explain it on a basis of financial

considerations", an expression which was again insulting to the Chinese Government. The value of these two consignments taken together was not more than £7,000. Could it be supposed that a Government would enter into a conspiracy for the sake of so small a sum?

He was not satisfied with the procedure of the Secretariat in distributing such documents. The Anti-Opium Association complained that the drugs imported would be sufficient for the legitimate needs of China for one year. The Chinese Customs Office in Peking had stated in its reply to the Association that the drugs were supplied to a number of hospitals and that one hospital in Shanghai had given 14,000 dollars to the Hai Tung Pharmacy to buy morphine and heroin for use over a period of ten years.

He would suggest that, in future, documents of this kind which were sent to the Secretariat should not be distributed to the Members of the League or to the members of the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said he had been consulted by the Secretary of the Committee in regard to the distribution of the letter in question and that he would accept full responsibility for that distribution. A previous letter from the Anti-Opium Association had been distributed, and he had felt that the subsequent correspondence should also be placed before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Association in question was under the patronage of the President of the Republic of China. The Secretary and Chairman of the Committee could hardly suppress a letter coming from a source under such high patronage.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) enquired as to the present position of the Anti-Opium Association.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the letter was dated January 13th, 1926, and contained a list of its patrons, which included the President Li Yuan Hung, W. W. Yen, Sun Pao-Chi, etc.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) asked whether all the persons whose names appeared at the head of the letter were still effectively collaborating in the work of the Association.

The CHAIRMAN said he could not enquire into this subject. It must be supposed that the letter, which was signed by the Secretary-General, Mr. Aspland, was still effectively under the patronage of the persons whose names appeared at the head of the document. It was almost impossible for such a document to be suppressed.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that there were hundreds of organisations in China which put at the head of their correspondence the names of the President of the Republic of China and some members of the Chinese Cabinet. He did not wish to attack the Association, but this was the second time that the Chinese Government had been obliged to complain of its action. Two years ago the Association had sent direct to this Committee a report on the opium enquiry in China. He had been instructed to protest against this procedure, which was not in accordance with the resolution adopted in 1922. He had also protested against an annual pamphlet published by the Association the contents of which were often insulting to the Chinese Government. This, however, was another matter. The Association was free to publish what it pleased provided it was not prohibited from doing so by law. The present letter, however, was on a different footing. The Chinese Government had replied to certain enquiries made by the Association, but the Association, disregarding the courtesy of the Chinese Government, had sent the documents in the case to the Secretary of the Advisory Committee with a letter containing criticisms and insulting remarks. The Chinese Government, when it received his report on the matter, would probably refuse to deal any further with the Association.

He had raised the matter in order that there might be no further distribution of documents which were insulting to his Government. He did not desire to discuss the letter any further.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that China, for special reasons, did not apply the system of import certificates. In order, however, to prevent the import into China of narcotics from Germany, against the will of the Chinese Government, and in order to put the Chinese authorities in a position to control the import of these drugs, the German and Chinese Governments had concluded a special agreement under which Germany would only authorise the export of narcotics to China on production of an import certificate delivered by the Chinese Government. It was understood, in the case under discussion, that the Chinese Government, aware of the responsibility which it had incurred by issuing an import certificate, would endeavour to control the destination and legal use of the narcotics imported from Germany.

The system of import certificates had always been recognised by the League of Nations as the most effective means of controlling the traffic in narcotics. The British Government was also of opinion that this system was the best means of rendering effective the provisions of the Hague Convention. It was understood that the Government of the importing country, in issuing the certificate, made itself responsible for ensuring that the imported drugs would be used only for medical and scientific purposes or some other legal object. The issue of import certificates would be useless and the whole system would collapse if the Government of the exporting country was expected, before delivering an export certificate, to assure itself that the drugs licensed for import into another country under an import certificate, regularly issued, would in fact only be used for the purposes described in the import certificate. The responsibility must lie with the Government granting the import certificate. The submission

of a regularly issued import certificate to a process of verification, particularly a request for information as to the exact use of the quantity authorised, would be an infringement of the sovereignty of the Government granting the certificate.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the observations made by Dr. Anselmino referred to a different question, namely, the responsibility of the German Government in allowing the export of so large a quantity of morphine and heroin to China, and he thought that this matter should be discussed after the Committee had concluded its consideration of the question raised by M. Chao-Hsin Chu.

The Committee had never refused to receive information from responsible persons or bodies such as the International Anti-Opium Association at Peking, which had frequently supplied it with valuable information in the absence of any communication from the Chinese Government and which had thrown light on reports sent to the Committee by the Chinese Government. He would remind the Committee of the valuable report received from the Association in regard to the production of opium in China at the time when the Chinese Government was sending reports which the Committee was unable to accept. He could not agree, therefore, to the suggestion that the Committee should not receive from this body information in regard to such a matter as was now under discussion.

The transaction to which attention had been called by the Association was defended as legitimate, but this could hardly be the conclusion at which the Committee would arrive after reading the papers. The amount of drugs for which a licence had been issued to the so-called pharmacy in Shanghai was as large as the total quantity which could be used by all the hospitals in China in one year. It appeared from the correspondence, on the authority of the Chinese Minister of the Interior, that approximately half of the consignment was destined for three institutions in Shanghai and the Hai Tung Pharmacy, and that the other half was to be divided between the four branches of the Hai Tung Pharmacy. The total consumption of this class of drugs in 119 London hospitals in a single year was 118 pounds of opium, 155 ounces of morphine, 30 ounces of diamorphine and 355 ounces of cocaine. When these figures were compared with the 100 kilogrammes of morphia and 100 kilogrammes of heroin intended for two or three hospitals in Shanghai and one or two so-called pharmacies, it was very difficult to believe that the transaction had a legitimate purpose. It appeared, moreover, that the Hai Tung Pharmacy, six weeks before the date of the letter sent by the Association to the Secretary of the Committee, was nothing but a private house.

The consignment arrived at Shanghai towards the close of 1925, and it was considered to be so extraordinary that the head of the Customs at Shanghai, on his own responsibility, detained it for several months pending communication with Peking. The matter was brought to the notice of the British Government, which instructed the British Minister in Peking to make representations to the Peking authorities. The Chinese Government, however, finally decided to allow the consignment to enter under the conditions which were defined in the letter addressed, on February 1st, by the Department at Peking to the International Anti-Opium Association. It was intended, according to that letter, that the consignment should be released, over a period of time, in limited quantities. The whole consignment, however, had already been released before that letter was written.

It was impossible to avoid the impression that the consignment was intended by the pharmacy for illegitimate purposes, and it was most deplorable that it should have been allowed to receive the drugs. The fact that it had received them pointed to a lack of effective control and made it imperative, in his opinion, for the manufacturing and distributing countries to consider very carefully under what conditions they should allow the export of such large quantities of drugs to China. He had already written to Dr. Anselmino on the subject and the point might be discussed at a later stage.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that the drugs in question were a very small quantity compared with the quantity smuggled into China. The Chinese Government had issued an official certificate and assumed the responsibility for admitting these drugs. That certificate was final and not open to question. For another Government to question it was an infringement of China's sovereignty. Great Britain had issued many import certificates for very large quantities of raw opium in order to manufacture morphine and other dangerous drugs in quantities far exceeding her own medical needs, and the surplus would easily go into the illicit traffic, poisoning the people of the world. He would refer in this connection to the opium war, as a result of which China was compelled to take opium from England.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Chinese delegate to be good enough to restrict the discussion to the point now under consideration.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he was referring to historical facts in reply to the attack which had been made upon his country. He had twice asked the Chairman to warn the British delegate in the course of his speech not to go so far as to insult the Chinese Government. China had suffered very much from a foreign interference which was almost intolerable. Even in regard to a small amount of drugs imported into China, authorised by the Chinese Government and imported from a country with which China had an official agreement for such importation, China was subject to interference which was quite unjustified. He was unaware that the British Minister at Peking had protested against the consignment in question and he would ask by what right this protest had been made.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the British Minister had acted in virtue of the treaty.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had acted upon a misinterpretation of the treaty and that that treaty itself would very shortly cease to exist. China had been able to manage her own affairs for four thousand years and was still able to do so. She had suffered continually from foreign interference and he desired to protest publicly against any infringement of China's sovereignty.

The International Anti-Opium Association at Peking was directed virtually by one man, who had forwarded the letter against which he had protested. This man was an Englishman who had helped to interfere in the domestic affairs of China. Was there any call for surprise that the Chinese people should have an anti-British feeling? He could assure the public and the members of the Committee that foreign interference in Chinese affairs would no longer be tolerated.

43. Illicit Traffic in Opium in Formosa : The Case of Hoshi and Other.

The CHAIRMAN said that the information contained in document O.C. 431 had been communicated by the Japanese delegate.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) enquired whether the Japanese representative could inform the Committee what was the result of Mr. Hoshi's appeal and whether Mr. Hoshi still had a licence for dealing in opium and other drugs. The Hoshi Pharmaceutical Company was one of the most important companies manufacturing and dealing in these drugs in Japan, and it would be interesting to know whether any action had been taken in regard to it.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he had not yet had any information from Tokio on this question. The affair was before the courts and the Government would decide, in regard to the licence, according to the sentence given.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was an ordinary smuggling case, and it was for the Japanese Government to decide whether it should make a special communication to the Committee on the subject.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the point which distinguished this case from an ordinary smuggling case was that the firm in question was the most important drug manufacturer and dealer in Japan.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that he would probably be able to inform the Committee in due course of the result of the case.

44. Illicit Traffic : The Position in Dairen.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to documents O.C. 420 and 437, observed that the new Convention did not require that the bill of lading should show the nature and destination of the goods.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether this was correct. He thought that the name of importer should be mentioned.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it had been agreed at the Second Conference that it was not necessary to indicate on the bills of lading the name of the consignee and the nature of the drug. It was merely necessary that the captain of the ship should be acquainted with the facts. The name and description of the goods must be given on the import certificate but not on the bills of lading.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was a very important point. These documents, as well as the previous documents considered, were interesting from the point of view of police measures and of the difficulties experienced in punishing persons engaged in the traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that his object in communicating document O.C. 420 to the Committee was to inform it in regard to the use by illicit traffickers of Dairen as one of the centres of their trade. The Japanese police had been very energetic and successful in some cases, but had never yet succeeded in discovering the people engaged in the traffic at Dairen. The matter had been the subject of friendly conversations between the British Consul-General at Dairen and the authorities in that place. Perhaps M. Sugimura could give the Committee some further information on the subject.

The British Consul-General at Dairen had made suggestions with the object of enabling the actual consignee to be traced when a consignment arrived to order. The difficulty at present existing was that seizures were made publicly, and the consignee, being warned in time, did not appear. The proceedings ought to be kept secret so that the consignee might come forward and be brought to justice.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he would like to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the zealous and friendly co-operation of the British Consul-General. He had indeed been so zealous in his co-operation with the Japanese authorities that his popularity among his own countrymen had suffered.

The position at Dairen was as follows. Mr. Kaku had come to Dairen immediately after the Opium Conference and conferred with the competent authorities of the Government of Kwang-Tung. He had given a great deal of information to the authorities at Kwang-Tung and continued to advise the Governor, taking into account the suggestions received from the British Consul-General. The authorities at Kwang-Tung had considerably improved their administrative machinery, but no information was as yet available as to the results achieved.

He would refer to his Government the case of Krogh, to which reference was made in document O.C. 437. According to his information, Krogh was in the shipping trade, and, according to the regulations of the Government of Kwang-Tung, only druggists were authorised to import morphine, cocaine and other narcotics. He wondered, therefore, how Krogh could have received permission from the police to import these drugs.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he would like to call the attention of the Committee to the method of smuggling drugs referred to in Section III of the report. It was impossible to discuss the matter in detail because enquiries by the Swiss and German Governments were still proceeding. He thought, however, that special reference should be made to it in the report of the Committee.

He would ask M. Sugimura whether he could give any information as to the nationality and status of the persons referred to in document O.C. 437. Bardens was described as a British subject and so was Broon. He understood, however, that Broon was an alias for Kapustin, who was connected with the firm of the same name in Berlin. What, moreover, was the position of these persons in regard to the local judicial authorities?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the document in question was only a summary of correspondence which had taken place between the chief of police at Dairen and the chief of police of the Government of Kwang-Tung. He would place the correspondence at the disposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

Foreigners inhabiting Kwang-Tung were subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of Kwang-Tung. Those inhabiting the territory belonging to the railways were subject to Japanese jurisdiction on both sides of the railway line as far as Chang-Chung. Outside Chang-Chung, and in particular at Kharbin, Japanese jurisdiction did not extend. The position of Kharbin was particularly complicated for this reason. It was a town on Chinese territory but subject to a Soviet Government. Undoubtedly, however, the Japanese were subject to the Japanese consular jurisdiction at Kharbin, and the British were subject to the British consular jurisdiction. Smugglers, who often had two or three nationalities and who changed them according to necessity, were for practical purposes exempt from any jurisdiction.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the British authorities would enquire into the nationality of Broon, and, if he were a British subject, the necessary measures would be taken.

The CHAIRMAN referred again to the question of consignments to order. The authority to import was given to a person named, but the bills of lading might be made out to order. The question had been thoroughly discussed during the Conference and it had seemed difficult for the bills of lading to be made out to a person named. The Conference had considered that the naming of the person on the import certificate would make it possible to trace the goods.

TWELFTH MEETING

Held on Wednesday, June 2nd, 1926, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian and Chinese delegates) and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

45. Report by the Japanese Ministry for the Interior regarding Seizures and the Punishment of the Illicit Traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the document before the Committee (document O.C. 448) mentioned Rangoon and Calcutta as places into which the illicit import was made. Had those cases been tried in Japanese courts or in the courts of the Government of India? Presumably, if the seizure had been made at Rangoon or Calcutta, the offender had been tried there.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that he would have to refer to Tokio to get definite information. The procedure was probably as follows: The principal offender was punished at Rangoon; but his accomplices were in Japan, and the Japanese Government had been able to lay hands on the accomplices, who had been punished. When an agent smuggled illicit drugs into Rangoon, the Japanese Government considered it its duty to prosecute the accomplices in Japan, for, in actual fact, they were accessories in the act of smuggling which had taken place in Rangoon.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) replied that this case was of great importance, since it illustrated what could be done by co-operation between two Governments. When a seizure was made in any British territory which appeared to affect Japan, information was at once communicated to the Japanese Government. The Indian Government had made many such communications, either directly or through London.

If M. Sugimura's explanation were correct, it showed that by this method not only was the actual smuggler at the port of import detected and punished but also his accomplices at home. He hoped that M. Sugimura would make further enquiries as he himself had suggested.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that a simple comparison between the reports furnished by the Government of India and the new information given by the Government of Japan ought to settle the point definitely. His impression was that supplementary punishments were inflicted in Japan in addition to the punishments inflicted in India.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) explained that, according to Japanese law, the exporter was immediately punished if he exported a consignment of drugs without authority. In the case under examination, however, it seemed that the act had been committed on foreign territory; the Japanese Government had been informed of it and, as a result, the accomplices had been punished. This case was an excellent example of the necessity for close co-operation.

What the Japanese Government principally desired was the speedy exchange of information, otherwise the police were unable to capture the smuggler.

Colonel WOODS asked what was the practice of the Indian Government when sending information of such a character to the Japanese Government. Did it go through diplomatic channels or by direct cable?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) was unable to give details. He thought that in all important cases information had been exchanged by telegram between the police authorities in India and their opposite numbers in Japan.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the Japanese Consul at Calcutta cabled to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Tokio information which had been communicated to him by the Indian authorities. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs sent it to the Ministry for the Interior, whence it eventually reached the authorities (Hyogo Department). This procedure was long and unsatisfactory. Many complications arose if the diplomatic or consular channel were used. Japanese consuls had no direct relations with the police. The present system might be improved.

Colonel Woods thought that there seemed to be a general desire to co-operate among the different Governments regarding the question. It would be far easier to take action if simple police arrangements providing for speed in transferring information could be adopted. This was an important question which the Committee should study.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question had already been examined by the Committee and would be discussed again under Item 8 of the agenda. A list of the authorities authorised to exchange information regarding seizures had been distributed to the Committee. In certain cases, this information was exchanged direct.

The Traffic in Women and Children Committee had organised a service of direct exchange of information. Direct communication had been essential as it was necessary to be able to reach the criminal in time. Decisive results had been achieved by this system and the traffic had completely disappeared in a large number of ports.

Resolutions had already been adopted by the Opium Committee regarding the direct exchange of information, as was shown in the document which had been distributed.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) quoted Article VIII of the Agreement concluded by the First Opium Conference, whereby the contracting Powers undertook to assist one another in their efforts to suppress the illicit traffic by the direct exchange of information and views between the heads of the services concerned, and Article III of the Final Act of the Convention adopted by the second Opium Conference, to the effect that the Conference recommended all States to co-operate as closely as possible with one another in the suppression of the illicit traffic by authorising the competent authorities to communicate directly with the corresponding authorities in other countries.

Direct communication was already established between Batavia and Singapore and also between Batavia and Hong-Kong.

The CHAIRMAN referred to a resolution adopted by the Committee in the previous year in which the Committee recommended that, whenever a case of illicit traffic was discovered or suspected, the Government concerned should take the most energetic measures with a view to following up every clue which might eventually lead to the discovery of the persons engaged in the traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed with the Chairman. The question of the direct exchange of information regarding seizures and persons engaged in the illicit traffic had been studied by the Committee for four or five years, and arrangements had been made for the purpose of facilitating that exchange. What was now wanted was not further action by the Committee but further action by the Governments. In that respect, matters were not yet quite satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that he should prepare a draft resolution on the subject, in which reference should be made to previous resolutions, to the existing Conventions, and to the fact that it was indispensable to improve the system if proper results were to be achieved.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that, by reason of the great area of his country, the number of police authorities was considerable. The Japanese Government was therefore compelled to centralise the authorities in various places. Secondly, there was a language difficulty, for telegrams were often difficult to read when they came from very scattered places. It was for this reason that the Japanese Government had not yet been able to furnish a complete list of the police authorities. Nevertheless, there was a very marked tendency on the part of his Government to adopt measures for the direct exchange of information.

The Committee adopted the Chairman's proposal.

46. Report by the Rotterdam Police on the Operations of the Firms of Buxtorf & Co., of Basle, and A. Broemson, of Hamburg.

In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) and M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that they had no objection to discussing in public the document before the Committee (Annexes 5, 5 a and 5 b).

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the matter referred to in the present document had been completely settled. Broemson was dead. The others accused had been condemned, the licence had been withdrawn from the firm in question and all illicit traffic between Germany and Switzerland had ceased. The system of import and export certificates was now in force between the two countries and had effectively shut the frontier against such traffic.

He desired also to refer to document O.C. 429, Annex 1, in which Mr. Aspland, the author, referred to the seizure of 12 ampoules of morphine of 1 per cent content, a quantity which was quite insufficient for the average morphinomaniac for one day. No suspicion could be cast on the German trade as the result of this seizure. Such an unimportant seizure, however, showed that the contraband trade from Germany to the Far East had completely ceased.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) desired to make certain observations concerning the Swiss firm mentioned in the document before the Committee. In the first place, the document itself had a somewhat special character since it was the report of a police official operating in a country other than his own. The speaker was sure that the Committee would agree with him in thinking that such a procedure was not quite in conformity with international practice, for police officials of one country could not and ought not to operate in another country without the co-operation of the police authorities of that country. He attached little importance to this, although the police official in question had shown much zeal in his investigations in Switzerland, extending them to cover not only traffic between Switzerland and the Netherlands but also, for instance, between Switzerland and the Balkans. He thought it was his duty to refer to this fact because the report in question had been officially submitted to the League, and his silence might be interpreted as indicating that his Government agreed with such a procedure. He hoped that M. van Wettum would not resent his observation and would perhaps consider it suitable to bring it to the knowledge of the Netherlands Government.

The Swiss firm inculpatated was accused of having sent a parcel of chemical products from Basle to Rotterdam, such chemical products containing narcotics among other substances. All this had occurred at a time when, so far as the international narcotic traffic was concerned, Switzerland was bound by no Convention and when no legislation on the subject had been adopted by that country. Thus the firm in question, in exporting the products under the heading "Chemical Products", had been acting in accordance with the provisions of the then existing Swiss Customs legislation and consequently had committed no illegal act. The firm in question had a good reputation.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked M. Dinichert if the Netherlands police official had in fact failed to co-operate with the Swiss police in this matter. Failure on his part to do so would astonish him.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the investigations of the Rotterdam police in Germany seemed to have been perfectly regular. The German police had co-operated, for Germany was interested in the matter of seizures of drugs and had nothing to hide.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) could give no formal reply to M. van Wettum. The document before the Committee had only just reached him, and he had not caused any special enquiries to be made. From the contents of the document, however, it would appear that the Netherlands police official had acted directly and had got into touch with the firm concerned without the assistance of any intermediary.

Further, he could not clearly see how the Swiss police authorities could have aided the Netherlands police official in question, in view of the fact that the latter was enquiring into something which was not then covered by any Swiss legislation, for at that time no legislation concerning the international traffic had been in existence. He would, however, if M. van Wettum desired it, make enquiries with a view to ascertaining whether the Netherlands official concerned had approached the Swiss police.

He would repeat, however, that the circumstances had occurred at a time when legal conditions in Switzerland were different from what they were at the moment and that, in consequence, such circumstances could not recur.

He had only mentioned the matter because, as Swiss representative, he could hardly pass it over in silence. He was ready to make an enquiry and, if it proved necessary, he would hasten to set the matter right before the Committee.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, if the Netherlands police had acted in an irregular manner, an investigation should certainly be made and the fact should be reported through diplomatic channels to the Netherlands Government.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) undertook to make the enquiry desired by M. van Wettum.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought that it would be most unfortunate if any impression was made on the mind of the public that the action taken by the Rotterdam police in this case constituted an undesirable incident. On the contrary, the Committee owed a deep debt of gratitude to the Rotterdam police for the action they had taken, for, had they not taken such action, the Committee would have had practically no information about one of the most serious cases of smuggling which had come to its notice. The action of the Rotterdam police had resulted in a whole series of operations being uncovered and they should be commended and not criticised. There was no reason why the Rotterdam police should not have pursued their investigations in any part of the world.

The present case was one in which a large quantity of dangerous drugs had been sent under a false designation to a Netherlands port, where the drugs had been seized. In Sir Malcolm Delevingne's view, it was the first duty of the Netherlands authorities and the Netherlands police to make the most thorough investigations they could into the matter, and it was most praiseworthy of them to have taken the trouble to send Netherlands police agents to Switzerland in order to follow up every possible clue in their possession. M. Dinichert had, he thought, answered his own objection when he had said that at the time when this question had arisen the Swiss law regarding the traffic in narcotics had not been in existence and that the Swiss authorities had had therefore no power to take any action. Criticism of the action of the Rotterdam police was most uncalled for.

He was surprised to learn from M. Dinichert that the firm of Buxtorf at Basle was one of which the Swiss authorities entertained a good opinion. After reading the reports—and he claimed to be quite neutral, for Great Britain was not in any way concerned—it seemed to him that, had the firm been a British one, the British Government would have regarded it with the greatest possible suspicion. Messrs. Buxtorf & Co. had been engaged not only in exporting drugs from Switzerland but in concealing them. They had taken part in a transaction which they must have known was illegitimate, and after the publication of the facts discovered by the Rotterdam police, on which no doubt had been thrown, it was difficult to understand how Messrs. Buxtorf & Co. could be regarded as a firm to be entrusted with a licence to deal in dangerous drugs.

Document O. C. 360 referred to the free warehouse possessed by this firm at the Federal railway station at Basle. It was in that warehouse that the nefarious operations of unpacking and concealing the dangerous drugs had been carried on. Would M. Dinichert explain to the Committee what was the meaning of the term "free warehouse"? Was it free in the same sense as a "free port"? Was it still in existence and, if so, was it possible for operations of this kind to be carried on inside it and outside the control of the Customs authorities? He did not think this to be the case, because he believed that Swiss law gave the Swiss authorities control in the matter, but he would like a definite assurance.

With regard to the despatch by Messrs. Buxtorf & Co. of goods to a place on the Austro-Swiss frontier, he wished to know on which side of the frontier that place was situated.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) replied that it was on the Swiss side.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) asked Dr. Anselmino whether the firm of Rudolph Oskav Raebel, of Frankfurt-on-Main, was the same as the firm engaged in the Gemma case. If so, did that firm still hold a licence to deal in dangerous drugs?

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that the licences to trade had not yet been withdrawn, but that no further export licences had been granted. The German Government had not the power to withdraw the licences to trade, since such power belonged to the Governments of the countries concerned. In the present case, it had made representations to the Prussian Government, in order that the permit to trade should be withdrawn.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) hoped that the Prussian Government would shortly withdraw that licence. This was the second case in which Raebel had been concerned in illicit drug dealings. The withdrawal of a licence to export was insufficient, because in illicit transactions no application was ever made for an export licence. In such cases the goods were packed up with other goods or sent under a false declaration. As long as the firm in question was allowed to obtain and be in possession of drugs, similar incidents would, he was afraid, occur.

Regarding the relations of Messrs. Merck to this transaction, the report of the Rotterdam police stated that this firm had believed the destination of these goods to be a place in Russia or China. That statement, however, was contradicted by the German report, which declared that Messrs. Merck had sold these goods to Switzerland without any knowledge that they had been intended for the Far East. After what was stated in the German report, he did not think that the Committee could proceed any further.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Netherlands inspector had informed Messrs. Merck at the conclusion of his investigation that he was convinced that the firm in question had not been implicated in any dealings constituting an infraction of the Opium Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that, in view of the whole circumstances, some suspicion might have been entertained by Messrs. Merck, though he was not suggesting that they had been accomplices.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thought that the Committee would do better to confine its investigations to the present and the future rather than to rake up past events. He would emphasise his view that the Committee should no longer deal with such facts, which were over and done with.

The question of the so-called illicit traffic in Switzerland might have aroused great interest and might have been of real importance, and Switzerland, for the past two or three years, had frequently been reproached on the matter. Such reproaches, though partly justified, had been exaggerated. In any case, Switzerland had appreciated them at their proper value, as was clearly and decisively proved by the fact that she had adopted legislation which was comparable with the legislation of any other country on the subject. Consequently, was it logical, now that Switzerland possessed such legislation, always to rake up past history?

He considered it his duty to refuse to discuss questions belonging to the past. Switzerland would be responsible for what happened in the future. The steps she had taken in the past with regard to any particular firm concerned herself alone and her Government would never tolerate any intervention from any other Government regarding it.

With regard to the police incident, he had undertaken, in order to meet M. van Wettum, to institute an additional enquiry. He felt sure that both M. van Wettum and himself would agree that, if a foreign police official had operated in Switzerland without a previous understanding with the police of that country, such a procedure was not quite regular. That was all he had said, and he had never referred to an "unfortunate incident". Sir Malcolm Delevingne apparently thought that foreign police could carry on their investigations in any country without the knowledge of the police of that country. He would suggest that Sir Malcolm Delevingne might ask the British Government's opinion on this point. If he did so, he would see what answer he would receive.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that it was M. Dinichert himself who had discussed past incidents. He had only intervened because he was somewhat apprehensive that an impression might get abroad to the effect that the action of the Rotterdam police was in some way being criticised. He desired to express his appreciation of the value of the work done by the Rotterdam police.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked M. Dinichert whether he had made his accusation against the Netherlands Government, without himself knowing whether it was true or not. It was a very serious accusation and it appeared to have been made without any foundation.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) replied to M. van Wettum as follows:

The following passages in document O.C. 360 would, he thought, meet the point:

"On August 25th, 1925, and the following days, I, the former of the above-named officers, began enquiries at Basle at the firm of Buxtorf & Co. A. G., of that town, as a result of which I obtained the following information:

"On April 27th, 1925, 23 cases of medicines from the firm of Merck at Darmstadt arrived for the firm of Buxtorf & Co. at Basle. These cases were to be held by Buxtorf & Co. at the disposal of the firm of Arwed Broemsen, Monckebergstrasse

5, at Hamburg, which was to wind up the transaction at a later date, and the cases were to be stored in Messrs. Buxtorf's free warehouse at the Federal Railway Station at Basle. Up to June 18th, 1925, the firm of Buxtorf & Co. at Basle received from all parts of Germany and Switzerland and from a large number of chemical factories consignments of chemical products which were to be stored in the same way and in the same free warehouse on behalf of Broensen. I was refused information as to whence Buxtorf had received these products and what was their quantity, on the ground that the enquiry did not relate to a punishable act committed in Switzerland.

"On June 5th, 1925, the director of the firm of Broensen of Hamburg, in company with another person, visited the offices of Messrs. Buxtorf. These two men went themselves to the warehouse, personally repacked the chemical products in other cases and placed new marks on the cases. On June 18th last, for example, on Vierhuff's instructions, Buxtorf sent 34 cases through the forwarding agency of C. H. Natural at Basle to the firm of Hermann en Theilnahmen at Rotterdam, these cases to be consigned in transit to the Holland-Amerika Lijn at Rotterdam on behalf of the firm of Broensen at Hamburg. . .

"The firm of C. H. Natural, as agents of the Holland-Amerika Lijn, had only been instructed to forward them as far as Rotterdam, but the goods were despatched and loaded by Buxtorf. Buxtorf knew that part of the chemical products he had received from Broensen were packed in these cases and hidden under the soap, etc., described as the contents of the cases in the invoices. On July 3rd, 1925, there were still 27 cases of this kind at the warehouse when news was received that the consignment sent through Rotterdam had been seized. At the same time, the firm of Broensen sent word from Hamburg that these 27 cases were to be immediately despatched to the Balkans and Buxtorf sent them on the same day to his agent at Buchs (on the Austro-Swiss frontier). He refused to say to whom and in whose name these cases were to be despatched. The most careful enquiry at Basle failed to disclose whether any person had played a part in sending this consignment. Buxtorf alone had seen it and knew that it had been sent off."

He had concluded that the Netherlands police official had in no way approached the Swiss police since *no* mention of their relations appeared in this report. He had not actually verified his conclusion on the spot, but he was ready to do so, and he would correct his statement if, as the result of an enquiry, he found it to be untrue.

He could not agree with Sir Malcolm Delevingne's contention that he himself had raised the question. The Committee had before it a document forming part of its agenda. In these circumstances, he had been called upon, as Swiss representative, to discuss the matter and to give explanations.

He would reply as follows to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's question regarding the free warehouse. German goods had been sent to a Netherlands port via Switzerland. As a result of this transaction, the goods in question had been warehoused and handled in Switzerland. The firm in question, however, had been perfectly free at that time to carry out such operations, and had been merely bound to conform to the Customs provisions then in force. At that moment, there was no legislation in force concerning the international drug traffic. At the moment, however, there was a provision in Swiss legislation whereby, provided the authority of the Federal Public Health Ministry were obtained, raw opium, but not other narcotics, could be warehoused in a Federal warehouse or free port. The opium so warehoused could not be exported without an export licence.

The CHAIRMAN urged the members of the Committee not to spend too much time on the past, for to do so was to prolong unduly the discussion of the Committee.

47. Illicit Traffic: Smuggling of Drugs at Hamburg.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the case of smuggling mentioned in the document now before the Committee (Annex 6), which had occurred at Hamburg and in which a Swiss manufacturer had been involved, had been very disagreeable for the German Government, since the German authorities had been suspected for a long time of not having fulfilled their obligations. The seizure had shown that the guilty parties had not been German subjects.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether Goldberg was involved in the case contained in the document and in the case mentioned in the Netherlands report (document O. C. 360).

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied in the affirmative.

In reply to a further question from Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire), the CHAIRMAN explained that the French police had no information about Goldberg. He would take the opportunity of thanking Dr. Anselmino for giving information on several occasions to the French Government.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that the document before the Committee had been sent to the League of Nations by the German authorities and also to the Swiss Government through diplomatic channels.

The Swiss Government had set on foot an enquiry, although the affair in question belonged to a period during which no legislation had been in force in Switzerland regarding narcotics. As, however, the affair concerned a firm of a certain importance which was still in business, the Swiss authorities had thought it necessary to make certain enquiries. The report from the German Government stated that the smuggling of narcotic drugs on a large scale had been brought to light by the police authorities at Hamburg. The Swiss Administration had first enquired whether the case had occurred after August 1st, 1925, but had found that this had not been so. It might appear somewhat surprising that the discoveries made by the Hamburg police, which concerned transactions that had taken place about a year and a-half before, had not been forwarded sooner to the League and to the Swiss Government.

The report stated: "The smuggled goods came exclusively from the chemical factory of Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. at Basle and were introduced under a false declaration as harmless chemicals." It was scarcely possible to use the term "smuggled goods" except when the legislation of the country covered the class of operations in question. It was not for an importing country to tell an exporting country what class of goods the former considered to be contraband. What was contraband for one country was not necessarily so for another.

The facts having occurred prior to the adoption of Swiss narcotic legislation, the firm in question had not been guilty of smuggling under Swiss law. It had nevertheless been accused of making a false declaration in describing the goods as harmless chemicals. At that time, Swiss Customs legislation already required that exports should be declared in due and proper form. Narcotics at that time were considered, for the purposes of the Customs, as "vegetable alkaloids". The firm in question had never exported from Switzerland any goods without making such a declaration and, in consequence, its declarations had always been in order so far as Swiss legislation was concerned. No case of the despatch of a consignment of goods had been discovered by the Swiss Administration in which they had not been described by the firm in question as "chemical products" or "vegetable alkaloids".

The goods in question had been stated to be "vegetable alkaloids" and the declaration describing them as "harmless chemical products" could be explained as follows. Railway and steamship companies, more particularly in Germany, required every consignment of chemical products to be accompanied by a statement defining the nature of those products. No German railway or steamship company, except in error, accepted for transport any chemical products which were not accompanied by such a statement, the sole object of which was to guarantee that they were non-inflammable or non-explosive and could not have an injurious effect on other goods in transport. It was for this reason that the words "harmless chemicals" should be introduced into the declaration or other papers accompanying the goods.

Such a phrase was well known and used also in Great Britain and, in fact, in most European countries. The words "harmless chemicals" had never been substituted in Switzerland for the regular Customs declaration, which was "chemical products" or "vegetable alkaloids".

Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. had then been accused of including strange terms in their price lists, such as "yeast", "yiril" and "yamik". It had been possible to prove that these were merely special code words used by this firm for many years and had been included in the printed price lists, which were sent all over the world, for the convenience of its customers and, in particular, those making purchases by telegram. Industrial and commercial firms in nearly every country used conventional terms when dealing with other firms.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) agreed that, as far as the Swiss legislation had been concerned, the consignments in question had been perfectly in order. Their import into Germany, however, had been illegal and was not permitted: the drugs therefore had been regarded as contraband.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) referred to the information in the document to the effect that a certain Chan Sham, described as being of British nationality, had received 21 kilogrammes of diacetylmorphine from the firm of Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. Chan Sham was not known to the British authorities. He would only say that it seemed very unfortunate that a drug of this nature and in such a quantity should have been supplied by a Swiss firm to a British subject, presumably without any enquiry as to whether he was authorised to receive it.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that two points of importance had arisen in the course of the discussion. First, the Committee had a mass of information reflecting most adversely on the firm of Hoffmann, La Roche & Co., and it had communicated this information to the Swiss representative at a previous session. While the actual fact of export by that firm from Switzerland had not been illegal, under Swiss law, at the time the exports had been made, the Committee had good reason to think that this firm was responsible for a large amount of what was regarded, at that time, by other countries as illicit traffic. The matter was of great importance, especially to his own country, for at the moment large quantities of cocaine were finding their way into India. He thought, therefore, that the Committee should ask the representative of the Swiss Government to inform it of the action, if any, which had been taken as a result of the enquiries which he understood had been made by the Swiss Government regarding the operations of the firm in question.

Secondly, M. Dinichert appeared to maintain that the firm, in exporting goods to Germany and declaring them as "harmless chemicals", had acted entirely within its rights. If that were so, such a contention appeared to cut at the root of all the Committee's work.

In the document before the Committee, there was a statement to the effect that the correspondence, signed and emanating from this firm, showed from the outset that it had been intended to conceal these transactions. He could not understand how any person in Switzerland could properly export to Germany, under the declaration "harmless chemicals", chemicals which in German law were not regarded as harmless. It would appear, therefore, that they had, in actual fact, been introduced into Germany under a false declaration.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) asked whether Sir John Campbell was referring to events which had taken place prior to the adoption of legislation in Switzerland on August 1st, 1925, or whether he was referring to the present position of affairs. Sir John Campbell had mentioned exports of cocaine to India. It was possible that consignments of cocaine had reached India from Switzerland, but he defied any member of the Committee to maintain that, from the date on which Switzerland became a party to the Hague Convention and had adopted legislation in conformity with its provisions, she could be accused in any respect of breaking that Convention by conniving at an illicit export of goods.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) explained that he had desired to raise the question of principle. He had understood M. Dinichert to maintain that the declaration "harmless chemicals" made by Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. was perfectly in order.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) repeated that the case in question had taken place prior to August 1st, 1925. The enquiry which had been made had shown quite definitely that the firm of Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. had never exported any consignment of goods which had not been found to be in complete accordance with the Swiss Customs legislation of that period. He repeated his explanations regarding that legislation.

The term "harmless chemicals" had been used merely to guarantee that the goods in question were not dangerous from the point of view of transport. The regulations of the transport companies in nearly all countries contained similar provisions. In France, for example, a similar description was required for such products, indicating not the intrinsic qualities of the goods exported (for example, that they were drugs) but their inoffensive qualities in so far as transport alone was concerned. Goods, therefore, which had been exported under former Swiss legislation had been covered by two declarations, one a Customs declaration and the other a declaration to comply with the transport regulations.

The CHAIRMAN said that the point raised by Sir John Campbell concerned an interesting question of principle which the Committee should discuss. A particular chemical firm might, for instance, set up in a country not a party to the Hague Convention, and in that case what measures should be taken: (a) with regard to the country in question, (b) with regard to the firm?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) took the case of Patagonia as an example. If a merchant in Patagonia sent to a merchant in India a substance which the former declared to be a harmless chemical and which was in fact morphia, he had made a false declaration. The declaration made by the exporter was made primarily with a view to meeting the requirements of the importing country. That was the essential point to which M. Dinichert had, so far, not referred, and it was that consideration that vitiated, in the view of Sir John Campbell, all that M. Dinichert had said regarding the matter. To take what had occurred in the particular case under discussion, where certain goods had been sent by post, the Committee knew quite well that anyone sending a parcel from a post office to a foreign country had to fill in a form in which he stated, for the benefit of the importing country, precisely what his parcel contained. That was the essential point of the declaration; he desired to emphasise the point in order that any misunderstanding which might have arisen as a result of M. Dinichert's contention might be dissipated.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) understood that Messrs. Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. were well acquainted with the provisions of the German law on the matter and that when they had made the declaration "harmless chemicals" they had failed to inform the German authorities of the actual nature of the contents.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thought that he had already sufficiently explained that the declaration "vegetable alkaloids", which Messrs. Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. had made on that occasion, had been entirely in conformity with the Swiss legislation at that period, and that the German Administration knew perfectly well, moreover, what might be included under such a declaration. In making it, the firm in question had in no way intended to deceive the Administration of a foreign country. In the absence of any special law on narcotics at that period, it had been impossible to classify such substances otherwise than by using the term "vegetable alkaloids". He could not understand, therefore, why Sir Malcolm Delevingne and Sir John Campbell should maintain that the declaration "harmless chemicals" had been misleading, when he had already explained that those words were not part of a Customs declaration but part of a declaration made for the benefit of fulfilling the transport regulations in Germany.

He was entirely in agreement with Sir John Campbell and Sir Malcolm Delevingne that it would be very desirable to unify Customs terminology in order to carry on the campaign against the trade in narcotics. This was precisely the object of the Hague Convention and the Convention of 1925.

The Committee should endeavour to realise Switzerland's position before she had ratified the Convention. It had been similar to that of other countries before they had adhered. What, for instance, had been the procedure followed by the British exporters prior to the passing of the Dangerous Drugs Act? They had exported narcotics without taking the precautions and without making the declarations now required by law. Before the ratification of the Hague Convention by the British Government, manufacturers and exporters were left entirely free to do what they liked. The only difference between Great Britain and Switzerland in the matter was that Switzerland had been in this position for several years longer. He was one of those who regretted that circumstances, not altogether under the control of Switzerland, had delayed the introduction of new legislation, but, though Switzerland might be accused in this matter of having got out of bed late, she had at any rate got out of bed on the right side. He hoped, therefore, that the Committee would not to-day still continue to reproach Switzerland with not having become a party to the Hague Convention at the same time as the other States.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the declaration required in Germany by railway and steamship companies was supplementary and explanatory as regards the danger of inflammability, etc., and that it was incorrect to translate "*ungefährliche Drogen*" by the words "harmless chemicals" or "produits inoffensifs" in the sense of "not dangerous drugs" or "non stupéfiants".

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed.

Colonel Woods agreed with M. Dinichert in thinking that it was far more important to look at the future than at the past. Whether an importing country could rely upon a statement made by the exporting country regarding the contents of a package was not a matter of legislation but of international good faith. This point should be made the subject of a resolution in the report of the Committee, so that, in future, it should be made clear that, whatever marks had to be made on a package in order to satisfy transport companies, it should be understood that the declaration intended for the Customs officials of the importing country should not be misleading in its terms but should in good faith give the actual contents of the package.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question of harmless chemicals was now definitely settled. In France, the expression meant that such chemicals were non-explosive and non-corrosive. The question raised by Colonel Woods would be examined at a later meeting. He called upon the Committee to discuss the question of principle raised by Sir John Campbell.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) took the case of Argentine in preference to Patagonia, for Argentine was now in the position which Switzerland had occupied prior to August 1925. Assume that Switzerland refused to admit morphine by post. If an exporter A in Argentine made up a package containing 2 kilogrammes of morphine, complied with the regulations of his own Government when posting it and then, for the benefit of the Swiss import authorities, stated that the package contained evaporated vegetable juices, that would be a false declaration, and incontestably so, because it would obviously be intended to deceive the Swiss authorities. If Switzerland prohibited the import of morphine by post, it was the indisputable duty of exporter A in the Argentine to state that his package contained morphine. The essential point was that the declaration of the exporter was made for the benefit and use of the importing country and was made with reference to its import laws and regulations.

To take another case, America prohibited the import of heroin. In Great Britain, the manufacture and export of heroin were not illegal. If a British subject exporting heroin sent from a post office in Great Britain a package containing 1 kilogramme of heroin to the United States, and made a declaration to the effect that the package contained morphine, or some substance other than heroin, that exporter was making a false declaration. The principle was that it was the duty of the person in the exporting country clearly to state the nature of the goods he desired to send to the importing country and that statement must be made with reference to the import legislation of the importing country.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the matter would be satisfactorily regulated in the future as soon as the Geneva Convention came into operation, because under Chapter V, Article 13, "Control of International Trade", paragraph 4 stated: "A copy of the export authorisation shall accompany the consignment, and the Government issuing the export authorisation shall send a copy to the Government of the importing country." The export authorisation would have to state what the substance was and its amount, and a copy of the authorisation would have to accompany a consignment. In all cases, therefore, where the traffic was legitimate and where no attempt was made to deceive, the authorities at the frontier of export and those at the frontier of import would know the nature of the goods.

The value of the present discussion lay in the light it threw on the character of the transaction in which Messrs. Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. had been engaged. That was a matter upon which each member of the Committee had, no doubt, formed his own conclusions.

In reply to the Chairman, Sir Malcolm Delevingne said that the provisions of Chapter V of the Second Opium Convention applied to all cases of exports from a country which was a party to the Convention, whether the export was consigned to a country which was not a party to the Convention or to a country which was. Article 18 of Chapter V of the Second Opium Convention stated :

“ If any Contracting Party finds it impossible to apply any provision of this chapter to trade with another country by reason of the fact that such country is not a party to the present Convention, such Contracting Party will only be bound to apply the provisions of this chapter so far as the circumstances permit.”

The fact that the country of import was not a party to the Convention did not prevent the country of export demanding compliance with the provisions of Article 13, except the provisions concerning import certificates.

Colonel Woods could not understand how the position would be essentially changed by the provisions in the Convention quoted by Sir Malcolm Delevingne. At the moment, exporters were required to describe accurately any substance they exported to another country. That country should feel that it could rely on the accuracy and adequacy of that description. Sir John Campbell's contention that the exporting country, if it showed good faith, must make its declaration with reference to the laws and requirements of the importing country, in order to give that country a clear understanding of the contents of the package sent, was very sound. He suggested, therefore, that the question should be further elucidated by means of a resolution.

In reply to Sir Malcolm Delevingne, who had pointed out that the declaration required under Article 13 of the Geneva Convention included the actual nature of the drugs despatched, Colonel Woods said that the existing Customs regulations required all that was provided for in Article 13. Under existing laws, persons exporting to another country had to describe the substance of their export and this description was forwarded with the article to the other country. If the description were adequate, then the procedure required under the present regulations accomplished as much as would be accomplished under Article 13 of the Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought that the question of the measures to be taken before the entry into force of the Geneva Convention with regard to the matter raised by Sir John Campbell should be mentioned in the Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that reference should be made in the Committee's report to the discussion which had taken place.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held on Wednesday, June 2nd, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

48. Illicit Traffic : Seizures at Singapore.

The CHAIRMAN asked the members whether they had any observations to make on the documents before the Committee (Annexes 7, 7 a and 7 b).

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the case referred to was a seizure made two years ago in a British colony of a certain quantity of morphine bearing the label of a German manufacturing firm. The German Government ascertained that the manufacturing firm had obtained an export licence to export the morphine to a firm in Bulgaria. The German Government did not feel itself called upon to ascertain from the manufacturing firm the name of the Bulgarian firm, and the British Government had applied to the Government of the Netherlands for further light on the matter, the consignment having been sent from Hamburg to Rotterdam. The Netherlands Government had ascertained that the consignment, instead of being sent to the Bulgarian firm which had ordered it, had been returned to Hamburg, where it had presumably found its way into the illicit traffic.

This was a case in which the illicit traffickers had managed completely to evade the control of the authorities. The person concerned in organising the transaction was Meffert, who had dealings with a Hamburg firm of the name of Albert Panzer, the representative in Hamburg of the manufacturing firm of C. H. Boehringer. This firm had been noticed by the Committee

in connection with previous illicit transactions, but the German Government exculpated the firm in this case from all responsibility, on the ground that the part played by it had come to an end with the despatch of the narcotics to the forwarding agent in Rotterdam. The forwarding agent in Rotterdam was Messrs. Steinman & Co., concerning whom information would be found in document O.C. 351. When the consignment arrived at Rotterdam, Messrs. Steinman & Co. had been asked by C. H. Boehringer to hold it at the order of Meffert. Steinman & Co. had subsequently received instructions from Meffert to hand the goods on to Messrs. Muller & Co., and it was on those instructions that the goods had been sent back to Hamburg.

It seemed a little difficult to distinguish between the responsibility of Meffert and that of Albert Panzer and of the manufacturing firm of which Albert Panzer was the Hamburg representative. He would be glad to have further explanations from Dr. Anselmino.

There appeared to be no explanation of how the consignment had escaped the control of the German authorities at Hamburg. Presumably an import licence from the German Government would have been necessary for the return of the consignment to Hamburg, but it was not stated whether an application was in fact made to the German Government for that licence.

He ventured to think that an examination of these cases and of the reports made on them by the Governments would be of valuable assistance to the Committee in preventing such transactions in the future.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the export from Germany to Rotterdam had been made in 1923, during the period of maximum inflation. The supervision of such exports had greatly improved in Germany since the introduction of the system of import certificates, which did not exist in 1923.

He would point out that the export certificate system could not be very strictly applied to exports to the Netherlands, as the Netherlands had not yet put the system generally into force.

The transaction was therefore quite clear, and the Committee might be well satisfied with the results obtained by the collaboration between the British, German and Netherlands authorities. The only culpable party was the trader Meffert, who was not authorised to engage in the traffic in narcotics in Germany. Meffert was a private trader, and he was not connected with the firm of Boehringer.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) enquired how Albert Panzer, representing the firm of Boehringer, came to have dealings with Meffert, who was not a licensed person.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said it was impossible to punish Boehringer, since Meffert was the only guilty party, in that he had re-exported the drugs without permission. It was owing to the collaboration of the Netherlands authorities that the German Government had been informed of this illicit export, and as a result of this information Meffert had been punished.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) insisted that, under the German law, it was illegal for Meffert to buy these goods and that it was a questionable transaction for C. H. Boehringer's agent to sell drugs to a man who was not entitled to buy them.

49. Illicit Traffic in Shanghai.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that documents O.C. 438 and 404 (Annexes 8 and 8 a) referred to two seizures made recently at Shanghai. There was first a seizure on board the s.s. *Angkor*, concerning which an interesting report had been communicated by the Japanese representative. The consignment consisted of 3,240 ounces of heroin shipped by the Allondon Factory of Geneva under a declaration that it consisted of synthetic perfumes and pharmaceutical products. The seizure was made on February 8th of the present year, so that the drugs were presumably exported since the coming into operation of the Swiss law. The Committee would like to know whether the Swiss Government had any information in regard to it, and in particular whether the Allondon Factory had a licence from the Swiss Government to export the consignment.

The Japanese authorities seemed to have acted very promptly. They had caused the three Japanese concerned in the importation to be arrested and tried, but the penalty, in view of the great importance of the case, appeared to have been very slight, amounting to only one month's imprisonment.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed that the penalty imposed was light, but it was the maximum penalty which could be inflicted by the consular tribunal.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) fully recognised the difficulty to which M. Sugimura referred. It was one which many consular officers had experienced.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) enquired whether the Secretariat had a collection of the regulations applied by foreign consulates in countries where they enjoyed extraterritoriality. It might be well for these regulations to be collected.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the British regulations in China had been communicated to the Secretariat some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN said he would furnish the Committee with the French regulations. The British and Japanese regulations were already filed.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Dutch regulations were also with the Secretariat.

The ACTING SECRETARY pointed out that this question had been dealt with at the Second Opium Conference when the report of the Secretariat had been discussed. It was stated in that report that the Secretariat had got into touch with countries enjoying extra-territoriality in China, and reference was made to the replies received.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Sugimura would find a complete reply to his question in paragraph 3 of that report.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he had seen numerous reports published in the Shanghai papers regarding foreigners engaged in smuggling, who were convicted at the mixed courts or at the consular courts, but he had received no instructions from his Government to collect these reports for the use of the Committee. The Chinese Government intended at some future date to deal with this question fundamentally. The disease must be treated at its source, and in the present case the trouble arose from the disease of extraterritoriality, a question which the Chinese Government intended sooner or later to take up.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) noted that the facts reported in document O. C. 398 (Annex 8 b) were previous to the introduction of the present Swiss legislation, i.e., prior to August 1st, 1925.

He found no particulars in document O. C. 438 concerning the date on which the export from Switzerland had been made. The only date given was that of February 24th, 1926, which related to the information received from the Consul-General of Japan at Shanghai. If information could be obtained concerning the date when the consignment was despatched, showing that this was subsequent to August 1st, 1925, he would undertake an enquiry into the matter. In any case, however, the present document would serve as the basis of an enquiry which he was prepared to set on foot. Pending proof to the contrary, however, he must assume that the export took place before July 31st, 1925, as he could not believe that a factory of this importance would have incurred the risks attaching to such a transaction under the present Swiss law.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the seizure was made on February 8th of this year. He had already communicated the particulars of this seizure to Dr. Carrière. According to the Japanese statement, the information was quite explicit and was based on the bill of lading which was produced by the Japanese prisoners. The bill of lading was issued by the Messageries Maritimes of Geneva. He would add that document O. C. 398, which referred to questionable transactions by the same firm, apparently before the Swiss law came into force, tended to indicate the nature of the business carried on by that firm. It would be found, for example, that when the firm was asked by Messrs. Lassen & Co., of Hamburg, as to the nature of the goods consigned, it informed them that the consignment contained milk sugar with santonin.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that no one could approve of false indications of that character. He noted, however, that it was a question of a declaration made by one firm to another and not to the Swiss Customs authorities.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said he would next refer to the seizure on the s.s. *Bessa* (Annex 8 a). A consignment of 4,410 ounces of morphine was despatched to the Far East under the description of calcium lactate. Perhaps the Netherlands representative could give the Committee some information on the subject.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that this transaction seemed to be very mysterious, and the German Government had not yet any knowledge of the matter. It was stated by Dr. Aspland that the morphine was of German origin, and that he had received an anonymous communication containing a great number of details, which were not, however, given in the letter. He must protest against the letter of Dr. Aspland, which, without any proof, accused the German Government. He proposed that the discussion of the document should be postponed, being convinced that, with the help of the Netherlands authorities, the German authorities would be able to clear up the matter.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands Government was at that moment making an investigation. He was not prepared to discuss the matter now.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion of the question should be postponed till the next session of the Committee.

The Committee agreed.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said he understood that an enquiry would be made by the Swiss Government into the case of the Allondon Factory and that the results would be communicated to the Committee. He would like to know, in this connection, whether the Swiss Government intended to take into consideration all the factors that had appeared in the case. The documents contained information which directly affected the question of the reliance which could be placed on the good faith of one or two of the largest exporters of drugs. Would

the Swiss Government take this information into consideration, irrespective of the question of date?

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said it was not clear at what date the export in question had taken place. If it had taken place after August 1st, 1925, the law would be enforced.

He insisted that events which took place before July 31st, 1925, must be examined in the light of the provisions existing at that time, which, so far as Switzerland was concerned, involved no regulations either of a conventional or legal character. The only thing which the Swiss authorities could ask of the firms engaged in this commerce was that their exports should be made in conformity with the then existing Customs regulations in Switzerland. Facts relating to the period before July 31st, 1925, could only serve as information for the Swiss authorities. This information might be useful, and the Swiss authorities would decide how much of it should be retained. Any judicial action, however, in the absence of laws relating to the subject, was of course excluded.

The facts mentioned, together with others in the possession of the Swiss authorities, had contributed towards convincing those authorities that it was necessary to establish regulations. Interesting evidence existed in regard to particular firms and the Swiss authorities were not indifferent to this evidence, but the position, in the absence of any legal provisions and undertakings, was somewhat special. It was not the Swiss firms but the Swiss authorities who had been responsible for the absence of legislation. Nevertheless, the firms might have suffered from this situation.

Certain countries which delivered export licences had refused to grant them to Swiss houses owing to the absence of legislation. These firms had, therefore, perhaps adopted certain contrivances which from a moral point of view were open to criticism, but which were explained by the conditions then existing. He would emphasise the fact that drugs sent according to methods which were more or less open to criticism might be intended for uses which were perfectly legitimate. It was necessary to look at the matter not only from the point of view of foreign legislation, but to take into consideration the objects for which these products might have been intended. Now, however, that there were laws on the subject, firms which previously could only export drugs with difficulty were now in a position to do so under export licences granted to them by certain foreign countries. This proved that their previous exports could quite well have been intended for legitimate purposes.

All this, however, concerned only the past, to which the Committee could not go back. He would emphasise the fact that all the consequences arising from the position which he had described were present to the minds of the Swiss authorities and he would be happy if the Committee would take note of the fact.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) understood that the Swiss Government, which had all the documents before it, was examining them and was prepared to take such action on them as it considered necessary.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said he would like to add some further observations in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding.

Under the provisions of the Hague Convention and of the Geneva Convention, and under the present Swiss law, any firm engaging in the manufacture or in the import or export of drugs required a Government authorisation. This was a reciprocal guarantee given by the various countries. A Government authorised a particular firm to manufacture or to export a product and assumed, as a consequence of international engagements, responsibilities which were of an international character. The conditions, however, under which the authorisations were given or withheld were a purely national and domestic matter, and in regard to them no foreign intervention in any form could be admitted by Switzerland.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said he must again refer to the letter of Dr. Aspland. The protest of Germany against the accusation contained in this letter was justified. He had examined the labels sent to the Secretariat by Dr. Aspland and found that the official Federal mark showed that the transaction was Swiss. The matter should therefore be examined by the Swiss, Netherlands and Belgian Governments, since the consignment had been sent through Antwerp.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought it would facilitate the enquiries which, he understood from M. Dinichert, the Swiss Government were making or were about to make if the Japanese authorities at Shanghai or Tokio would forward to the Swiss Government, either directly or through the Secretariat, the original bill of lading produced by the Japanese prisoners at Shanghai. This would be a very useful piece of evidence.

His object in starting the discussion was merely to ascertain the nature of the transaction. Possibly the export had been made by the firm in question without the knowledge of the Swiss authorities and the goods had been smuggled out of Switzerland under a false declaration. No question arose affecting the point to which M. Dinichert had just referred. The question was simply whether the transaction was a case of the smuggling of drugs out of Switzerland without the knowledge of the Swiss authorities.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said it was understood that the Swiss Government was very anxious to receive any details and information which might assist it in making an

investigation. It would, in particular, be grateful to the Japanese Government if it would collaborate in the matter.

50. Question of the Publicity of the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether it would not facilitate the further examination of particular cases of illicit traffic if the discussions were held in private.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) and M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) welcomed this suggestion.

After an exchange of views, *it was decided, by four votes to two, that the meeting should be continued in public.*

51. Illicit Traffic : Consignment by the Steamship " Oostkerk ".

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), referring to document O.C. 447, said that the Netherlands police was convinced that this was not a case of contraband. He had asked for information on the subject, but was not yet in a position to make a statement.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that this was another case in which a large consignment of morphine had been sent to the Far East under a false description. The reason given for the false description was that it was necessary to disguise the contents in order to avoid theft during the voyage. It was not clear from the report whether the export made from Rotterdam was under the licence of the Netherlands authorities or whether the firm of Jordan & Berger had declared the real nature of the consignment. If they had failed to declare it, it would be difficult not to conclude that the transaction was clandestine.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he had no information on the subject.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thought it would be necessary to wait two or three days before his own information became available.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether this was a transit operation or not.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the firm of Merck had sent the goods to Jordan & Berger, who had handed them over to Nievel Goudriaan & Co. for despatch. It would not, therefore, seem to be a case of transit. It would certainly be interesting to know whether Jordan & Berger had exported this consignment of morphine under a licence of the Netherlands Government. He assumed that Dr. Anselmino would take up with the firm of Merck the question of the false description of the goods.

The CHAIRMAN said this raised a question of principle. He believed that the new Convention contained no provision in regard to bills of lading. Sometimes the single word " merchandise " was put upon the bills of lading when it was not desired to mention the substance involved. It would not be right, however, to put the name of another substance.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, under the new Convention, there could be no difficulty, as an export licence would accompany the consignment.

The CHAIRMAN said that the bill of lading did not necessarily indicate the goods. It was merely necessary that there should be a number specifying the object sent.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the German shipping companies, particularly in Hamburg, required that, on the bills of lading and the ship's papers, the goods should be clearly described. For this reason, traders sent such goods not through Hamburg but through Rotterdam, with the object, he believed, of diminishing the cost of insurance. There was no official regulation on the subject, but merely an agreement between the shipping companies.

52. Illicit Traffic : Traffic in Indian Opium from Kwang Chow Wan.

The CHAIRMAN asked Sir Malcolm Delevingne whether he knew what quantity of opium was involved in the sale referred to in document O.C. 405 (Annex 9).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the information in the document had been derived from an examination of papers seized by the Hong-Kong authorities in the house of an illicit trafficker. Some indication of the quantities would be found in the fact that in these papers, which covered a period of six months up to the end of 1925, mention was made of the purchase of 17,235 taels of prepared opium for despatch to Seattle in the United States. He had discussed the question raised in the document very fully and frankly, during the First Opium Conference, with the French delegation, which had agreed that a system under which Indian opium could be sold in large quantities to wholesale dealers at Kwang Chow Wan

was undesirable and would be discontinued. He presumed that the French authorities would put an end to this system if they had not already done so.

The CHAIRMAN said he could not give any precise information in regard to this smuggling transaction, which, if exact, would be explained by the fact that hitherto raw opium was put on sale at Kwang Chow Wan. He would point out that only a certain quantity of the opium had been sent to the United States of America. This was clear from the English text, but it might be assumed from the French translation that the amount sent to the United States was considerable.

53. Illicit Traffic : Letter from the Secretary of the International Anti-Opium Association, Peking, concerning Alleged Opium Shops in the French Concession in that City.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not question the gravity of the facts recorded in document O. C. 408. He had last year emphasised the fact that the French authorities were by no means satisfied with the position existing at that moment in the French concession, although they were endeavouring to find a remedy. He would bring the document to the notice of the French authorities at Shanghai and would draw the special attention of the French Consul-General to the facts referred to by the International Anti-Opium Association.

He would inform the Committee of the general measures taken in the French concession in China when the questions affecting China were being discussed.

54. Illicit Traffic : Prospectus of the Shanghai Tat Seng Company.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he had communicated document O.C. 432 to the Committee as one of some interest. He drew the attention of the Chairman to the last paragraph, in which it was stated that the company had found Chinese territory too dangerous and had therefore been compelled to transfer its operations to French territory.

The CHAIRMAN thought that reference was made to the French concession in Shanghai. He thought it unnecessary to assure his colleagues that no French authority took part in operations of this character and that it was useless to lay stress on a document of the kind which had been presented.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he had seen the document and that he had duly noted it.

55. Question of Co-operation between the Union catholique d'études internationales and the Advisory Committee: Reply to the Union.

The ACTING SECRETARY read the draft of a reply to the Union catholique d'études internationales.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Chao-Hsin Chu whether he was satisfied with the terms of this reply.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he had no objection to it, but would once again emphasise the fact that documents which were insulting to a Government should not be distributed.

FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held on Thursday, June 3rd, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

56. Adoption of the Minutes.

The Minutes of the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth meetings were adopted with certain amendments.

With regard to a passage in the Minutes of the fifth meeting in which the Chinese representative had complained of the manner in which certain unofficial documents insulting to the Government of China had been distributed, M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) explained that the distribution of such documents should be left to the tact and judgment of the Secretariat. One document in particular, which had been insulting to his Government, had been distributed. Why, he did not know. The past should be forgotten and precautions taken to prevent any repetition of the mistake. The members of the Committee met in a spirit of co-operation to fight the common enemy, opium. They had no desire to attack each other.

The ACTING SECRETARY pointed out that, in the interests of the Secretariat, it would be better to continue the practice of consulting the Acting Chairman regarding the distribution of documents. If the Secretariat were to suppress any document, it would be taking a very heavy responsibility upon itself.

The CHAIRMAN agreed. He could assure M. Chao-Hsin Chu that no member of the Committee desired the publication of documents which were injurious to a country.

57. Omissions or Delays on the part of Governments to notify Results of Investigations into Cases of Illicit Traffic reported to them.

The Committee decided to discuss this item in a private meeting.

58. Protest from the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs against the Smuggling of Russian Opium into Manchuria.

The Committee decided to discuss this matter when Item 9 (a) of the agenda: "China: (a) The Opium Situation: Consideration of Information available from China", was under consideration.

59. Illicit Traffic: Seizures in the Philippines.

In reply to a question from Sir Malcolm Delevingne as to the seizures in the Philippines, Colonel Woods said that the Government of the United States had recently forwarded to the Netherlands Government at The Hague certain reports of seizures. He was uncertain whether these referred to the Philippines.

The ACTING SECRETARY said that two annual reports and a seizure report had been received from the United States.

It was decided to discuss the question of seizures in the Philippines when the Committee considered the United States reports.

The Committee would also consider at that moment a memorandum from Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

FIFTEENTH MEETING

Held on Thursday, June 3rd, 1926, at 5.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

60. Illicit Traffic: General Situation.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) did not think that the Committee could leave the question of the illicit traffic, which was the most important on its agenda, without considering the general situation. Every member of the Committee was impressed with the gravity of the position. The facts as to seizures made by Governments in individual cases illustrated the activity of the illicit traffickers. The Committee was aware of the worldwide scale on which they continued to carry out their operations, the enormous sums involved and the very large amounts of drugs now being smuggled. It had before it remarkable figures of seizures at Hong-Kong and of seizures by the Chinese maritime Customs. It had also considered striking extracts from the Indian Excise reports, communicated by Sir John Campbell, concerning the spread of the cocaine habit in India. He himself had communicated striking figures about the position in Egypt, where the growth of the drug habit had aroused the attention of the Government and of the public. Information in the Press had recently come to hand regarding large smuggling transactions in Finland and Latvia. The Secretariat was in communication with the authorities in those two countries with regard to the traffic which appeared to be carried on with Russia on a large scale.

Information had also been received from the Canadian Government concerning traffic across the American continent, and the Committee had also received information concerning the South American States.

These facts, numerous though they were, by no means represented anything like the full extent of the traffic. The Committee had always been of opinion that the only method by

which this traffic could finally be brought to an end was by a limitation of the manufacture and by the stricter international control provided for in the Geneva Convention of 1925. Every member hoped that that Convention would very shortly be ratified by the requisite number of Powers and would come into operation so that the Central Board might be constituted, thus making it possible to maintain a much closer supervision over the traffic. For the present, Sir Malcolm Delevingne considered that it was the duty of the manufacturing countries to do more than was being done to ensure that the products of their drug factories did not find their way into illicit traffic. The huge amounts seized showed how vastly the production of those factories was in excess of the world medical requirements. Could not something be done immediately to reduce that production to more moderate limits? The action which, according to information received by the Committee during the present session, was being taken or about to be taken by the Governments of the manufacturing countries represented on the Committee, would do something to effect this, but he thought that it would require very firm action on the part of those Governments if production was really to be reduced to the proper figure.

At the moment, the Committee could do no more than call the attention of the Council and of the Assembly to the facts, and insist once more upon the vital necessity of effecting a reduction of the manufacture of those drugs. The Council and the Assembly should be asked to impress once more on the countries and Governments concerned the importance of making the utmost possible effort to secure that result.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thought that, if the morphine manufacturers formed a syndicate, they could immediately reduce their total production and proceed to a further reduction after having closely examined the situation over a period of years. A morphine trust would not be under the necessity of finding markets for its lessened production, in view of the fact that its total manufacture would just suffice to cover medical and scientific needs.

The reduction of manufacture would inevitably make it possible to close a certain number of factories in each producing country. This would mean a corresponding decrease in the number of persons using or supplying the drug, so that each Government would be able to reduce to a minimum a control which was at present very difficult to exercise.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne had urged that some steps should be taken. In the view of Dr. Anselmino, conventions did not suffice. Something practical must be done. He drew the Committee's attention to document O. C. 446, in which he had explained a method whereby success might be achieved. He hoped that his colleagues would study the document carefully and consider whether it might not be possible to put it into practice.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as a result of the discussion of the question of the illicit traffic, the Committee had obtained much information. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had raised the matter and had supplied the Committee with valuable data. Every member had been struck by the vast size of the figures of the seizures made, from which an idea of the total of the illicit production could be obtained. After interminable discussions and numerous enquiries, the medical needs of the world were now known, and the Committee was aware that about 100 tons of medical opium, 130 tons of morphine, 84 tons of codein and 15 tons of heroin—a total of 329 tons of opium and its derivatives—were necessary. It would be of interest if the Secretariat could furnish the total amount of the number of tons seized. Such a figure was certainly higher than the figure of the medical needs, and to obtain an estimate of the total amount of the illicit traffic it had to be multiplied by ten.

The method proposed by Dr. Anselmino was certainly of great interest and it could be discussed by the Committee either at the present session or later. It might be better to discuss it at another session, in order that all the proper authorities could examine it.

Dr. Anselmino's proposal was of great importance, but there was one serious objection to it. The Committee could not compel all manufacturers to form part of a syndicate. A manufacturer might refuse to do so and might transport his factory into a country where the Hague Convention was not applied. Consequently, the method proposed by Dr. Anselmino, which in itself was perhaps of interest, was obviously not enough. It would not do away with the necessity of urging all countries to apply the new Convention rapidly and vigorously.

Colonel Woods agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne in thinking that the duty of the producing countries was clear. If the supply of drugs could be regulated, the trouble would come to an end. It was with this object in view that he had made his suggestions. As to his suggested Police Conference, the idea was that the men in authority in the actual departments for enforcing the regulations in each country, whether those men were Chiefs of Police or Under-Secretaries, should be brought together in a Conference.

Such a Conference would, he believed, be able to solve such problems as, for instance, the unsatisfactory nature of communications between countries to which reference had been made in the Committee, especially with regard to Great Britain and Japan. The question of communications had been raised continually and the proposed Conference could make effective and rapid the inter-communication of information between Governments. It could, further, make arrangements whereby the names of persons known in a certain country to be engaged in the illicit traffic could be communicated to other countries. In New York, as probably in all great cities, a rogues' gallery existed containing photographs, information, finger-prints, measurements, etc., of persons who had been convicted of crime. An international rogues' gallery of individuals engaged in the illicit traffic in drugs would be a most wholesome thing. If, for instance, every captain of a ship known to have unloaded a shipment of drugs at a

destination other than that indicated in the manifest was known in every country, those captains would become marked men.

He had also suggested that in every manufacturing country there should either be Government ownership or adequate Government control of factories. Until that had been achieved, he thought that an effective plan which could be put in operation would be the bringing together of representatives of all factories manufacturing derivatives of opium or coca leaves. This suggestion was somewhat on the lines of that made by Dr. Anselmino. If these men met, they could be reminded that they were engaged in a legitimate operation, since the drugs they manufactured were indispensable to the world, and that their business was of the greatest value to humanity, with the consequent result that the very value of their business meant that the abuse of it was exceedingly dangerous. They could be asked to consider among themselves the ways and means by which the legitimate purposes of this business could best be served and the illegitimate aspects controlled or prevented. The representatives of those factories, that was to say, the men who carried on their business quite legitimately, would be able to advise the Committee from their own experience as to the best means of serving the legitimate needs of the world and of making it impossible for any manufacturer to allow his products to be used for any purpose which was not medical and legitimate.

His suggestions were therefore: (1) the enforcing officers in all countries should meet together in a Conference; (2) direct governmental ownership or control of the trade should be established; (3) the representatives of the manufacturers of drugs should meet and confer on the best measures to be adopted, in order honestly to limit those drugs to the legitimate purposes of the world.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the suggestions made by Colonel Woods might serve as the basis of resolutions. They could be examined in succession.

With regard to the Conference of Police Authorities, he thought that such a Conference had been held in Washington or New York two years previously and that it was a regular institution. Perhaps the Committee could refer to that Conference the matter with which it was dealing.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked that the proposals of Colonel Woods should be discussed at a later meeting, in order that the members should have an opportunity of studying them. The proposal of Dr. Anselmino and the analogous proposal of Colonel Woods could, for instance, be discussed together. The question raised by Dr. Anselmino was a difficult one and needed reflection. A syndicate of manufacturers was already in existence.

With regard to the summoning of another Conference, this question was so important that it could not be discussed immediately. The Governments would have to consider it, and his own Government might have some objection to make, in view of the fact that it had not as yet adhered to the Second Opium Convention.

The CHAIRMAN reassured M. van Wettum. He had no intention of proposing that the Committee should immediately discuss the question convening a new Opium Conference. He saw no objection, however, to adopting a resolution recommending the next Conference of Police Authorities to place the question of narcotics on its agenda.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) agreed that the Committee could not usefully discuss at the moment Colonel Woods' suggestions. With reference, however, to the Chairman's observations regarding the International Police Conference, he could give the following information.

The very important question of narcotics had been considered by the last International Police Conference and instructions on the subject had been given to the British representative at that Conference. It had not been possible, however, to carry the matter very far at that time and nothing much, he believed, had been achieved as the result of the discussion. A future Conference might achieve greater results, but to enable it to do so it would be necessary to submit suggestions to it regarding the points which needed consideration.

Colonel Woods, however, had not proposed that a purely Police Conference should be held. He had in mind, apparently, a Conference of the central authorities of each country who were charged with the general administration of the laws relating to the control of narcotics. The police naturally played a very important part in the execution of those laws, and on the detective side there was a good deal still to be accomplished in the matter of securing co-operation. Colonel Woods, however, wanted to go further and to propose a Conference of central authorities which should draw up measures of mutual assistance. If this were so, Sir Malcolm Delevingne did not think that the Police Conference to which the Chairman had referred would be adequate. Whether the holding of a Conference on the lines proposed by Colonel Woods was possible was another question. Several countries, for instance, did not possess a central authority in control of narcotics.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. van Wettum in thinking that the matter should be placed on the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) reminded the Committee that the Conventions adopted by the two last Opium Conferences had still to be put into practice. The regulations contained in them were by no means universally enforced. His own country, for instance, had not yet

enforced the system of import and export certificates. To convene a new Conference was therefore useless.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) shared what he thought was the general disinclination of the members to propose convening a new Conference. After all, a police officer was merely an executive officer, instructed to carry out the declared policy of his Government as expressed in laws. The essential point was, therefore, the Government laws on the subject, for the police officer was limited to their application. In his view, the Committee should preferably concentrate on what had already been achieved, rather than seek further opportunities by convening new conferences of the kind suggested. He had frequently pointed out that the existing Hague Convention, which had now been almost universally accepted, contained a definite stipulation that "the Contracting Powers shall enact pharmacy laws or regulations to limit exclusively to medical and legitimate purposes the manufacture, sale and use of morphine, cocaine and their respective salts, unless laws and regulations on the subject are already in existence. They shall co-operate with one another to prevent the use of these drugs for any other purpose".

Later provisions in that Convention might, he was aware, be regarded as attenuating the responsibility of Governments in the matter, but the fact remained that this responsibility had been clearly and definitely stated. He therefore agreed with M. van Wetsum that the most suitable and practically profitable line of advance would be to press for the ratification of the Convention of 1925, which filled in the gaps and omissions of the Hague Convention of 1912. These Conventions provided a watertight system, which merely required to be applied in order to stop the illicit traffic. The Committee must continue to insist on this. It was aware that the total number of drug factories in the world was almost certainly less than fifty. If the Governments which had ratified the Convention of 1912 and agreed to put it into force *did* put it into force, they would immediately have those factories under strict control. In accordance with their existing international obligations, no cocaine, morphine, heroin or other drug could leave these factories except for medical and scientific purposes. The drug problem could be solved whenever the interested Governments wished to solve it.

Colonel Woods had spoken of the possibility of putting all drug factories under the direct control of the Government. He thought that India was the only country in which that ideal had been a practical reality for many years. There was one morphine factory in India; and at no time had there been any suggestion, from any quarter, that a single ounce of morphine manufactured in that factory had found its way into the illicit traffic. If each Government controlled each factory in its territory, similar results could reasonably be anticipated.

The suggestion of Dr. Anselmino was open to criticism. M. Bourgois had indicated one objection, but there were others; and all suggestions of that kind had the vital defect that they were at the best mere possibilities of the future. They could not be immediately introduced or enforced. There existed at present a weapon fully adequate for the purpose. Why should it be discarded or left unused and another and perhaps a less effective sought? If the provisions of the Hague Opium Convention of 1912 and the Geneva Convention of 1925 were put into force, the drug problem would immediately be solved.

Colonel Woods thought the remarks of Sir John Campbell of great interest. They were supplementary to his own. Sir John Campbell had pointed out that, if certain provisions of the Hague Convention were put into force by Governments, the drug problem would be solved. Colonel Woods was trying to point out how those provisions might in fact be put into force. He was trying to translate them into action. Sir John Campbell had indicated the weapon. Colonel Woods was trying to indicate the best way to use it.

The CHAIRMAN was in complete agreement with Sir John Campbell. It was better to concentrate on the enforcement of the existing Conventions rather than to adopt new solutions.

He agreed, however, with Colonel Woods in thinking that there would be no objection to contemplating direct contact between the information services and later, by the stages and with the reserves which he had already mentioned, a Conference of representatives of those services. Nevertheless, the Committee could not discuss the matter at the moment but might be able to take it up at a later date.

SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held on Friday, June 4th, 1926, at 10 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

61. Appointment of a Drafting Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a Sub-Committee should be appointed to draft the text of the resolutions adopted by the Committee during its discussion. The text of the resolutions

would be discussed at the same time as the report. He proposed that Sir Malcolm Delevingne (British Empire), Sir John Campbell (India), M. van Wettum (Netherlands), M. Sugimura (Japan) should form the Sub-Committee.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said he did not wish to be a member of the Sub-Committee.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) presumed that it was understood that any resolution submitted by that Sub-Committee would be discussed by the full Committee before it was finally adopted.

The CHAIRMAN said that all resolutions drafted by the Sub-Committee would be discussed by the full Committee. The Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should, he thought, be members of the Drafting Sub-Committee.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

62. Adoption of the Minutes.

The Minutes of the eleventh meeting were adopted with certain amendments.

63. Action to be taken by the Secretariat with regard to the Distribution of Reports on Seizures and the Question of Forged Labels.

The CHAIRMAN said that the question raised in document O. C. 416 (Annex 10) was that of the distribution of reports accusing firms in certain countries without having first sent the document to those countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it would appear that certain international organisations of smugglers were putting on the market narcotics which were not of German origin but which were fraudulently provided with forged labels, more or less skilfully imitated. This was done in order to cast suspicion on German firms if the goods in question were seized. He quoted the memorandum from his Government in which it was stated :

“ In these circumstances, the German Government considers it regrettable that before a case of smuggling has been thoroughly investigated, the Secretariat of the League of Nations should forward to the States Members of the League and to the parties of the Hague Opium Convention in a circular note a communication from another Government according to which, in the cases in question, narcotics manufactured by German firms have been seized. ”

As the Advisory Committee already knew, the German Government was doing everything it could to prevent the illicit trade in narcotics. Consequently, because of the inconveniences which German firms experienced as the result of these forged labels, the German Government would be glad if, in cases of this kind, it should first of all be allowed to carry out an enquiry into the alleged facts in order to obtain the necessary information. In his view, the Secretariat must use more prudence in distributing communications regarding seizures.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in general, documents were only distributed to the members of the Committee. In this case, however, the document appeared to have been communicated to all the Members of the League.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) asked Dr. Anselmino to explain exactly what procedure he would like the Governments and the Secretariat to follow.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that the Government concerned should be informed of the seizure effected. The seizure should also be brought to the knowledge of all the members of the Committee, but it was not necessary to communicate it to all Governments until proof was established that the Government under suspicion had been shown to be guilty. Cases had occurred in which particulars of seizures had been communicated by the Secretariat to Governments not represented on the Committee, notably with regard to seizures made at Bombay, Calcutta and Singapore. The narcotics in question had borne false labels imitating those of German firms. In actual fact they had come from the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat why particulars of such seizures had been sent to all Governments, although, in general, they were only sent to members of the Advisory Committee and to the Governments concerned.

The ACTING SECRETARY replied that it had been the practice of the Secretariat to distribute all reports of seizures to all Governments.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Secretariat should not distribute a document concerning seizures without possessing proof that the Government accused had actually been guilty.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Secretariat had apparently acted upon a resolution adopted by the Committee to the effect that all important seizures were to be communicated to all Members of the League. If the procedure were to be changed, a new resolution was necessary.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the passage in the memorandum by the German Government, which had just been quoted by Dr. Anselmino. From this it appeared that there had been something more than a mere communication of the seizure in question. Comments had been added. It seemed that the Governments ought to be informed of the facts and of the facts alone.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) did not know what the Chairman meant by comments. As far as the British Government was concerned, only the facts of the seizure were reported to the League.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the solution would be to revise the original resolution adopted by the Committee whereby seizures were to be reported to all Governments.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) thought that, generally speaking, documents affecting any particular Government ought to be dealt with with great prudence. Consequently, he was opposed to the transmission, without comment, of such documents to all Members of the League. The first step to be taken was to communicate these documents to the Governments concerned, in order that they should be allowed an opportunity of making an enquiry, if necessary, and of forwarding explanations. It was only when the results of the enquiry or the opinion of the Governments concerned had been obtained that the question arose whether the documents ought, or could, be forwarded to all Members of the League.

He would make an exception in the case of the Governments represented on the Advisory Committee, in view of the fact that those Governments had been called upon to exercise a special activity in the matter of opium and dangerous drugs. The documents, however, should be considered as confidential by the Governments represented on the Committee until the question had been cleared up. Communications concerning seizures in most, if not in all, cases gave rise to a diplomatic complaint, from the Government which considered itself prejudiced to the Government considered as being more or less responsible, to the effect that a particular Convention had not been properly respected. This diplomatic action would have to be dealt with before any sort of publicity could be given to such documents.

The CHAIRMAN thought that communications concerning seizures should only be sent to the Governments represented on the Advisory Committee and that they should not be published until after enquiry had been made.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) returned to the question of forged labels. The complaint of Dr. Anselmino had been based on the fact that, in the case of many of these seizures, labels found on the packages or tins had borne the name of a German firm. In a number of cases it had been found that the labels were not the authentic labels of the firms, and consequently it was suggested that, if the world at large were informed that tins or packages had been seized bearing those labels an unfair aspersion was cast upon the firm in question.

The great majority of the seizures communicated to the League were those made on British territory by British authorities. Communications had passed between the German and British Governments with regard to this matter. The general practice of the British Government in the matter of seizures was as follows. When a seizure was made on British territory and when the tins, packages or containers bore labels indicating on the face of them that they originated in a particular country, the British administration sent the information in the first instance to the Government of the country concerned for enquiry. The British Government would then wait a reasonable time for an investigation to be made by that Government before any further step was taken.

It was not always possible, however, to follow this procedure, since, in some cases, information obtained in connection with the seizure was of importance to other Governments and might be of general importance in connection with the suppression of the illicit traffic. In those cases, in addition to communicating the information to the Government of the country from which the drugs appeared to have originated, the British Government, if necessary, communicated the information to any other Government apparently concerned or to the Secretariat of the League. This was a practice which was not only reasonable but was obviously incumbent on the British Government, by reason of the provisions of the Hague Convention and the recommendations of the Committee, which the British Government had adopted.

If subsequent enquiries by the Government immediately in question showed that the labels were forged, and if that information were communicated to the British Government, it immediately passed it on to the Secretariat of the League. This had been done, for instance, in the case of certain seizures in Singapore, where labels purporting to come from Messrs. Merck and Co., but which had proved to be forgeries, had been found.

He thought this practice was the proper one. The Government made a seizure. All the relative facts enabling the source of the contraband to be ascertained should be immediately communicated to the interested Government either directly or through the Secretariat. Where possible, an opportunity should be given to the Government of the country from which the drugs appeared to emanate to make investigations before any publicity was given to the facts. For this, however, it was essential that the investigations in question should be made promptly, and in this connection the British Government had not always obtained the results of the investigations very quickly. Promptness in making the investigations and in communicating the results to the Secretariat was very necessary. Such a procedure would, he thought, satisfy the German authorities.

The German memorandum, however, raised the whole question of forged labels. The Committee, which was well aware of this favourite resource of smugglers, had never been able

to ascertain whence those forged labels originated. In 1922 the German authorities had discovered that no less than 1½ million false labels had been printed in Coblenz on the order of a Chinese firm, and that in 1923 a Berlin firm had been found in possession of forged copies of labels of a British manufacturing firm. It did not necessarily follow, because a package was seized in the Far East bearing a label proved to have been forged, that that label had been forged in the Far East. It might easily have been forged in Europe. The smugglers were extremely clever, and this was a very obvious trick to play in order to conceal the origin of their smuggled goods.

The Committee might consider whether anything further could be done to investigate the question of forged labels in order to discover their origin. Quite recently, Sir Malcolm Delevingne had communicated for investigation a number of cases to the Japanese Government through its representative on the Committee. This question was, of course, very difficult to investigate, but he thought such investigation was desirable, and the Committee might consider if there were any steps to be taken in the matter.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that, if it were necessary to communicate particulars of seizures to Governments, it could not be stated that the narcotics seized came from any particular country until that fact was proved. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had referred to the friendly co-operation between Germany and England which had given very good results. He hoped that the reply of the British Government which had not yet been communicated to him on the case in question would satisfy the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN said that this question had already been discussed and settled by the Committee after a very thorough examination. In this connection he would refer to the record of the discussion (document C. 418. M. 184. 1923. XI, Minutes of the Fifth Session, Fifth Meeting, held on May 26th, 1923, page 37). The resolution adopted on that occasion read as follows :

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

The Committee had therefore discussed the conditions under which information regarding seizures could be made public and the responsibility of Governments and of the Secretariat involved in this question. The facts could only be communicated with the assent of the Government concerned.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Secretariat had not acted in conformity with that resolution, for it stated that the Secretariat should be instructed to forward the information “ with the consent of the Government concerned. ” In this case the German Government had not given its consent.

The ACTING SECRETARY thought that the “ Government concerned ” meant the Government which furnished the information. This was clearly shown in the record of the discussion which the Chairman had just quoted.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it was an international practice to allow a Government accused of anything to defend itself.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) agreed with the interpretation given to the resolution by Dr. Anselmino. This was, he thought, proved by the fact that the words “ Government concerned ” were in the singular. To ask for the opinion of the Government concerned was a matter of international courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN thought the difficulty would be easily solved. According to what he himself had said on the occasion to which he had just referred, the Government of the trader inculpated was also an interested party.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) could not agree with the interpretation of the resolution given by Dr. Anselmino, M. Sugimura and the Chairman. Obviously, responsibility for the use made of the facts of a seizure must rest upon the Government making that seizure. Its actions in that respect could not be fettered by the views of other Governments which might appear to be concerned. The interested Government referred to in the resolution of 1923 was the Government which communicated the information.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that it was for the Government which had made the seizure to take all the necessary measures. Generally speaking, it was preferable not to send information regarding seizures to the League. It was not in conformity with the fundamental principles of the League to take any steps on information received from one Government until the facts noted were conclusively proved. It was grave enough for a single Government to accuse any particular country. It would be far graver to place that responsibility on the League.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed with M. Sugimura. It was obvious that, in cases where information sent in by a Government involving the responsibility of another Government

which was a party to the Hague Convention, it was not for the League to make such information public. It was not for the League to publish the accusation of one Government against another Government before the second had been able to enquire into that accusation.

The CHAIRMAN said that the communication of the particular seizure in question by the Secretariat had been made as the result of its interpretation of the words "Government concerned". On the occasion of the adoption of that resolution, M. Brenier had proposed:

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

As far as the Secretariat was concerned, it had acted in conformity with the resolution. The Committee was unanimously agreed that communications of seizures ought to be made to all members of the Committee. Should such communications, however, be made to all Members of the League and also to all States which had signed the Hague Convention?

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) suggested that the practice followed by the British Government met the needs of the case and took full account of the considerations of international courtesy and fairness mentioned by M. Sugimura and M. Dinichert.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China should be included in any matter concerning international courtesy. He agreed with M. Sugimura and M. Dinichert in thinking that the prestige and reputation of a Government should be the first consideration.

Colonel Woods said that there appeared to be an impression that when one Government sent information regarding the seizure of something in the possession of a citizen of another country an accusation was made against the Government of the latter country. The accusation, however, was against the individual law-breaker who happened to be the national of another country, and the country making the seizure would be just as vigorous in proceeding against one of its own citizens as it would be in proceeding against the citizen of another country.

Every country represented on the Committee was unanimous in wishing to stamp out the traffic. Therefore, it seemed obvious that each of those countries would welcome the help which any other country could give it by sending information regarding any act committed by one of its citizens in defiance of the law. This procedure appeared to him to be the exact opposite of the procedure whereby one country criticised or assumed an unfriendly attitude towards another. The situation appeared to be that the nation making the report was acting in the closest co-operation with the other nation by informing it of something which one of its nationals had done about which it knew nothing and thereby making it possible for the other nation to take such action as it deemed best against the person breaking its laws.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that he had only referred to documents accusing Governments. He had added that when, in particular, the Governments concerned were parties to the Hague Convention, any seizure of narcotics coming from a country party to that Convention might involve the Government of that country if it had not strictly and rigorously applied the stipulations of the Hague Convention. To take an example, if narcotics coming from Switzerland were seized, the Swiss Government was concerned, because it was a party to the Convention. To a certain extent it might disengage its responsibility, but it was concerned since, by signing the Hague Convention, it had undertaken to see that only duly authorised consignments of drugs left Switzerland.

When an individual was concerned, it was not necessary to extend the responsibility too far. Nevertheless, the fact remained that, every time narcotics coming from a country which was party to the Hague Convention were seized, that country was concerned, so much so that such seizures gave rise to parallel diplomatic action. To sum up, he was only referring to cases in which the responsibility of Governments was in any way engaged.

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. Anselmino was in full agreement with Sir Malcolm Delevingne with regard to the procedure which had been followed in the case in question. In these circumstances, he hoped that the matter would be regarded as settled, as the discussion had resulted in an agreement between the parties concerned.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked what, as the result of the discussion, would in future be the practice as far as the despatch of information to the League about seizures was concerned. To take the case of the Netherlands Indies, most of the contraband seized belonged to people of Chinese origin. Would the Netherlands Government be unable to give information to the League concerning such contraband until it had asked the Chinese Government for permission to do so?

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that he could only agree with the English text of the resolution and not with the French text, which did not appear to him to be accurate.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the discussion had arisen out of Dr. Anselmino's representation, which had merely concerned cases in which the labels on the seizures

turned out to be forgeries. In this respect, Dr. Anselmino was quite satisfied with the practice followed by the British Government.

The discussion had now taken a more general turn. It appeared that M. Sugimura and other members of the Committee had suggested that, before any particulars could be published by a Government of seizures of contraband, the permission of the other Governments must be obtained. It seemed impossible to apply such a rule. Most Governments published particulars of seizures of contraband in their official statistics as a common practice. The answer, therefore, to M. van Wettum's question was in the negative. A Government making a seizure published it on its own responsibility and according to its own discretion. The Committee was only concerned with the communication by a Government to other Governments Members of the League and to the Secretariat of the particulars of a seizure. The resolution adopted in 1923 had disposed of that question in a manner accepted as satisfactory by all members of the Committee. It would therefore be unfortunate to re-open the question.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) desired to know definitely whether it was intended that particulars of all seizures concerning another country should be communicated to the Government of the country to which the smuggler belonged. If that were so, all countries must be placed on an equal footing. China was deeply interested in the matter, because many Chinese had been reported as smugglers of prepared opium and many smugglers belonging to other countries had been reported as smuggling opium and other dangerous drugs into China. If the Chinese Government were to notify the Governments of all countries to which the smugglers whose goods had been seized belonged, it would expect to receive notification from other countries with regard to Chinese smugglers.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) desired to reply to the question put by M. van Wettum, who had enquired as to the rights of a Government which had made a seizure. In M. Dinichert's view, they were as follows : a Government could do, for itself and under its own responsibility, whatever it liked. He did not think it was the intention of the Committee to draw up rules for the guidance of Governments regarding their direct relations with other Governments.

The whole discussion had turned on the question of the communications to be made to Governments *via* the Secretariat of the League. The position in respect of such communications was best explained by the following example. Supposing the Netherlands Government communicated particulars of a seizure to the Secretariat, what action should the Secretariat take with regard to such a communication ? It was here that the delicate question arose. M. Dinichert maintained that, when that communication engaged the responsibility of other Governments, the organisations of the League must act with prudence. The first step they should take should be to communicate the document to the Governments concerned, that was to say, to any Government which might have an explanation to give. The document might also be communicated confidentially to the Governments represented on the Committee.

The result of these preliminary steps should be to give the Governments concerned an opportunity of replying within a reasonable period of time, either disavowing their responsibility or recognising that a regrettable incident had occurred. When the results of their enquiries had been forwarded to the Secretariat, there would appear to be no objection to publishing the information regarding that particular seizure.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that such a procedure would hamper the work of the Committee. The answers of the Governments concerned might take a long time to reach the Secretariat. Some limit should therefore be fixed ; perhaps a period of six months.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) pointed out that he had expressly said that Governments should be required to furnish a reply within a reasonable period of time.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) fully agreed with M. van Wettum that the answer from the Governments should be given in a reasonable time, due account being taken of the difference in the distance between European countries and countries in other continents. Further, in a country like China a seizure might be made in Kwantung, that was to say in the south, and communicated to Peking in the north, and thus a considerable amount of time would be lost.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the matter could best be settled by private discussion between the members of the Committee. The discussion could be resumed when they had had time to reflect on the matter.

64. General Application of the System of Import Certificates.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to Annex VIII of the Secretariat's Progress Report and to a letter from Dr. Anselmino (Annex II) regarding the difficulties raised by the application of the present import certificate system.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that in Germany there was no difficulty in principle in applying the system, but that difficulties of a practical kind were encountered. The Committee had decided that, in order to make it possible for the authorities to issue export licences, the

import certificate should be presented to them. Several copies of those certificates were therefore necessary. Switzerland and the Philippines had adopted the system.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said he had been instructed by his Government to raise the same question. The point was not without practical importance. The Government of India would like provision to be made for duplicates; the only difficulty seemed to be that the Geneva Convention of 1925 stated very precisely exactly what was to be done with regard to import certificates. It was impossible to modify or make any addition to the Convention; any resolution adopted by the Committee, therefore, should be merely in the form of a communication to Governments calling attention to the fact that this point appeared to be of some practical importance and that it would be for the convenience of exporting countries if duplicates were sent.

Further, the Government of India desired to suggest that Governments sending certificates to an exporting country should authenticate those certificates by stamping them with an official seal. This would give an additional guarantee regarding their authenticity and might prevent or render more difficult attempts at forgery.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Sub-Committee could prepare a recommendation in this sense.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that it had been decided that the import certificate should be kept by the authority of the exporting country granting the export licence. Some countries, however, required the presentation of the original certificate at the Customs office of the country to which the consignment was sent. There were other countries which required the Consul of the importing country residing in the exporting country to give a certified invoice. To obtain such invoice the import certificate had to be shown to him. In both cases a copy of the import certificate was necessary. Only two countries had adopted the system of duplicates—Switzerland and the Philippines.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) saw no difficulty. A country could make as many copies of a certificate as it wished.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that it was purely a question of machinery. His Government thought some recommendation should be adopted to the effect that the certificates on which the exporting country acted should be issued in duplicate. No question of principle was involved.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) did not think that any resolution was necessary.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be sufficient to refer to the matter in the Committee's report.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) suggested that in that case some such phrase as the following might be inserted in the report:

"The Committee decided to take no action in the matter. It would be for individual Governments to make such representations as they might consider desirable to the other Governments concerned."

In reply to M. van Wettum, who had asked whether it was suggested that the Committee should adopt a recommendation in favour of putting an official seal upon import certificates, Sir John Campbell said that that was one method of dealing with the matter. Two Governments, Germany and India, had experienced difficulties which would be removed if two copies of the certificate were supplied. A more fully authenticated certificate would prevent the possibility of forgery or fraud. Such a matter could, he thought, perhaps be settled by direct negotiation between the Governments concerned, or the Committee could adopt a recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN thought that to make a recommendation was useless.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed.

The Committee decided to mention the matter in its report.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Free City of Danzig figured in the list of States given in Annex VIII to the Progress Report by the Secretariat which had accepted the system but had not intimated whether the import certificate system was in force or not. Danzig was applying that system, and if the Secretariat were not aware of this fact it was not the fault of the Free City.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) desired to refer in general to the working of the import certificate system. He thought it desirable to consider the situation regarding countries not enforcing this system and making no provision for the control of exports and imports. The import certificate system was a great step forward, but it had always been recognised that it did not cover all the ground and that very important gaps would still be left in the case of countries which had not adopted the system and still more in the case of countries which exercised no effective control over imports or exports.

The importance of this matter was increasing yearly, as was shown when the cases of illicit traffic were considered. Cases had been laid before the Committee in which large quantities

of drugs or opium had been exported to countries and which were apparently far in excess of their legitimate requirements.

What ought to be the attitude of the manufacturing and distributing countries towards countries exercising no effective control and not putting into effect the import certificate system? He was very glad to learn from M. Dinichert of the action taken by the Swiss Government. M. Dinichert had said explicitly that the Swiss Government, when considering an application for an export licence, required proof, in cases where no import certificate from the Government of the importing country was produced, of the *bona-fide* character of the export, and proof that it was destined for legitimate purposes. This was an admirable system, and one which had been adopted by the British Government, which gave no licence for the export of opium or drugs—except after rigorous scrutiny and for small quantities—to countries which had not adopted the import certificate system or which did not effectively control their exports and imports. The United States Government went even further and required not only to be satisfied that the drugs were needed for legitimate purposes but also that there was an actual shortage of the drugs in question in the country of import.

The only method by which gaps in the import certificate system could be filled up was for the exporting countries to exercise a rigorous scrutiny of every application received by them for permission to export to a country not exercising effective control. If the condition of affairs continued under which large quantities of drugs were sent to countries where no effective control was being exercised, the Committee's work would be very largely nullified.

The Committee had often had occasion to recognise the ability of the illicit traffickers. They knew every trick of the trade and were quite well aware of what went on in the Committee, for they studied its reports with an attention which might well be imitated by some Governments. Traffickers were quite aware of those countries which exercised effective control and of those which did not. They took full advantage of the opportunity offered by the latter. It was the duty of the exporting country to do something. The question had been discussed at length by the Second Opium Conference and Sir Malcolm Delevingne had tried in vain to obtain the insertion of a clause in the Geneva Convention concerning it. The position was a serious one, and he thought the Committee should agree to recommend that the procedure followed by the Swiss and British Governments and, in a more rigorous form, by the Government of the United States should be the common rule of all Governments concerned.

Further, the Committee should not forget the practice adopted by the Indian Government, which recognised that it was under a moral obligation not merely to require the production of an import certificate but also to see that the drugs exported did not go to countries where they were liable to enter illicit channels.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) entirely agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. He had referred at a previous meeting to the practice of the Swiss Government with regard to exports of drugs to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Swiss law required an export licence for consignments destined to all countries, whether those countries possessed a licensing system or not. In the case of countries, which had adopted the import certificate system no difficulty arose. The Swiss authorities hoped that all countries would adopt this system. It was for this reason that he had referred to representations which the Swiss Government had made on the subject to the Chinese Government.

With regard to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, M. Dinichert explained that, since that country was a party to the Hague Convention and since it had concluded an arrangement regarding import certificates with certain other countries, notably Great Britain, the Swiss Government had thought that it would find no difficulty in adopting one day the complete import certificate system. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had adopted another system which might be considered as a substitute for the import certificate system.

Switzerland, however, might find herself called upon to export a consignment of drugs to a country which was a party to the Hague Convention and which had not adopted an import certificate system. Switzerland had no power to bring any pressure to bear on that country with a view to causing it to change its legislation. In that case, M. Dinichert stated that the Swiss office issuing export licences would not issue a licence unless it received indications from which it might be assumed that the consignment concerned was destined for medical uses. The present period was a period of transition. The sole desire of Switzerland was that the import certificate system should be introduced progressively into all other countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Germany applied the system of import and export certificates on a basis of reciprocity. She applied it, on this basis, to China and Egypt, and was at the moment negotiating with Esthonia. The procedure followed in Germany was similar to that adopted in Great Britain with regard to the supervision of exports to countries which had not adopted the import certificate system. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had recalled a discussion which had taken place in the First Opium Conference concerning the question of the transit of opium for smoking. This question had been settled by the Agreement adopted by the First Opium Conference on February 11th, 1925. By the terms of that Agreement, the "transit through, or transshipment in, any possession or territory, into which opium is imported for the purpose of smoking, of raw opium consigned to a destination outside the possession or territory shall be prohibited, unless an import certificate, issued by the Government of the importing country, which can be accepted as affording sufficient guarantees against the possibility of illegitimate use, is produced to the Government of the possession or territory".

In Article 13 of the Convention of February 1925, adopted by the Second Conference, no stipulation of this kind concerning import certificates had been inserted. It had merely been stipulated that these certificates should be drawn up, so far as possible, according to a model stating in the case of opium and coca leaves that they were for legitimate purposes and as regards other narcotics that they were "solely for medical and scientific purposes".

He quite understood Sir Malcolm Delevingne's intention, but he could not agree with it. He could not imagine that the German Government would be prepared to discriminate between certificates coming from the various countries. If a Government issued an import certificate, it was for that Government to take responsibility for that certificate, and the matter did not in the least concern other countries, which could not interfere with the internal arrangements of any State. If it were found that any excess of imported drugs were exported or passed as contraband into another country, measures would have to be taken. This, however, was another matter. An official authority, however, could not refuse a licence to export on the receipt of an official import certificate. A refusal to grant this licence could only be made by a central arbitral committee or by the Governing Body of a private syndicate under Government supervision.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) asked what action the German Government would take if it received an import certificate from the Government of "Patagonia" for a consignment of 1,000 kilogrammes of heroin.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) replied that, as far as Patagonia was concerned, he did not think that such a case would ever arise.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that such cases did arise.

The remainder of the discussion was postponed till the next meeting.

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held on Friday, June 4th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

65. General Application of the System of Import Certificates (*continuation*).

The CHAIRMAN thought that the observation of Sir John Campbell at the preceding meeting regarding the Hague Convention of 1912 and the Geneva Convention of 1925 should be applied to the present discussion. Sir John Campbell had said that the Committee should confine itself to obtaining the speedy ratification and application of both Conventions since in themselves they constituted a complete guarantee and, if strictly applied, would render any further steps quite unnecessary.

He fully agreed with this view and would point out that of the fifty-four countries Members of the League a very large number had ratified one or other of the Conventions, and that, while the Committee could recommend the taking of provisional measures to cover the period before the Convention of 1925 was generally applied, it would be too much to urge the adoption of measures not provided for in either Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said, with regard to the question of the import certificate, that the problem was twofold. There was first the question of exporting to countries not exercising any effective control over imports and exports, and there was secondly the question of exporting to countries where the import certificate given might not appear to provide sufficient guarantees.

Colonel Woods had been particularly struck by what appeared to him to be the extraordinarily contradictory position with regard to the whole question of the manufacture and distribution of drugs. On the one hand, practically every nation agreed that such manufacture and distribution should be limited to the medical needs of the world. On the other hand, nearly every nation complained of an increase in smuggling. The Eastern countries viewed with alarm the prospect of the substitution of drugs for smoking opium. India reported an alarming increase in the seizures of drugs. The Chinese representative had said that in two years 30,000 ounces of morphine had been seized in China, which was more than equal to one year's consumption in Great Britain.

The Far Eastern countries and the other consuming countries had a right to ask for protection from the producing or manufacturing countries. It was entirely within the power of every Government to prevent its manufactured drugs from being smuggled into other countries. If factories were properly controlled, the regulation of the production of the manufactured drugs was easy. The moment the drugs passed into the hands of the trade regulation became

difficult, for they were small articles and easily smuggled. In the United States of America and, he thought, in Great Britain, the export of drugs had almost ceased, owing to the very rigorous provisions adopted. The regulations adopted in Switzerland would shortly have the same effect. Most countries, indeed, had effective laws or were gradually adopting them, but, to take the example of Patagonia, if drugs from that country were found in another country, it seemed to Colonel Woods to be impossible for the Committee not to take the view that Patagonia was responsible.

If the distribution and export of drugs could be limited by the manufacturing country, he thought that ultimately the production of the raw material would be brought under control. In the first place, the demand would be reduced by the restriction of manufacture and, in the second place, the raw material was bulky. It was impossible to conceal, for instance, a ton of coca leaves in a piano leg, and the illicit trade in the raw material could therefore be comparatively easily controlled by ordinary police measures. No country knowingly permitted the export of microbes of typhoid fever or similar contagious diseases, but the effects of morphine and cocaine were far more dangerous to a community than those of typhoid fever, and it was easier to make sure that there would be no export of morphine and cocaine than it was to make sure that no typhoid fever case should go from one country to another. The responsibility was clearly on the manufacturing countries. It was a practical and not a theoretical matter. It was well known that measures which would prevent export could be adopted by any Government that wished to do so.

Much benefit had unquestionably resulted from the Hague Convention and the two Geneva Conventions of 1925 and many countries had passed model laws on the subject. In the police experience of Colonel Woods, however, no law ever enforced itself, and the Committee could not expect with serenity and confidence that a difficult duty would perform itself simply because agreements had been signed or laws passed. A manufacturing country could feel that it had done all that was possible only if it were able rigorously to control all export.

He was well aware that in this he was merely voicing the considered beliefs of the Committee. There was perhaps a danger, however, that too much attention might be paid to the ways of doing things and too little to the imperative necessity of obtaining results, no matter what the method. The work of the Committee might be more effective if it laid particular emphasis on this point and constantly referred to the responsibility on every country to keep its manufactured drugs from leaving its territory except for medical purposes. It was the responsibility of the manufacturing country towards the consuming country which was the main point. He did not know what practical means the Committee would adopt. Its experience was greater than his own, but he thought that it might be wise at least for the Committee to go so far as officially to recognise the several responsibilities of the different manufacturing States when they permitted their products to go beyond their own borders.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) regretted that Colonel Woods had raised this point. The Committee would remember the great difficulties which had been encountered in the Second Opium Conference in reaching any conclusion upon it. He fully agreed with the Chairman that the Committee should not try at the moment to go further than the stipulations of the Convention of 1925, which, up to the present, had only been ratified by a few countries.

With regard to the first point raised by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, to the effect that measures must be taken to deal with countries which had not adopted any form of control of imports or exports, he would refer the Committee to Article 18 of the Second Convention, which read, as follows :

“ If any of the Contracting Parties finds it impossible to apply any provisions of this chapter to trade with another country by reason of the fact that such country is not a party to the present Convention, such Contracting Party will only be bound to apply the provisions of this chapter so far as the circumstances permit. ”

Thus each country had to take its own measures. For instance, in the past, when the Netherlands had dealt with the question of the transshipment of drugs consigned to Vladivostok, it had solved the problem by asking for a certificate from Vladivostok. The Committee was well aware of the good results which had been achieved by such action. Moreover, when in future the Central Board made a recommendation, it was left to the countries concerned to put that recommendation into practice in the way they thought best. Article 24 was clear on this point :

“ If it (the exporting country) does not do so, it shall immediately inform the Board that it is not prepared to act on the recommendation, explaining, if possible, why it is not prepared to do so. ”

In passing, he would remind the Committee of the great stress laid by him during the Conference on the words “ if possible ”, owing to the difficulty of making any discrimination between two countries if they both furnished import certificates.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) congratulated Colonel Woods on his statement of the position. The Committee should certainly consider Colonel Woods' suggestion to the effect

that the manufacture of dangerous drugs must be controlled. It was waste of time and energy to try to remedy the situation when the manufacture of drugs was in excess of legitimate requirements. The question must be dealt with from fundamental sources. An appeal must be made to the manufacturing countries and the opium-producing countries not to produce manufactured drugs or opium in excess of legitimate requirements. He would admit that, in respect of the latter, China was equally worthy of blame.

It was very easy for manufacturing countries to control the opium within their borders. They could pass laws and decrees forbidding the issue of licences to manufacturers. The matter was then closed, but, whatever measures were taken, the essential point was to put an end to excessive manufacture and production. An effective organised Government, that was to say, a Government different from the one at present in power in the unfortunate country which he was representing (which, at the moment, did not possess complete control), could certainly stop over-production. Why did countries possessing such a Government not do so? The peoples of the Far East had, as Colonel Woods had pointed out, a perfect right to raise the question, because they were suffering from the effects of this production.

In general, China had no desire to interfere with anyone else provided that she were left alone. But China would appeal to the countries concerned to do something to diminish over-production, without which there could be no smuggling. He would give an instance. He hoped that he would not be misunderstood. Supposing a country possessed a factory manufacturing gems for export to various parts of the world and supposing that the Government had adopted an import and export certificate system covering those gems, such a system might prove ineffective in certain cases owing to the difference in value between the certificates furnished by the various Governments. That being so, the country manufacturing the gems could not merely wash its hands of the matter. It must reduce its production if anything were to be achieved. An ancient Chinese philosopher, Lou TZE, had said: "Do nothing and the world will be well governed." That doctrine was not sound when applied to administrative purposes but could be effective if applied in this case. Trouble was being made if a large quantity of raw opium were produced by the opium-growing countries and if it were imported into the different manufacturing countries. The Committee should therefore first ask the opium-producing countries to stop production. If, for instance, China did not stop production, then China should be blamed. An appeal must equally be made to the manufacturing countries to stop manufacture.

There were certain countries, such as Turkey or Persia, which were not putting into practice the provisions of the Hague Convention. If those countries produced raw opium in unlimited quantities, they did so because they could find a market for it. If manufacturing countries refused to buy the opium produced in Turkey, Persia, India or China, those markets would disappear and, in consequence, the latter countries would reduce or put an end to their production. The amount of opium required for legitimate purposes was limited. The Committee was trying to obtain the introduction in all countries of measures for solving the narcotics problem, but in reality the recommendations were having the opposite effect. He was glad that the Government of the United States had stopped the export of drugs and only manufactured an amount just sufficient for its own use. If every country had followed such a procedure, the countries of the East would not suffer from this evil and all police measures against smugglers would be rendered unnecessary. No production and no distribution meant no smuggling.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) had understood Sir Malcolm Delevingne's statement at the preceding meeting to be in the nature of an appeal, based upon the colossal magnitude, as evidenced by the statistics before the Committee, of the illicit traffic and on the great harm that that traffic was undoubtedly causing. During the discussion, M. van Wettum and Dr. Anselmino had raised the point that it was impossible to discriminate between the import certificates given by the various Governments. He was unable to share that view; it was contrary to the expressed opinion of his Government, as members who had attended the First Opium Conference at Geneva would remember. The Government of India had on that occasion taken the view that each Government had an indisputable right to question the import certificate of any Government if it were satisfied, on evidence which it considered sufficient, that the product exported to the country in question was finding its way into the illicit traffic. That contention had been supported by quoting the preamble to the Hague Convention, under which each of the signatory Governments had expressed its definite determination to limit abuses as far as lay in its power. The argument had been that not only had Governments a right to do this but that they were bound to do so, and to use all legitimate and practical measures in order to achieve that end. In pursuance of that policy, the Government of India had always claimed the right to question import certificates, when it was satisfied that such a procedure was necessary in order to ensure that no narcotic product exported from India should find its way into the illicit traffic.

He did not, however, desire to raise the legal question of the correct interpretation of the Hague Convention, but preferred to associate himself with the appeal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne who had asked Governments to adopt two measures which would have an immediate practical effect in reducing the volume of the illicit traffic. India was one of the countries which now suffered severely from the influx of illicit drugs, and he urged the members of the Committee to make representations to their Governments designed to secure the acceptance of Sir Malcolm Delevingne's proposals.

The CHAIRMAN said that he did not question the right of Governments to discriminate between import certificates. He only questioned whether it was opportune to ask them to do so.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that China agreed that the best method of stopping smuggling was the adoption of the export and import certificate system. Two years previously China had opposed its adoption owing to the fact that there were treaties in existence binding her hands. The matter had been referred by the Chinese Government to the Diplomatic Corps at Peking, but no communication had yet been received from that body. If, however, all Governments were of opinion that the import and export certificate system constituted an adequate method for stopping smuggling, why was China not allowed to put that system into force?

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that, in his view, the two proposals made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne were essentially different. When, in accordance with a Convention, a country furnished an import certificate, the exporting country must consider that certificate to be valid and legitimate, unless it was prepared to maintain that the importing country was violating its international engagements. No licit import certificate existed without the corresponding undertaking on the part of the Government delivering it that it was destined to cover a legitimate consignment of drugs. Governments could therefore always contest the validity of an import certificate if they were prepared to accuse the country furnishing it of having violated its international engagements, but M. Dinichert could not agree to any recommendation on the part of the Committee recognising that possibility. If certain Governments thought they had the right to do so, they should do so on their own responsibility and not on the recommendation of the Committee.

On the other hand, he agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne's second proposal. When a country, which had adopted no undertaking and which did not enforce any import certificate system, desired to import a consignment of drugs from an exporting country, the exporting country was quite within its rights in seeking to ascertain whether the export would be legitimate or not. A recommendation to that effect could therefore be made. The Committee might even go so far as to say that in this case the exporting country was justified in conducting an enquiry and even that it was, so to speak, under a contractual obligation to do so, for, by the terms of the Hague Convention and the Convention of Geneva, the signatory States had undertaken to co-operate in the limitation of the production and of the trade in narcotic products not destined for medical uses.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Dinichert should draft a resolution concerning the import and export certificate system, taking into account the discussion which had taken place.

The proposal of Colonel Woods regarding the control of manufacture and the proposal of M. Chao-Hsin Chu concerning the limitation of production could be discussed under the item "Other business".

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) understood that, in M. Dinichert's view, it was the duty of the exporting country, when dealing with a country which had not adopted the import certificate system, to make sure that the narcotics exported would not pass into the illicit traffic.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that M. van Wettum should assist Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Dinichert in drafting the resolution.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) felt obliged to decline to be a member of the Sub-Committee. As he had explained here and at the Second Opium Conference, it was impossible for any measure such as that proposed by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Dinichert to be adopted. He could not combine the provisions of Article 18 with M. Dinichert's observations, and he would be glad if the position could be clarified.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed with M. van Wettum in thinking that the obligation imposed on States by Article 18 was only conditional, for that article stated "so far as the circumstances permit". When an exporting country was furnished with an import certificate from an importing country, that certificate should not be called in question. But when it received a request to export a consignment of narcotics without a guarantee furnished by the importing country, then it had the moral duty of ascertaining, so far as circumstances permitted, whether the export of that consignment would really meet a legitimate need in the importing country. Such cases very rarely occurred. If, for instance, a country received a request to export 10,000 kilogrammes of morphine, it would appear, on the face of it, that such a request was out of proportion to the legitimate needs of the country making it. While it was impossible, in such a case, to make an enquiry in the importing country, the Government furnishing the export licence could not do so blindly. It must examine the request with the object of ascertaining whether the export would not be used for illegitimate purposes. There was a moral obligation imposed on States by the Convention, which stipulated that countries must co-operate.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, as the Conventions had not been applied, countries refused to co-operate. In that case, how could such co-operation be achieved?

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) agreed that, as long as the Conventions were not in force, Governments did not possess the moral obligation to which he had referred. He had not meant, however, to maintain that the Committee could not make a recommendation to Governments with a view to anticipating the application of the principles contained in a Convention not yet in

force. Many years ago, recommendations had been made concerning import certificates, and for many years the system had been in force in some countries without the adoption of any international convention. Governments might therefore be induced by a recommendation to apply certain principles immediately. He could not understand M. van Wettum's contention that, as long as a Convention was not in force, the Committee could make no recommendation on the subject to the Governments.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the question was of great importance. The Netherlands had already adhered to the Second Geneva Convention, and, when she ratified it, she would be under the obligation of putting into force the provisions of Article 18. M. Dinichert, however, desired the Committee to make an immediate recommendation with reference to that article. In his opinion, the Netherlands Government could not consent to this.

With regard to Colonel Woods' proposal, if it amounted to the rationing of manufactures, he could not discuss it at the present session, for it had not been placed on the agenda.

By the terms of Article 18 which he had already quoted, every Government had been left free to do what it thought right in the fulfilment of its moral obligations under the Convention. He therefore saw no reason why the Committee should make a recommendation suggesting the action Governments should take after the Convention was in force.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that his suggestion was not covered by Article 18. Article 18 referred to the application of the provisions of Chapter V of the Geneva Convention, which provided for the granting of export and import licences and other matters. His suggestion, which had been supported by M. Dinichert, was to the effect that, in granting licences to export to a country possessing no effective system of control, the Government of the exporting country should scrutinise carefully every application before granting the licence.

The CHAIRMAN said, with regard to Colonel Woods' proposal, that it was obvious that the Committee could not discuss it unless it decided to do so by a vote.

He proposed therefore :

- (1) That no new questions should be added to the agenda of the present session ;
- (2) That each proposal should be accompanied by a resolution ;
- (3) That he should be authorised to call members to order if they did not keep to the question under discussion.

With regard to the question of the export and import certificates system, he would repeat his proposal that Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Dinichert should prepare a resolution.

The proposals of the Chairman were adopted.

66. Extracts from the Intelligence Reports from His Britannic Majesty's Consuls in China for the Half-Year ending September 30th, 1925.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China), referring to the document before the Committee (Annex 12), asked the name of the correspondent who had written from Tungtai to the effect that General Ma Yu-Jen had introduced a large consignment of opium into Northern Kiangsu. Was that correspondent a foreigner or a native and had he any proofs of this accusation against Chinese officials ?

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said he did not know the name of the correspondent. British consular officers, however, were not in the habit of quoting letters of this kind unless they had been received from responsible persons.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) asked whether the British Consul at Chinking would be responsible for this information. If he referred the matter to his Government, measures would be taken and proof required. If the report were true, the British Consul would be thanked for his information and the General in question sent to prison. If it were not true, the General would probably bring an action for damages. No accusation could be made without furnishing proof. Such information only tended to make trouble and create bad feeling.

67. Smuggling of Opium from China.

The CHAIRMAN hoped that M. Chao-Hsin Chu would move a resolution regarding this point at the end of the discussion. The Committee was aware of the yearly appeals made to it by the Chinese representative for co-operation in the campaign against the opium evil.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the principal reason why the Governments represented at the First Opium Conference at Geneva had felt unable to go further than the provisions of the Agreement concluded by that Conference had been the fact of the smuggling of opium into their Far-Eastern possessions, especially from China. A great deal of doubt had been expressed at the time as to the existence of such smuggling and it had now been revived in a letter sent to the Committee by Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

In the documents before the Committee, there were to be found many references to smuggled opium from China, for instance, in reports of seizures from the Netherlands East Indies,

reports of the Government of French Indo-China, etc. He would call attention to one very striking instance contained in the figures given in Appendix A of the Report of the Government of the Straits Settlements for 1924 (document O. C. 23 (o) 2), containing a statement of the seizures of opium and dangerous drugs during that year. The authorities in the Straits Settlements had seized 12,613 tahils of raw opium and 90,539 tahils of prepared opium. With one or two minor exceptions, the whole amount had come from China. It was equivalent to a little under 4,000 kilogrammes. The amount consumed in the Straits Settlements during 1924, according to document O. C. 415, was 44,000 kilogrammes, which meant that the amount seized was one-tenth of the amount actually consumed. The Committee had been accustomed to consider the amount of contraband opium or drugs seized in the Far East as about one-tenth of the amount actually smuggled. He did not know whether this proportion could be applied in the present case. If it could, then the amount smuggled would be very nearly equal to the amount actually consumed.

The authorities of Hong-Kong, at the time of the First Opium Conference, had estimated the amount of opium smuggled into that colony as equal to the amount purchased legitimately from the Government monopoly. The Adviser from the Straits Settlements at the Conference had not put the figure for Malaya quite so high as that. Whatever the figure was, however, the amount was substantial and proved that the contention advanced at the First Opium Conference was justified. He drew attention to the point because a good deal of doubt was still being expressed as to the reality of the smuggling of opium from China. He did so with no intention of criticising the Chinese authorities, for everyone recognised that they were in no way responsible. The fact was of great importance, however, when considering the question of the control and use of prepared opium in the Far East and as such had to be mentioned.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) could not entirely deny the contention of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, whose complaint was justified. He had no desire to defend opium traffickers and hoped that the Far-Eastern possessions of Western Powers would deal with them very severely. No protest on that score had ever been made by the Chinese Government, which was willing to do all in its power to prevent the smuggling of opium. He would point out, however, that, according to the Hague Convention, opium-smoking had to be reduced gradually and effectively. That Convention had been in force for about ten years and, from the statistics furnished by the Secretariat, it was to be seen that the consumption of prepared opium in some Far-Eastern colonies had increased rather than decreased, thus showing that the provisions of the Convention were not being executed. He would take Singapore as an example. The total value of opium prepared for smoking in Singapore alone was over one million dollars, representing more than 40 per cent of the total revenue of that colony. It was consumed by the Chinese in that colony and, though M. Chu in no way desired to interfere with other person's concerns, he felt justified in referring to the position of his unfortunate fellow-countrymen who were opium-smokers in those colonies. The facts had been brought to the notice of the Opium Conference by the Chinese delegate and very seriously discussed.

One of the reasons why the Chinese Government had not signed the Convention was that it considered that, as long as the Far-Eastern possessions were not prepared to put an end to opium-smoking in their territories, China could not co-operate with other Powers. China hoped that those Powers would keep strictly to the Hague Convention and would endeavour to reduce yearly the amount of opium prepared for smoking.

With regard to the smuggling of opium from China, he could not deny that China had produced opium. China could, however, supply no report to the Advisory Committee on the production of opium for the following reason: the planting of the poppy in China was prohibited by law. The reason why that law was not properly enforced was because of the grave internal troubles of China. China was in a period of transition and must therefore be excused if she could not entirely fulfil the obligations of the Hague Convention.

It was unfortunately true that opium was produced illegally in China and that the Chinese Government could not prevent it from being sent to other countries. It would do its utmost in this, and M. Chu would inform his Government that the members of the Committee complained that Chinese opium was being smuggled into other countries. He expressed his regret that this was so. The Chinese Government promised to do the best it could, but in making that promise it asked for the co-operation of other Powers. They must prevent the Chinese people from being allowed to smoke too much opium. He would remind the Committee that a very large quantity of opium was smuggled into China from outside, that amount being equal to the quantity of Chinese opium smuggled into other countries. It was for this reason that she asked the Committee to co-operate in all efforts to prevent foreign opium being smuggled into China. He would remind the Committee of the fact that such opium was largely, if not entirely, handled by people other than Chinese.

Though China might be blamed for producing opium, the Chinese Government had not the power to control in that respect so large a country as China, especially during the transition stage through which the country was now passing. The Committee should remember, however,

that China was harming no foreign nation. The prepared opium smuggled from China into other countries was only consumed by the Chinese residents in those countries. The smuggling of opium was a very evil habit. Opium-smokers should, in his view, not merely be sent to prison, they should be shot. Members might think that this was somewhat drastic, but this was his personal view. The Chinese Government was doing its utmost to stop opium-smoking in China and hoped that the other Powers would do their best to fulfil the provisions of the Hague Opium Convention in their own colonies.

68. Use of the Registered Letter Post for smuggling Drugs into China : Circular issued by the Inspector-General of the Chinese Customs.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) drew the attention of the members of the Committee to a reference made in a letter sent to the Inspector-General of the Chinese Maritime Customs by the Commissioner from Harbin. This Commissioner made an excellent proposal to the effect that the American system of refusing to accept any article of correspondence exceeding the ordinary size of a letter unless marked "To be opened by the Customs" should be adopted. To do so, would be to eradicate the present abuse. He would propose a resolution to the effect that all registered letters exceeding the ordinary size should be marked "To be opened by the Customs".

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that this was a question which solely concerned China.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that in that case, if the Committee did not think it necessary to adopt a resolution on the subject, he would communicate with his Government on the point.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the provisions of Chinese law prohibited the despatch of narcotics by letter. The despatch of boxes or parcels of which the value was declared was allowed when the authority of the Chui-Wu-Ch'u had been obtained by the Inspector of Customs. English postal regulations prohibited the despatch of such parcels.

As far as the regulations of the Japanese post were concerned, the postage of morphine, cocaine and heroin was prohibited except to non-Chinese doctors and chemists and to hospitals and military establishments established throughout China. The despatch of those drugs was also permitted to military doctors and schools of medicine of all kinds in conformity with the regulations adopted by the Chinese Government and approved by the Diplomatic Corps in Peking. With regard to the cases of contraband mentioned in the document, the Director of the Postal Services had discovered the persons who had sent them; those persons would be punished for the despatch of drugs as samples without value, which was prohibited.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that from document O. C. 387 it would be seen that the Chinese Customs authorities had already taken measures to deal with the matter so far as lay within their power. Something more, however, should be done in addition to the measures taken by the Chinese authorities. The Acting Commissioner of Customs at Harbin said: "We are evidently confronted here with a vast and well-organised system which has undoubtedly been working ever since the re-establishment of the Siberian mail route, whereby narcotics were peacefully delivered at the delinquents' door..." This was a very important fact and should be taken into consideration by the proper authorities in Europe or in any part of the world from which those drugs originated.

Instances were given in document O. C. 387 of the abuse of the post by illicit traffickers. They took advantage of the facilities offered by the post, without informing the authorities of the contents of their packages, and he thought that the Committee might call the attention of Governments to the circular issued by the Inspector-General of the Chinese Maritime Customs, with a view to their taking whatever action might be possible. The attention of the International Postal Union at Berne might also be drawn to the circular.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that M. Chao-Hsin Chu and Sir Malcolm Delevingne should draft a resolution on this subject.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed.

This proposal was adopted.

69. Summary of a Despatch from the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Soviet Ambassador in Peking (February 24th, 1926), protesting against Russian Opium being smuggled into China (Annex 14).

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said that he had been instructed by his Government to state that it did not ask the Committee to do anything in this matter, but that any favourable proposal which it could make and which might assist China to stop such smuggling would be welcome.

70. Annual Reports from the Chinese Government.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) said he had received a despatch from Peking to the effect that his Government had received a letter from the Secretary-General of the League stating

that a resolution had been proposed by the Advisory Committee and adopted by the Assembly in 1925 urging all Governments to send in their reports on the trade in opium and other dangerous drugs before October.

The Chinese Government was quite willing to comply with this resolution and an annual report would be submitted to the Committee.

71. Opium Situation in Mandated Territories. (Document O. C. 418.)

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the information contained in this report had been or would be examined by the Permanent Mandates Commission. It showed that the situation in the mandated territories was not of any particular gravity.

72. Action taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference. (Document O. C. 426.)

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Professor Knaffl-Lenz proposed, according to the report of the Health Committee, that dicodide and eucodal should fall under the provisions of the Convention. The note by Dr. Knaffl-Lenz began by a fundamental error. The two substances in question were not derivatives of morphia. They were manufactured from thebain, which was a harmless alkaloid found, together with morphine, in opium in the proportion of 0.5 per cent. Neither dicodide nor eucodal could be manufactured from morphia. It was therefore formally impossible to place such substances under the provisions of the Hague Convention. On the other hand, such substances were narcotics which could give rise to abuses. In this respect the note of Dr. Knaffl-Lenz was correct.

There was no great danger that these substances would become an international menace, because the quantities it was possible to manufacture were relatively small. At the moment, they were used in Central Europe, but were almost unknown in the rest of the world. Substances which did not constitute an international danger could not be recommended, in the view of Dr. Anselmino, as products which should fall under the scope of an international convention. The danger, however, must be guarded against, and he had therefore discussed the matter with the manufacturers in order that all measures should be taken to prevent the abuse of such substances.

The manufacturers of dicodide had undertaken to withdraw from the trade dicodide in solution and in the solid forms. It was only made in the form of tablets of bi-tartrate of dicodide, which were insoluble and only contained the proper medical dose. The firm of Merck, which manufactured eucodal, had given a similar undertaking. Eucodal was neither offered nor sold in the solid form but only as a preparation containing the proper medical dose. Thus it was impossible to abuse these two products.

This was an example of a successful campaign against drugs. It was more effective than the provisions of any Convention or any certificate or any control. It must not be forgotten that manufacturers who were as well known as Merck deserved great credit for manufacturing the drugs necessary for the health of humanity. It was in their interest to prevent any suspicion that they were encouraging the traffic in narcotics. Such manufacturers would adopt any measure to prevent their products from being abused, if they received the necessary co-operation. The manufacturers should not be attacked in words, but the work should be carried on in harmony with them. In this way the end desired would be more rapidly achieved.

His Government was in a somewhat delicate position in view of the fact that it was not a member of the Office international d'hygiène publique in Paris. The German delegate had always made a reservation in the Second Conference regarding the work which that Office should be asked to do. He hoped that, before the Health Committee took any decision on the matter, and before a report was sent to the Council regarding the application of the provisions of the Geneva Convention to eucodal and dicodide, the German Government would be asked to explain the present position in the matter. He asked that the above remarks should be transmitted to the Health Committee by the Secretariat.

With regard to preparations to which the provisions of the Convention should not apply, he proposed that the document should be referred for examination to the Expert Sub-Committee composed of Dr. Carrière, Dr. Tsurumi and himself. The Sub-Committee would be assisted by M. Blanco.

After a short exchange of views, the Committee decided to continue the discussion of this subject at the next meeting.

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

Held on Saturday, June 5th, 1926, at 10 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

73. Action taken by the Health Committee of the League to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference (continuation).

Dr. Wasserberg, member of the Health Section, came to the table of the Committee.

In reply to Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), Dr. WASSERBERG said that the conclusions of the Expert Committee appointed by the Office international d'hygiène publique at Paris had been approved by that Office.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) proposed, in view of the fact that the British expert, Sir William Wilcox, had not been present at the meeting of the Expert Committee which had considered the matter, and in view of the fact that Dr. Anselmino, who had not been consulted, had strong objections to the recommendations made, that the Health Committee should be asked to consult both those persons before coming to any decision with regard to the recommendations.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, by the terms of the Convention, the Health Committee of the League had to decide the question.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that in that case he would withdraw that part of his proposal concerning the British member. The British member of the Health Committee could consult Sir William Wilcox.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that the matter should be referred to the Health Section of the Secretariat for reference to the Health Committee.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) explained the substance of his objections. Dicode and eucodal were undoubtedly narcotic drugs, but the manufacturers had withdrawn them from the trade except in the form of insoluble tablets containing the minimum medicinal dose. This being so, it was impossible for them to become subject to abuse.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could lay the matter before the Health Committee in a letter. The note by Dr. Anselmino could be submitted to the Health Section, which could forward it to the Health Committee.

After a short exchange of views, *it was agreed that the Health Committee should be asked to discuss the question with Dr. Anselmino before it took any decision.*

74. Question of the Insurance of Consignments of Opium and other Dangerous Drugs : Proposal from the British Government suggesting that a Clause concerning Drugs to which the International Opium Convention of 1912 applies be inserted in all Maritime Insurance Policies.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) hoped that the Committee would adopt a recommendation strongly urging the Governments of countries interested in maritime insurance to consider the question raised in the memorandum from the British Government.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that the clause in question did not perhaps entirely achieve the desired object. The measure was in fact directed chiefly against opium, but drugs only were mentioned. The word "drugs", however, was used in a technical and defined sense in the Hague Convention, and therefore, if the clause now in question contained the word "drugs" only and not "opium" also, it might be considered that it related solely to drugs and not to opium, especially as the Hague Convention was, in fact, referred to in the clause.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed that the recommendation of the Committee should be made quite explicit.

Colonel Woods stated that he could not speak officially in the matter but, in the absence of Mr. Tuck, he might say he understood that the matter was receiving favourable consideration in the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in order strictly to comply with the Convention, the first two measures at least should be adopted. No consignment could be put on board without an import

licence, and the description of the goods must always figure on the policy. He asked, therefore, what novelty would be introduced by this proposed regulation.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the proposal concerned the insurance of cargoes of opium or drugs transported by sea. It was based on the fact that persons engaged in the illicit traffic were obtaining funds from banks on the security of insurance policies. Suppose, for example, that a syndicate in Shanghai was arranging for a consignment of opium to be transported from the Persian Gulf to the China Seas, it insured the consignment with some insurance company for a certain amount, took the policy to a bank and secured a loan on the security of that policy, thus being able to finance the transaction. It was to make this impossible that the British Government had concluded with the maritime insurance companies and underwriters in England the arrangement mentioned in the document before the Committee.

Mr. TUCK (United States of America) said that the United States Government had approached certain insurance companies with a view to arranging for the insertion in their policies of a clause somewhat similar to that inserted in the maritime insurance policies in Great Britain. While he had no definite information as yet, he believed that the matter was receiving favourable consideration.

The Committee decided to ask Sir Malcolm Delevingne to draft a recommendation on this matter.

75. Examination of the List drawn up by the Committee of Experts of Drugs and Preparations falling under the Provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Committee of Experts had been instructed to draw up a list of drugs and preparations falling under the provisions of the Hague Opium Convention. After an exchange of views, the report before the Committee had been drawn up. The Committee of Experts had proposed that the provisional list should be forwarded to the Governments in question, asking them to adhere to the proposals contained in the report and to complete the list of drugs. If all countries did not co-operate, the list would be incomplete. When the replies had been received, a final list would be drawn up.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that it would be unwise to send any list at the moment. The list prepared was based partly on the Hague Convention of 1912 and partly on the Geneva Convention of 1925.

The Committee had agreed at its previous session to restrict the number of documents distributed in order that Governments should not be worried with too many questions. As far as he knew, all that was wanted was a list that would enable the Secretariat to draw up statistics. It was impossible to obtain the information required, for there were many Governments which had not yet adopted the Convention of 1925.

The CHAIRMAN said that in France at the moment the departments concerned were drawing up a list of drugs which should be covered by the Convention. Might not the document prepared by the Committee of Experts be of use to other Governments?

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said there would be no objection to helping Governments to prepare a list at a later stage, but at this stage the Committee was asking them to furnish information which they were not bound to give.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed that as long as the list was provisional no use could be made of it, either by the Secretariat or by Governments. Such a list could not be adopted as a guide by the Secretariat in preparing its statistics without being first examined and revised by the Committee, and members of the Committee could only revise it after consultation with the medical authorities of their countries. The medical authorities in Great Britain had made a number of suggestions, some of them of importance.

The Committee was faced, therefore, with an alternative: either to postpone the whole question of the list for further consideration until the Convention of 1925 had come into operation or to consider the list at the next session after the members had had time to consult their medical authorities at home. As, however, M. van Wettum seemed to suggest that Governments would not wish to deal with the matter immediately, he had no objection to postponing it until the Convention of 1925 had come into force. The Committee, in any case, could not provisionally adopt the list and give it to the Secretariat as a guide for use when dealing with statistics sent to the Committee.

He was in no way criticising the list, for he thought that the Committee of Experts had done a very useful piece of work. In this matter, however, it was almost inevitable that the different medical authorities might take different views and have different observations to make.

In reply to M. Blanco, Sir Malcolm Delevingne explained that, in his view, the list could not be used for the purpose of compiling the Committee's statistics until it had been examined and revised by the medical authorities in the different countries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) pointed out that it was impossible to draw up a practically complete list without the co-operation of all countries. The Committee of Experts was at present in possession of lists from Great Britain, Germany and Switzerland only. The French list was being prepared. This collection was not sufficient.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) desired to thank the Committee of Experts for the great trouble which it had taken in drawing up the list. That list should be completed, however, before it was sent to Governments. He thought that the Committee of Experts should be asked to make it as complete as possible.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland), in reply, stated that the Swiss administration and science would do everything possible to assist in the compilation of the list.

The CHAIRMAN explained that it was in the interest of the Governments that they should submit their lists as soon as possible and before ratifying the Convention of 1925. The lists should contain a table of their preparations and patent medicines, together with an indication as to which fell within the scope of the Convention and which did not.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that there were certain questions of principle regarding the list which would have to be settled. In document O.C. 422, the Committee would find the criticisms made by the British medical authorities regarding the principles adopted in the compilation of the medical experts' list. It was very likely that the medical authorities of other countries would have criticisms or suggestions to make. Obviously, therefore, before the Expert Committee could complete the list, it must have before it these criticisms or suggestions. Great Britain had already sent its own. Those of other Governments could be obtained either by making a formal request to those Governments or by an unofficial communication through the members of the Committee. He thought the latter was the better course.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the Japanese lists had been sent in two years previously.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) made the following proposal :

“ That the Committee of Experts be asked to continue its work with the collaboration of the medical authorities of the different countries, obtained through the intermediary of the unofficial good offices of the members of the Advisory Committee. ”

This proposal was adopted.

76. Question of a Centre of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs at Goa.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) referred to the observations made at a previous meeting by Sir John Campbell, to the effect that an endeavour was being made at the present moment to establish at Goa a centre for the illicit traffic in narcotics. He had already assured his colleagues that the strictness of the Portuguese laws in regard to narcotics was a sufficient guarantee against any such attempts. He had nevertheless asked his Government for further details, and he had just received the reply. His Government had also forwarded to him on May 26th a communication from the Government of the Portuguese Indies, a communication which was consequently previous to the assurances which he had given to the Committee as to the guarantee afforded by the Portuguese laws against attempts at illicit traffic. The laws according to this communication were as follows :

The import of cocaine and its distribution were regulated by the Decree of 1909, amended by the Agreement of July 21st, 1914. The Decree prohibited the import and sale of cocaine in the territories of Goa, with the exception of the quantities used by chemists for medical purposes, up to a total limit of 2 kilogrammes a year.

The Agreement of 1924 authorised the provisioning of the military hospital with cocaine. Morphine was imported in small quantities only for medical use ; other narcotics were imported by licence or permit delivered by the police. Such products could not be obtained in any large quantity by traders because their distribution was controlled.

He would, before communicating the reply given by his Government to his telegram despatched at two o'clock in the morning on July 28th, submit some observations which would help to explain this reply. Geographically, Goa was a Portuguese settlement in the territory of British India. Access to Goa was by sea or through the territories surrounding it. In Portuguese territory there was no production of opium nor any manufacture of morphine or cocaine or their respective salts. Goa must accordingly import all the drugs that were required for medical and scientific purposes. In these circumstances, Goa could not re-export the drugs.

The telegram from the Portuguese Government explained that there had been an export of drugs in transit from Karachi in British territory, an arrangement which was not prohibited by the legislation regulating the question of opium and narcotics. The question of transit was governed by the Agreement of 1925. This Agreement, however, was not yet in force, and traffic in transit was accordingly authorised. The consignment in question coming from Karachi in British territory should have been stopped at Mormugao on the request of the Government of Bombay, but it had been stolen on the high seas. The authorities at Goa

could not be held responsible, as transport in transit was effected on vessels which did not belong to Portugal, and Portugal had, moreover, no shipping in these waters.

He would gladly forward to his Government all the information which Sir John Campbell was willing to give him, and he would assure his colleagues that he would not fail to furnish the Committee with any necessary explanations on the subject which his Government might communicate. He could not but draw the attention of the Committee, however, to the fact that Sir John Campbell had at a public meeting provoked a certain feeling of distrust *vis-à-vis* the Portuguese Government.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) desired to make it quite clear that he had cast no doubt or suspicion on the action or attitude of the Portuguese Government. The matter concerned British subjects. The attempts to which he had referred had taken place on British territory.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said he recognised, in view of the declarations which Sir John Campbell had just made, that Portugal was not being called in question. He could not, however, fail to note that the name of Goa had been brought forward and that this was a grave matter, as it might give rise to suspicions in regard to Portugal.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) explained that the British subjects in question had attempted to use Goa as a base for their operations.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that he would forward to his Government the observations made in the Committee, in order that the two Governments concerned might collaborate in order to avoid any attempts at illicit traffic being actually carried into effect. Conversations were at that moment in progress between the Government of Bombay and the Government of the Portuguese Indies, from which it appeared, as noted in the telegram from the Portuguese Government which had already been mentioned, that the consignment coming from Karachi in British territory should have been stopped at Mormugao at the request of the Government of Bombay. It was for this reason that he considered it irrelevant for the name of Goa to be mentioned in the Committee. It was common knowledge that when observations of this kind were made at a public meeting, though with the best intentions, the public had a tendency to be carried away by its feelings and to interpret what it heard to the discredit of the party to whose conduct attention had been drawn.

The Portuguese Government had a clear conscience in the matter. As, however, the name of one of the Portuguese territories had been mentioned in connection with a scheme of illicit traffic in drugs, he had felt it necessary to clear his Government of all responsibility.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) repeated that there was no intention on his part to make any accusation against the Portuguese Government. He had mentioned the facts because they had an international aspect. He had repeatedly emphasised the point that there was no question of any accusation against the Portuguese Government.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) thanked Sir John Campbell for his remarks, which he would forward to his Government. He had defended with some emphasis the good name of Goa, because the reputation of his country must remain intact. Portugal, like Cæsar's wife, must be above suspicion.

The CHAIRMAN said that the exchange of views between Sir John Campbell and M. Ferreira would be recorded in the Minutes.

77. Position as regards the Ratification of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference at Geneva 1925.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that Portugal was at the moment drafting the instrument of ratification of the two Conventions which she had signed.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee always noted with satisfaction statements of that kind. France would ratify very shortly.

The Committee had decided to insert this point in its agenda, because of the importance of obtaining ratifications. It had, on several occasions, expressed the view that its work was paralysed until that ratification had taken place. It seemed useless to propose any new measures, which would become superfluous when the Convention had been ratified. He proposed, therefore, that the Committee should renew its recommendation concerning ratification.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that it was a disappointment to him that so few members of the Committee had made definite declarations on this important question.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) reminded the Committee of the statement he had made concerning the intentions of Switzerland. The signature of the Geneva Convention had coincided with the introduction of legislation in Switzerland, which, as far as the international traffic was concerned, constituted in fact an application of the provisions of that Convention. He could only hope that the practical experience which would now be gained would not be of the kind to place unexpected difficulties in the way of a speedy ratification of the Convention.

78. Export of Morphine from France to Greece and to Cuba : Annual Report from the French Government for 1923. (Document O. C. 23 (s) 1.)

The CHAIRMAN said that in themselves the exports in question were not large, though they were considerable when compared with the figures of population. The amount exported

had been 1,700 kilogrammes in the case of Greece and about 1,600 kilogrammes to Cuba. He had asked the French Customs authorities to verify these figures. The absence of statistics from Greece made it impossible to ascertain what had become of the 1,700 kilogrammes of morphine imported. Moreover, great prudence must be shown regarding the conclusions to be drawn from these figures. Conclusions could only be drawn from statistics if the latter referred to a certain number of years. In the year in question, for instance, stocks exhausted through military requirements might have been replenished. In any case, the attention of the French authorities had been drawn to the exports for 1923 and if there were any large imports in the future the necessary steps would be taken. The French Government would consider whether it was not desirable to draw the attention of the Greek Government to those imports.

The same was true with regard to Cuba. In the report from the Cuban Government, no import or export of morphine was shown. It was therefore not possible to know what had become of the 1,600 kilogrammes of morphine now in question.

The ACTING SECRETARY said that the reason why Cuba was not mentioned in the statistics submitted to the Committee was that its import was below 25 kilogrammes, which was the minimum figure fixed by the Committee. Cuba had forwarded information to the effect that she had imported 6 kilogrammes 575 grammes of morphine in 1923.

79. Export of Raw Cocaine from the Netherlands to France : Annual Report from the French Government for 1923. (Document O. C. 23 (s) 1.)

The CHAIRMAN said that this question referred to a remark of M. van Wettum concerning the annual report from the French Government for 1923. M. van Wettum had said that that report "mentioned that raw cocaine had been exported from the Netherlands and that this was probably inexact. As far as M. van Wettum had been aware, there had been no export of raw cocaine from the Netherlands, and the report of the Netherlands for 1923 made no mention of it."

The French representative had laid the matter before the Customs authorities in his country. He would forward the answer to M. van Wettum so that he might be able to verify the dates and quantities.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thanked the Chairman.

80. Question of Imports of Heroin into Formosa in 1923 : Annual Report from Formosa for 1923. (Document O. C. 23 (c) 1.)

M. KUSUMA (Japan) said that M. Tsurumi had enquired into the matter and that the Japanese authorities were of opinion that the quantity imported in the years 1922-24 had been about the same in each year.

81. Relation of the Quantities of Raw Opium used in Japan in the Manufacture of Morphine to the Amount of Morphine produced : Annual Report from the Japanese Government for 1923. (Documents O. C. 23 (c) 1, and O. C. 428.)

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that, since he had not yet had time to examine document O. C. 428, which had only just been distributed, he would merely point out that the Japanese statistics seemed to have been compiled on a different basis from that suggested by the Advisory Committee. Could the Japanese authorities, in compiling their statistics, give the actual amount of the raw materials used in the given year and the actual amount of the drugs produced from that raw material.

The CHAIRMAN said that the point raised by Sir Malcolm Delevingne was of particular importance in view of the principles involved. The Committee, at its next session, should have a table of the discrepancies occurring between the statistics of the various countries.

M. KUSUMA (Japan) said that the difficulties mentioned by Sir Malcolm Delevingne were obvious. As regards the process of transformation in the case of morphine, exact figures could not be given. The amount given in the statistics was based on the transformed product. In future, however, he would undertake that more exact figures would be supplied.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) agreed that there would always be some uncertainty with regard to the transformation of the drug. The point to which he wished to draw attention was that the amount of raw material given in the statistics was the amount of raw material permitted to be used by the authorities and not the amount actually used.

82. Extradition : Statement of the Position of Certain Countries in regard to this Question.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would communicate to the Committee a document containing the position of France with regard to this question.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that negotiations between Great Britain and the United States for the conclusion of an extradition treaty on the matter were in progress.

83. Consideration of the Report of the International Anti-Opium Association on certain New Opium Substitutes and of Dr. Knaffl-Lenz's Notes on that Report. (Document O. C. 341 (b).)

The CHAIRMAN called the Committee's attention to the fact that, in 1923, 48,000 lbs of caffeine had been imported into China, 22,000 lbs in 1924, and about 2,000 lbs of strychnine.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that he had referred the question to the medical authorities in Great Britain and had received a letter from a distinguished authority the conclusions of which were somewhat different from those contained in the note of Dr. Knaffl-Lenz. The letter, which was of great interest, was at the disposal of the Committee. He did not think that any action could be taken in the matter in view of the difference of opinion on the effects of the two drugs to which reference had been made. He thought that it would be better not to publish the note of Dr. Knaffl-Lenz.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) and M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked to see a copy of the letter to which Sir Malcolm Delevingne had referred.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) undertook to communicate the substance of the letter to those members of the Committee who desired it.

84. Opium Situation, particularly as regards the Philippine Islands : Letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright. (Document O. C. 452.)

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) thought that the letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright had been written under two misapprehensions ; the first of these was a question of fact. Much of her letter contained statements and arguments based upon the assumption that there was no illicit traffic from China to the Philippine Islands. As the Committee would remember, Mrs. Hamilton Wright had made statements regarding what she considered to be the excessive quantities of opium exported from India to British North Borneo. He had already laid before the members of the Committee the exact statistics of that traffic, but he would remind them that he had disputed the statement made by Mrs. Hamilton Wright at the previous session, as the result of which she had communicated with the Governor-General of the Philippines, whose answer had been submitted to the Committee on August 31st, 1925. The Governor-General had stated that only a very small quantity of opium had been smuggled into the Philippines. On that occasion Sir John Campbell had then asked whether the Governor-General's statements referred to the import from British North Borneo only. Mrs. Hamilton Wright had replied in the affirmative and had undertaken to forward the reports on the Philippines as soon as possible. What had actually occurred, therefore, had been that Mrs. Hamilton Wright had made certain allegations which the reply of the Governor-General of the Philippines had shown to be unsubstantiated. This reply she had communicated to the Committee, but there was nothing in it which suggested that there was no smuggling into the Philippines from China.

The second point concerned the reasons which had actuated the Government of India in adopting a new policy with regard to the export of opium. He would remind the Committee that, during the session, he had made a statement regarding the policy of the Government of India and had explained in detail its reasons for adopting that policy.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) said that the information contained in Mrs. Hamilton Wright's letter regarding the position in the Philippines had reached the Committee unofficially. He hoped that the Committee would receive official information from the United States authorities as to the position in those Islands, where a very important measure had been adopted some years previously. Could the unofficial representative of the United States of America give official information, particularly with regard to the statistics of seizures, etc., or if it could not be given to the Committee direct, could it be furnished through the Netherlands Government, both on this occasion and for the future ?

Mrs. Hamilton Wright had made certain statements in her letter with regard to Persia, some of them of an optimistic kind which he hoped would prove to be well founded. Had the Secretariat any information regarding the progress of the enquiry now being conducted by the League Commission in Persia ?

Mr. Tuck (United States of America) said that in the list of seizures made by the United States Government, forwarded to the Secretariat by the Netherlands Government, there

appeared to be no information about the Philippines. He would undertake to obtain from his Government the particulars desired by Sir Malcolm Delevingne, which he would be glad to communicate unofficially to the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire), in thanking Mr. Tuck, hoped that the statistics would cover a period of years in order that a comparative view might be obtained.

Mr. TUCK (United States of America) undertook to look into the question.

The ACTING SECRETARY, replying to Sir Malcolm Delevingne, stated that the Commission of Enquiry to Persia had informed the Secretariat that it would leave Persia on June 10th for Geneva, where it would prepare its report for submission to the Council. That report would probably come before the Council at its September session.

Only general information had been received regarding the places which the Commission had visited. No provisional report of any kind had yet come to hand.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to insert in the Minutes the letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright with regard to the traffic in the Philippine Islands.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) did not think this was necessary.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) would prefer that the letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright should not be included in the Minutes. There was in his view a misconception of facts which vitiated the greater part of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would inform Mrs. Hamilton Wright that her letter had been distributed to all the members of the Committee and that the record of the Committee's discussion of it would be found in the Minutes.

85. Reports from the Government of the United States of America and List of Seizures.

Mr. TUCK (United States of America) said that three reports regarding seizures had been communicated to the Secretariat through the Netherlands Government. The first gave special statistics regarding the enforcement of the Internal Revenue Narcotic Laws from July 1st, 1915, to December 1925, and covered fourteen geographical divisions in the United States, together with the territory of Hawaii. Since the table was a large one, the Secretariat had informed him that it had not yet been possible to distribute it to the Committee.

The following figures would, he thought, be of particular interest. They covered a period of 10½ years (July 1st, 1915, to December 1925). During that period there had been 51,197 violations of the law, 26,371 cases tried, 24,693 convictions, 1,678 acquittals and 6,667 compromises. The percentage of convictions for that period, therefore, was 93.6, which was extremely high. The cost of the enforcement of the narcotic laws in 1925 was 971,392.20 dollars.

In document O.C. 453 was to be found a list of seizures reported by the United States Government for the months of January and February 1926, and the third document on seizures gave the total number for the fiscal year 1925.

The term "Yenshee" in those documents meant "dross".

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said there were certain points in the United States report for 1924-25 to which he would like to refer. He observed that it was stated that "continued difficulty was encountered in preventing . . . the self-consumption of narcotic drugs properly purchased by physicians themselves addicted to the use of such drugs". This was a difficulty that was experienced in England. Could the United States authorities inform the Committee in future reports of the steps taken to deal with this difficulty, which was obviously serious?

The document also referred to "increased quantities of morphine (chiefly morphine-hydrochloride), but little of which was manufactured in the United States of America, heroin, which was not manufactured, and cocaine which had been landed illegally on the east coast from ships arriving from European ports". This confirmed the serious situation noted by the Committee with regard to the illicit traffic.

The report also stated that, for the fiscal year 1924-25, the United States had imported 1,632,625 lbs. of raw opium from England. These figures did not agree with the figures of the exports from Great Britain to be found in the table annexed to document O.C. 415. The explanation probably was that the Government of the United States had included in its imports opium purchased through English merchants in London, which did not come from England but exported from Constantinople or some other exporting centre directly to the United States. For the purposes of comparison, he thought that the statistics should be prepared on a uniform basis, and it was not, in his view, strictly correct to regard as exports from England exports of opium from countries other than England merely because they were negotiated through an English merchant in London.

Mr. TUCK (United States of America) thought that this might be due to the fact that the United States statistics were based on the fiscal year.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) doubted whether this was the explanation. In document O.C. 415 it was stated that in 1922 England had exported to the United States 6,510 kilogrammes, 5,725 kilogrammes in 1923 and 3,791 kilogrammes in 1924. This meant that the total for the three years was less than the figure for the single fiscal year given in the United States report. Some other explanation was therefore necessary.

It was said in another passage in the report of the United States that " opium used for smoking purposes is smuggled : all kinds are acceptable for this purpose. While a large part is apprehended and seized on arrival, it is believed that the traffic could be more effectively combated by employing additional means at the ports of exit to prevent placing opium aboard ships sailing for the United States ". He felt sure that the British Government would be very glad to consider any suggestions made by the United States authorities.

Mr. TUCK (United States of America) stated that he would endeavour to supply further information on this point at a later date.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), referring to the statement in the report to the effect that " the use by the patient is controlled by the attending practitioner, who is responsible for the use of all narcotic drugs and preparations dispensed in the case either directly or by prescription ", said that this was of interest, for one of the difficulties encountered in Great Britain was that an addict would become the patient of two or three doctors simultaneously without the doctors being aware of this fact. He was thus able to obtain prescriptions or supplies from all three. He would like to know what would be the responsibility, under the United States law, of the medical practitioner in such cases.

It was also stated in the report that " the Government is without authority to report the output of each firm ". Was the Government without authority to report the total amount actually manufactured by the firms ?

Mr. TUCK (United States of America), speaking subject to correction, replied that the narcotic legislation in the United States was a financial one, and that the statistics were therefore based on taxes payable on ounces. The Government, therefore, had no power to demand from the manufacturer statistics for the amounts manufactured, but could only require statistics of the amount of the raw material purchased and the amount of the finished product sold.

In reply to Sir John Campbell, who had asked for an explanation regarding the manner in which the export tables were drawn up by the United States authorities, Mr. Tuck said that such a table always appeared in two separate columns, the first containing the net quantities exported from the United States and the second the quantities of the preparations. For example, in the 1925 report, it would be seen that Canada imported from the United States 15 ounces of heroin, net quantity, for the fiscal year ended June 20th, 1924, and that the total of products containing this quantity for the same period was noted as 12,966 ounces. The footnote at the bottom of the pages giving export statistics in the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue explained this point.

Mr. Tuck thanked the Committee for its courtesy in having allowed him to make these observations.

NINETEENTH MEETING

Held on Saturday, June 5th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

86. Measures for Controlling the Drug Traffic. (Document O. C. 450.)

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should now discuss document O. C. 450, and asked if Colonel Woods would suggest some resolutions which would embody the recommendations he had made.

Colonel Woods said he was ready to submit certain resolutions to the Committee in accordance with the proposal made by the Chairman.

The first resolution was as follows :

" That this Committee recommends that the Council should consider the advisability of suggesting to firms in all countries that manufacture cocaine and morphine that they meet in Conference with the Chairman of this Committee, and consider and recommend to this Committee what means they believe will be effective in properly regulating the production and distribution of these drugs for lawful and beneficent use and in suppressing their unlawful and subversive use. "

The second resolution would be concerned with the bringing together of the administrative officers of all countries whose duty it was to enforce narcotic laws, in order that the legal traffic in opium, coca leaves and their derivatives could be more effectively regulated and the illicit traffic therein more effectively suppressed. The Committee should recommend the summoning of such a Conference, which could arrange for speedier and more practically effective inter-communication among Governments of information about law-breakers, such as photographs, methods of operation, finger-prints, and other records.

He had made a further suggestion, in view of the unanimous feeling which appeared to have been manifested in the Committee, concerning the apparent inadequacy of the measures at present in force to suppress the unlawful traffic in cocaine and morphine. The suggestion was that, in order to suppress entirely the unlawful use of these drugs, they should be limited to medicinal and scientific needs. He was convinced that this was the only method whereby suppression could be achieved. At the moment, however, he could not suggest any form of resolution regarding the practical methods for achieving this.

He hoped that the Drafting Sub-Committee would be able to draw up a resolution which would carry out the general purpose of his last suggestion. Something must be done to bring about as speedily as possible the limitation of the manufacture of these drugs for the scientific and medical needs of the world. He thought that the Committee was unanimously agreed that this should be done, and equally so that it had not yet been done. There was no organisation better qualified to draft a resolution than the Drafting Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the above proposals, thought that it might be possible to pass a resolution concerning the usefulness, when the moment was favourable, of establishing close contact between the officials in various countries whose duty it would be to enforce the Convention. He would emphasise the fact that such a resolution could only be adopted when the time came, because at the moment the system in force in the different countries was not well defined, since in most countries the Hague Convention was still in force. Perhaps another system would be in force in some months' time. In these circumstances, it would not be opportune to fix a very near date for such a Conference, since the officials in question would not know which Convention they were required to enforce. The resolution should therefore be drafted in general terms drawing the attention of the Governments to the importance or usefulness of holding a Conference of the officers concerned when a favourable opportunity arose.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted and the Committee instructed the Drafting Sub-Committee to prepare a resolution.

As regards the first resolution proposed by Colonel Woods, concerning the summoning of a Conference of representatives of manufacturers, the CHAIRMAN thought that the proposal raised certain very delicate questions. The Preparatory Committee had had to examine a similar question and had discarded it; Dr. Anselmino had submitted an interesting note on the point. The Chairman had read with interest Dr. Anselmino's suggestions and he thought that something might one day be achieved. He doubted, however, whether the right moment had yet come, whether public opinion had been sufficiently prepared, whether the Governments were willing, and whether the question had been sufficiently investigated. This was purely his personal opinion, and he would like to know the views of his colleagues.

With regard to Colonel Woods' proposal concerning the Police Conference, M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) quoted Article III of the Final Act of the Second Convention to the effect that all States should co-operate with one another as closely as possible in the suppression of the illicit traffic, and that they should authorise the competent authorities charged with the administration of the law on the subject to communicate directly with the corresponding authorities in other countries.

Colonel Woods said that the object of this suggestion was to increase the possibility of enforcing this article which was, at the moment, to a great extent a dead letter.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) disagreed. He did not think that the article in question was a dead letter.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. With regard to the convening of a Conference of Police Officers, he would desire to know the views of the authorities in the Netherlands before expressing his opinion.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) thought that no harm could result from such a Conference.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) replied that it was a question of advantage. Would there be any advantage in calling together in, for example, six months' time, police officers from each country, or would it not be better to wait until all countries had enforced the new Convention? He thought there would be difficulties regarding the convening of the police of each country, including Japan and the United States.

Colonel Woods remarked that, if the smugglers could travel from one country to another and cross the ocean, the police certainly could.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) thought that the proposal must be dealt with methodically. It might be necessary first to establish a system of regional co-operation. The divergence of views did not seem very great, however, and the Drafting Sub-Committee could probably prepare a text, based on the provisions of the two Conventions, which would meet with general approval.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. Sugimura in thinking that a text based on the provisions of the two Conventions would prove acceptable to the Committee. Colonel Woods had described the methods adopted in the United States, and other Governments might be asked to inform the Committee of their methods. The Committee would also draw attention to the direct communication of information between countries and would recommend that, when the circumstances were favourable, a general Conference of Police Officers should be convened.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether the Conference of Police Officers would represent the whole world or only countries represented on the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that the resolution would emphasise the importance of receiving reports similar to that submitted by Colonel Woods, the importance of direct contact between the police officers in the various countries, and, finally, the usefulness of summoning a Conference when circumstances allowed. It was obvious that the Governments would not immediately agree to the summoning of a Conference. The Committee should proceed gradually and should content itself with recommending as a first step that the various countries should communicate their methods.

The wording of the resolution ought to suggest the idea that there would be several stages, the last of which would be the convening of a Conference.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) understood the proposal of the Chairman to mean that the Committee should emphasise the importance of obtaining, as a first step, accurate information concerning the police methods adopted in each country.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) hoped that the formula to be drafted by the Sub-Committee would be as simple as possible. It should not, however, cover only police authorities. Reference should also be made to other authorities, e.g., the Customs authorities, whose duty it was to execute the measures required by law.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

It was understood that the Drafting Sub-Committee would prepare a resolution based on the exchange of views which had taken place.

With regard to the second suggestion of Colonel Woods, to the effect that a Conference of manufacturers should be summoned under the chairmanship of a member of the Committee, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) thought that this suggestion, together with the memorandum of Dr. Anselmino, deserved examination and consideration, but that the Committee was not in a position to take definite steps at the moment. The members would desire to consult the authorities in their own countries and obtain the views of the manufacturers themselves. He suggested, therefore, that consideration of the proposal should be adjourned and that it should be placed on the agenda of the next session.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that such a proposal would require considerable examination on the part of Governments.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thought there would be no objection to encouraging manufacturers to hold a private conference, which would enable them to discuss the present position and to make proposals regarding the measures which they themselves could take against the illicit traffic.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) agreed that manufacturers should be asked to meet together. It would thus be possible to discover how many drug factories were in existence. The Committee could then obtain a figure of the total amount of dangerous drugs required for legitimate purposes and, when that figure was obtained, manufacturers could be asked to arrange between themselves what proportion of the total output they should each undertake. The production of any amount above that figure would be prohibited.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) thought that Dr. Anselmino had clearly defined the exact scope of the Conference, which might be of a private nature but should be encouraged by the Governments. Manufacturers should be left to deal with these questions for themselves, for they were administrative and technical in character rather than diplomatic.

The CHAIRMAN noted the interest with which the Committee regarded the proposal of Colonel Woods as amended by Dr. Anselmino. It was precisely because this problem raised a large quantity of complex and delicate questions that the members who represented their Governments felt it impossible to deal with the matter immediately. Several of them seemed to desire that it should be placed on the agenda of the next session. It was open to any member of the Committee to ask that this should be done.

With regard to the third proposal of Colonel Woods, to the effect that the Drafting Sub-Committee should draw up a formula concerning the limitation of production, the Chairman doubted whether the Sub-Committee would be able to find a formula which the Committee had sought in vain for five years.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) did not think that Colonel Woods had made a definite suggestion but had merely expressed a desire.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) pointed out that the object at which Colonel Woods had been aiming was the same as that before the Second Opium Conference. Proposals had been submitted to that Conference with regard to the matter but had not been accepted, and it had finally decided on a compromise, which was embodied in the Geneva

Convention, and which it was hoped would lead indirectly to a reduction in the use of drugs and their eventual limitation to the quantities necessary for medical and scientific purposes.

The Geneva Convention was not yet in operation, and the new scheme had not therefore been tried. In those circumstances, he agreed with the Chairman in thinking that it was impossible to embark on a fresh investigation of the subject, but he would like to point out, and he hoped that other members of the Committee would agree with him, that the Committee's desires were in full accord with the desires expressed by Colonel Woods, and that it hoped that, through the medium of the new Convention, those desires would be realised in a comparatively short time.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne in thinking that the whole Committee realised the importance of limiting the production of drugs to medical and scientific needs. After long discussion, however, the Second Conference at Geneva had adopted a solution providing for indirect limitation. The Government of the United States had itself agreed to the principle of indirect limitation.

87. Summary Report concerning the Application of the Swiss Federal Narcotics Law during the Last Five Months of 1925. (Document O. 23 (f) 4).

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) explained that the report before the Committee was called a summary report because it only applied to the last five months of 1925 and because, owing to the fact that the Federal and Cantonal legislation had only recently been adopted, it had been impossible to collect in time certain statistics, more particularly with regard to consumption. The Swiss Government had endeavoured to submit its first report for the present session of the Committee, but had only had the first four months of 1926 in which to prepare it, although the Committee had agreed that in order to obtain full statistics at least six months were necessary.

The Committee would be able to note that the statistics given were as detailed as possible. They even comprised monthly statistics with regard to the import and export of narcotics. He thought that in future his Government would not burden the Committee with so many statistics.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the report in question could serve as a model for all Governments. It was very complete and gave all the details required by the Committee, and even more.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) noticed that, under item 8 of the export statistics, a new drug was mentioned—"phenatrene"—which appeared to contain 50 per cent of morphia. In September 400 kilogrammes, in October 800 kilogrammes, and in November 1,400 kilogrammes, a total of 2,600 kilogrammes, had been exported over a period of three months only. This was a very large quantity and he would be grateful for any information regarding the traffic which M. Dinichert could supply. The destination of the drug appeared to have been Japan.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) replied that the report gave certain information on this point. With regard to the special properties of such a product, he would ask Dr. Anselmino to explain the scientific side of the matter. The drug had been exported exclusively to Japan.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the term "phenatrene" was a scientific one and was used in organic chemistry. It denoted a pure product of tar and was similar to naphthaline; a preparation containing 50 per cent of morphia, and of the nature of which he was unaware, had been exported under the name of "phenatrene".

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the name was entirely new to him. As the quantities exported had been increasing very rapidly, and were large in themselves, it would be of interest if further details regarding the nature of the drug, and the traffic in it, could be furnished.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that he would inform Dr. Carrière of the interest which this drug had aroused. Dr. Carrière would probably be able to give scientific explanations with regard to it. There could scarcely be any doubt as to the legitimate nature of the export, in view of the fact that the Swiss and Japanese administrations had been privy to it.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that the countries of origin of the raw opium used were given in the import tables. They were principally Turkey and Greece. Taking 12 per cent as the morphine content of the opium from those countries, the figures for the import of raw opium for five months would correspond to at least 4,500 kilogrammes of morphine—an enormous quantity.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that he was unable accurately to estimate the relation between the import of raw opium and the production and export of the manufactured products. Such import and export were of a speculative character, and the relations between them could not, therefore, always be exactly estimated. In any case, the measures of control which had been taken made the illegal use of the substances impossible. The destination of the products was shown in the table of export.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that he had already pointed out that no definite conclusions could be drawn from the statistics given for one year. The opium crop was

essentially of a variable kind and the prices fluctuated. He had already explained on the basis of detailed and precise information that, when a manufacturer found it possible to buy opium cheaply, he built up stocks for several years.

Dr. Anselmino had informed him that the price of opium at the end of 1925 had been very low. The fluctuations in price should therefore be borne in mind. These amounted in some cases to thirty and forty per cent within a few months.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that the import of raw opium in December represented nearly forty per cent of the total imports for five months, which confirmed the statement of Dr. Anselmino.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) recognised that it was impossible for the Committee to lay too much stress on import figures covering only a short period. He was, however, very much struck by the figures, particularly by the enormous export to Japan, especially in view of the general position as disclosed by the Japanese reports. Japan manufactured large quantities of drugs, but showed no export whatever. Local consumption had always been stated to be small and very closely controlled. The Swiss statistics now indicated that large quantities of drugs were being exported to Japan, which meant that these quantities would have to be added to the amount manufactured in the country itself. No explanation had ever been vouchsafed as to the ultimate destination of this very large total quantity of drugs.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) replied that statistics covering only five months could not be taken into consideration. He would add that there was a very large consumption in Japan, which had a population of 80 millions.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) suggested that the Committee should ask the Japanese Government through its representative to deal with the import of phenatrene in its report for 1925.

With regard to what had been said about the import of raw opium and the manufacture of morphine in Switzerland, he would emphasise the point that the quantities manufactured for the five months—amounting to the very large figure of 5,000 kilogrammes—corresponded to the import of raw opium for the same period.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that he would ask his Government to give explanations regarding phenatrene.

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) said that, if there was any disproportion between the raw material and the manufactured product, this was clearly due to a speculative cause, namely, the accumulation of stocks. The report stated clearly the destination of the exports.

88. Compilation of an Index of the First 500 Documents distributed to the Committee.

On the suggestion of Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), *it was decided that, in order to make it easier for the members to use the documents submitted to them, which now numbered over 500, the Secretariat should be asked to compile an index of the first 500 documents.*

89. Situation in Free Ports regarding the Control of the Import and Export of Opium and Dangerous Drugs.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) said that the Committee had not time to discuss this matter. It appeared, however, that the situation was not as satisfactory as had been supposed and that there were grounds for thinking that in some of the free ports the control was not as effective as had been desired. He asked, therefore, that the situation in free ports regarding the control of the import and export of opium and dangerous drugs be placed on the agenda of the next session. The Secretariat should be asked to obtain, during the intervening period, information from the Governments regarding the exact situation, both legal and administrative, in each free port and free zone, such information to include the nature of the control exercised over the imports into free ports, the handling of the drugs and their export.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a resolution on this subject should be inserted in the report.

This proposal was adopted.

TWENTIETH MEETING

Held on Tuesday, June 8th, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

90. Examination of the Draft Resolutions to be submitted to the Council.

Resolution I.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) suggested that the second paragraph should form a separate resolution.

This proposal was adopted.

The first paragraph (final Resolution I) was adopted unanimously with slight amendments.

Resolution II.

The text of the second paragraph (final Resolution II) was accepted by all the members, with the exception of M. van Wettum (Netherlands).

Resolutions III, IV, V and VI (final numbering).

These were adopted with formal amendments.

The original Resolution VI was then discussed, and, on the suggestion of M. SUGIMURA (Japan), the meeting was suspended for a short time to enable Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Bourgois, the authors of the two drafts before the Committee, to come to an agreement.

It was finally decided that this resolution should be withdrawn altogether.

Resolution VII.

Resolution VII was adopted with amendments.

Resolution VIII.

After some discussion, Resolution VIII was also adopted in an amended form.

Resolution IX.

M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) proposed that a paragraph should be inserted in this resolution to the effect that letters be marked "To be opened by the Customs", this suggestion having been put forward by the Harbin Maritime Customs Commission.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the Council should be asked to draw attention to this proposal.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) suggested that the Council should be asked to send a copy of the correspondence which was before the Committee on this subject to the Universal Postal Union, so that it should have the whole matter before it.

Resolution IX was adopted with a slight amendment.

Resolutions X and XI.

These were adopted without modification.

Resolution XII.

It was decided to withdraw this resolution and instead to insert in the report a paragraph to the same effect.

91. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council.

The report was discussed paragraph by paragraph.

Reservation made by Austria when signing the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925 : Presence of M. Pflügl.

On the suggestion of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), *it was decided to insert the following paragraph :*

“ M. Pflügl, on behalf of the Austrian Government, attended one of the meetings of the Committee and, after discussion, announced that his Government would withdraw the reservation which it had attached to its signature of the Convention adopted by the Geneva Conference of February 19th, 1925. ”

Seizures.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) thought that the following paragraph should be inserted after the paragraph ending “ there is no doubt that the quantity of drugs manufactured is considerably in excess of medical and scientific requirements ” :

“ The Committee had before it a long list of seizures reported to the Secretariat by different Governments and detailed reports of investigations undertaken in various countries into important cases of illicit traffic. These documents are too voluminous to print *in extenso*, but the Committee thinks it advisable to extract and quote from the mass of information before it two sets of figures which illustrate the scale on which the illicit traffic is carried on :

“ The authorities at Hong-Kong seized, during 1924, 338 kilogrammes of morphine, 150 kilogrammes of heroin, and 57 kilogrammes of cocaine.

“ The Chinese Maritime Customs during the years 1923 to 1925 seized. . . (adding the tables which appear on page 4 of document O. C. 429.) ”

This was agreed to by the Committee.

Ratification of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925 : Effective Control of the International Traffic.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) proposed that the words “ extremely difficult ” should replace the words “ cannot be secured ”.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) suggested the addition of the phrase : “ It will be seen from Annex 3 that very few countries have so far ratified or adhered to this Convention. ”

The suggestions made by Sir John Campbell and Sir Malcolm Delevingne were adopted.

After an exchange of views, *it was agreed that a draft should be submitted by M. Dinichert which should replace the paragraph reading :* “ Indeed, the Committee feels the necessity for new measures, but hesitates to propose them on the eve of the ratification of the Convention. ” M. Dinichert was asked to submit this draft as soon as possible.

Application of the Hague Convention : Examination of Annual Reports.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) suggested that the first paragraph under this heading might be made a little stronger.

It was decided to insert, after the words “ . . . examination of the annual reports supplied by the Governments ”, the following :

“ It would call attention to Annex 4 of this report and would point out that some countries have sent in no report to the League, that others have sent in reports at irregular intervals, and some have sent in reports which are incomplete. ”

After the paragraph referring to Resolution VI, “ Ratification of the Hague Convention by Turkey, ” the following paragraph was added on the suggestion of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE :

“ The Committee is impressed by information it has received, which indicates that illicit traffic is being carried on in certain countries which have not yet furnished the annual reports which the League has asked for, nor any information as to the laws which have been adopted for the control of the traffic in opium and drugs, in accordance with the provisions of the Hague Convention. The Committee would be glad if the Secretary-General would make every effort in his power to ensure the transmission of these reports and of the laws in question. It has decided to adjourn further consideration of the matter until it has learnt the result of such action. ”

A further suggestion of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire), that reference to the statement made by M. van Wettum as to the new control for the production of coca leaves in Java, was adopted.

M. van Wettum was asked to draft a paragraph, which would be added to the report.

Export of Opium from the Persian Gulf.

Paragraph 1. It was decided to replace the words “ has become worse ” by the words “ has not improved ”, and to add the sentence “ See Annex 6 to this report ”.

Paragraph 2. The following sentence was inserted after the words "to repeat with particular emphasis in Resolution VII": "The recommendations regarding the regulation of ships engaged in carrying opium in the Persian Gulf, which it made last year and to which effect has not yet been given."

At the suggestion of M. DINICHERT (Switzerland), the word "useful" was replaced by the word "interesting".

Special Recommendations.

Paragraph 1. It was decided that the following sentence should be added to this paragraph: "The Committee also calls attention to a new method of smuggling adopted by the illicit traffickers with the Far East which is described in Annex 9."

Paragraph 2. Colonel Woods made a statement with regard to this paragraph. He had read Resolution X with interest but he was unable to recognise any adequate connection between this resolution and his recommendation. He stated that he appreciated the difficulties of the work of the Committee and the fact that progress had been and was being made, but he had been very strongly impressed by one outstanding fact in the report, and that was the increase of the drug traffic. This increase was referred to many times in the report and was very emphatically phrased in Resolution I, yet the principal recommendation which the report made was that it was not wise to take any further action pending the ratification of the Convention. It was not even suggested that measures of possible improvement harmonious with the Convention should be taken by States which might feel inclined to do so, and the idea of the Committee seemed to him to be "Do not do anything until you can do everything; do not enforce anything that may improve the situation until you can put into effect a certain Convention". While waiting for this ratification, the correct procedure would be to do everything possible to improve the situation, even in a small degree. He agreed that the Convention, when ratified, would improve matters, but he did not feel that the improvement would be enough, or that the imminence of adoption was near enough to justify waiting for it, or doing nothing meanwhile.

From his point of view as police adviser to the Committee, he considered that this traffic in the derivatives of opium and coca-leaves must be rooted out lock, stock and barrel and must be limited to the medical and scientific needs of the world.

He had given his advice on how this could best be done in the statement he had made on May 31st at the eighth meeting. The Chairman had shown his approval of this statement at the time it was made, and several members of the Committee had referred to it afterwards in appreciative terms. If the Committee meant that this statement was regarded as an important one, why take away from it any strength it had and make no mention of the measures it recommended, which would go to the root of the matter? This Committee was an advisory one. It was not called upon to weigh matters of policy or select one course of action as an administrative body would. It did, however, have to accept responsibility for keeping the Council fully advised as to measures which would be effective in improving the situation.

He suggested a paragraph to be inserted after the sentence reading: "This statement was regarded by the members of the Committee as of particular importance."

The CHAIRMAN said he had no objection to adding to the report the paragraph mentioned by Colonel Woods, should his colleagues agree, but he would like to point out that the Committee in its report had called the attention of the Council to the difficulties which had been encountered with regard to obtaining annual reports from the Governments parties to the Hague Convention; it had pointed out that only one country among forty signatories to the 1925 Convention had ratified it, while one other had declared that it would ratify within three months.

Under these conditions, was it wise to suggest measures which went further than the Convention before countries had notified their intention of carrying out the measures contained in that Convention?

Two of the resolutions submitted by Colonel Woods touched on questions of principle which had been decided on at the Second Opium Conference, and he had not thought it advisable to renew the debates on this subject and go back on principles accepted by more than forty countries. He wished to make this statement so as to explain the ideas which had guided the Advisory Committee during the present session. He suggested that the meeting should be interrupted for a short time so that he and Colonel Woods could have a private conversation on the matter.

Colonel Woods said that he would be very glad to talk the matter over with the Chairman. He suggested that possibly the reason why countries did not live up to the obligations undertaken in the Hague Convention and why they did not ratify the 1925 Convention at once was because they might think these Conventions did not mean business, but that, if they were asked to do something which would really root up the evil, they might be more likely to act.

The CHAIRMAN thought that some of the countries did not fully realise the importance of statistics. Their utility had been brought out very strongly in the resolutions and in the report. He would discuss with Colonel Woods the re-drafting of the relevant passage in the report.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) did not agree that the suggestions made by Colonel Woods should be incorporated in the report. He felt that these suggestions, if included, would give rise to discussion in the Fifth Committee and thereby cause much dissension.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. van Wettum to be good enough to have confidence in him and to allow him to submit a new text.

Position in the Far East.

Paragraph 1. The word "Acts" was replaced by the word "Agreement", and the following sentence was inserted at the end of this paragraph :

"It still remains to be ratified by four States, and the Committee would ask the Council to use its utmost efforts to secure the early ratification of the Agreement by those States."

Paragraph 2. Sir John CAMPBELL (India) submitted an amended text to replace this paragraph. This amended text, *which was adopted by the Committee*, reads as follows :

"The representative of the Government of India made an important declaration on the policy which his Government had adopted in respect of the export of opium. This policy is stated in the following resolution, which has been unanimously accepted by the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly in India :

" 'This Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that immediate steps should be taken to give effect to the policy of progressively reducing the exports of opium from India, except for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes, so as to extinguish them altogether within a definite period. '

"The representative of India informed the Committee that, though he was not in a position at present to state what period would be fixed for the extinction of all exports of opium from India except for medicinal and scientific purposes, he could give it an assurance that that period would not be unduly prolonged. It is understood that an announcement, definitely fixing the period, may be expected from the Government of India in the near future. It was also intimated that, when the agreement for the direct sale of raw opium to the Government of Indo-China came into force, the Calcutta auction sales would be abandoned. "

Paragraph 3. M. SUGIMURA (Japan) asked that this paragraph should be amended by replacing the words "Central Board" by the words "Supreme Council", and that, instead of the word "Minister", the words "Minister for Foreign Affairs" should be inserted.

This proposal was adopted.

Paragraph 4. M. CHAO-HSIN CHU (China) wished to know what was meant by the phrase "documents which have reached the Committee". He did not think that the documents which had been submitted to the Committee did China justice. He would protest once more against the distribution of the documents sent in by the International Anti-Opium Association.

After an exchange of views, *it was decided to delete this paragraph and replace it by the following* : "The situation in China does not appear to have changed much since the last session."

Documents at the Disposal of the Committee.

Paragraph 1. The sentence "This subject was dealt with in Resolutions XI and XII" was deleted and a paragraph on the lines of the resolution concerning free ports and free zones (Resolution XII), which was withdrawn, was inserted.

Paragraph 2. After some discussion, *it was also agreed to insert the following sentence after the words* "which dealt with Article 8 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925" :

"Certain points were raised by Dr. Anselmino on this report, and the Committee agreed to ask the Health Committee to confer with Dr. Anselmino before taking a decision on the report. "

It was also decided to ask Dr. Anselmino with the Chairman, to draft a paragraph, for insertion at this point with regard to the list drawn up by him concerning the conditions governing the importation and exportation of narcotics in various countries.

It was decided that the words "it asked that the bibliography concerning drug problems should be kept up to date" *should appear after the sentence* "should be collected in a single document with tables and an index", *followed by a paragraph suggested by Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire), reading* :

"The Committee had before it a summary of the annual reports received from Governments, with statistical tables, which had been prepared by the Secretariat,

and which will be printed as an Annex to the Minutes of its proceedings. The Committee noted a number of discrepancies between the figures of exports and imports, as returned by different countries ; and it recommends that in future all important discrepancies should be examined by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Governments concerned, before the summary is submitted to the Committee (see the seventh resolution adopted by the Committee at its meeting last year, which received the approval of the Council and of the Assembly). The work of the Committee would also be greatly facilitated if the statistics could be analysed and summarised before the meeting of the Committee, so as to present a general view of the world situation in regard to the production, manufacture and distribution of the drugs. It recognises that this will place additional work on the Secretariat and it accordingly welcomes the proposal, which it understands has been made by the Secretary-General, to add an additional member to the Section."

It was further agreed that the last paragraph should read as follows :

"For some time this Section will be responsible for peculiarly important work, but part of that will, when the new Convention of February 19th, 1925, comes into force, be transferred to the organisation provided for by that Convention."

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) suggested that, in addition to the annexes in the list submitted by the Chairman, the following documents should be added :

1. The British memorandum on maritime insurance of consignments of drugs.
2. The circular issued by the Chinese Maritime Customs in regard to smuggling of drugs through the post.
3. Paragraph 3 of document O. C. 420.
4. Extracts from the Indian Excise Reports in regard to cocaine smuggling in India.
5. Extract from the memorandum on the situation in Egypt.

It was agreed that these documents should be annexed to the report.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) asked whether document O. C. 417 (a) would form an annex to the report, as under these conditions he would only be able to accept the report with a reservation.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) stated that this information had hitherto formed an annex to the report and he would object very strongly to its omission.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that it was already very late and he thought that it would be better to continue the discussion on this matter at the next meeting. He suggested that the Committee should meet again the next morning.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) regretted that it would be absolutely impossible for him to be present at a meeting next morning. After some discussion, *it was decided*, on the suggestion of Sir John CAMPBELL (India), *to close the present meeting and to meet again, after an interval for dinner, to finish the discussion.*

TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held on Tuesday, June 8th, 1926, at 9.45 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee or their substitutes (with the exception of the Bolivian delegate), and Colonel Arthur Woods (Assessor).

92. **Shipments of Persian Opium from Bushire during the Period June 1st, 1925, to April 30th, 1926 : Question of the Publication of Document O. C. 417 (a).**

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) requested that this document should not be published. He had pointed out at previous meetings the contradictions existing between it and document O. C. 417, and he could not agree to the publication of one document and not the other. Should the Committee decide to publish document O. C. 417 (a), he would not only be obliged to formulate a reserve but he would also feel it his duty to explain his attitude to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly. He asked the Chairman to put to the vote the question whether the document in question should form an annex to the report or not.

The CHAIRMAN asked M. Ferreira if he would agree to the publication of the first page of this document, omitting the notes.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) agreed.

Mr. PERRINS (British Empire) did not think that this procedure would be acceptable to the Committee. He said that the Committee had published each year the information together with the notes, without which the information lost much of its value. It was particularly desirable to publish the document *in extenso* as it contained the only comprehensive account which the Committee had on the traffic in the Persian Gulf.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that if it were decided that document O. C. 417 (a) should be published, he must ask that document O. C. 417 should also form part of the report, in order that the Fifth Committee could make a comparison between the two documents.

Mr. PERRINS (British Empire) said that it was, of course, for the Committee to decide what it would do with the information presented to it, but he suggested that M. Ferreira's reservation should take the form of a note added to the document itself, pointing out what appeared to him to be discrepancies between the two accounts. The British Government took full responsibility for what was stated in the notes appended to document O. C. 417 (a).

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) insisted that the document must be suppressed, or he would be obliged to accept the report with reservations.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that that part of document O.C. 417 in which M. Ferreira was interested should be published together with document O.C. 417 (a). He asked M. Ferreira if he agreed to this.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) repeated the declaration he had made at the previous meeting. The information from the so-called *Macao Gazette* quoted on page 15 of document O.C. 417 gave the impression that the s.s. *Mowinkel* had unloaded 813 cases of opium at Macao, which were destined for Vladivostok. He had already pointed out that it seemed impossible to unload 813 cases of opium at Macao in a single day, since the so-called *Macao Gazette* (document O.C. 417 (a), page 15) stated that the *Mowinkel* had arrived at Macao on August 5th and left on the same day for Keelung. It was true that Sir Malcolm Delevingne had stated that the boat had left Macao on the 6th, but, according to authoritative information available, it did not seem to M. Ferreira that it would be possible to unload 813 cases even in two days.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) suggested that the Committee should not return again to the discussion which had already taken place and which was embodied in the Minutes. It would surely meet all requirements if document O.C. 417 (a) were published, together with such extracts from document O.C. 417 as M. Ferreira himself might choose.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that, if document O.C. 417 (a) was not suppressed, he wished to draw attention to the contradiction existing between the information contained in the two documents.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) regretted that he could not accept the suggestion made by the Chairman. The Committee must take certain precautions with regard to publicity. Documents published by the Committee must be exact if their value was not to be lost. He could not admit this compromise.

The CHAIRMAN stated that he had only made this suggestion in order to meet M. Ferreira.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that one of these documents contained a hidden accusation. In face of such an accusation, he insisted that he should be allowed to utilise means of defending himself, namely, by pointing out the contradiction which seemed to him to exist between the information supplied in the two documents.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that the establishment of such a precedent for the future must be avoided. It seemed to him that the Committee must have unanimity in any decision concerning the publication of documents.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote the question of the publication of these documents. He drew the attention of his colleagues to the suggestion put forward by M. Sugimura, namely, the necessity for obtaining unanimity in the Committee on any questions concerning the publication of documents.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) remarked that, as unanimity was necessary for the publication of a document, he would accordingly, in the present case, be judge of his own affairs.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked what was the difference between the two documents and if the information contained in document O.C. 417 was obtained from the Portuguese Government or from the British Government.

The ACTING SECRETARY stated that document O.C. 417 had been prepared by the Secretariat. It contained all the information received by the Secretariat concerning the Persian

Gulf during the last few years. The particular case of the s.s. *Mowinckel* was an extract from a letter which was received by the Secretariat from the British representative. After receiving this information, the Secretariat wrote to the Norwegian Government in order to obtain supplementary explanations. The reply of the Norwegian Government was transmitted to the British representative, and it was on the basis of this ulterior information that document O.C. 417 (a) had been prepared.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that the two documents had been presented at the same time.

Mr. PERRINS (British Empire) said that he would like to have it quite clear as to what the difference in substance between the two documents was. The second document read almost word for word the same as the first, but added something more, and he saw no substantial difference between them. Whilst it seemed to him to be a work of supererogation to print them both, he was, however, quite willing that this should be done if this procedure would give satisfaction to M. Ferreira.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) stated that if the two documents were the same it was not necessary to publish them both.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that they were not the same. If they were studied closely, the difference could be seen.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) said that his own point of view was very clear. He could not accept the publication of two contradictory documents.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the following procedure. He would put to the vote the question of the publication. If there was one contrary vote, the document would not be published. Would the Committee accept this procedure ?

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) said that this would create an undesirable precedent. The whole difficulty now seemed to be, with regard to this suggestion, that no document should be published without unanimity. As far as he was aware, no such decision had been taken up to the present, and it seemed to him a precedent of far-reaching importance, for if any document were put before the Committee which seemed to implicate any Government, the delegate of that Government, if it were represented on the Committee, could stop publication. That would create a somewhat extraordinary situation.

The CHAIRMAN said that it could be specified that this procedure did not create a precedent.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) said that there was an extremely simple way of solving the difficulty and that was to allow him to adopt the report with a reservation.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the Committee had to vote on two documents which expressed the same thing, one being of a later date than the other. It appeared to him that the Committee was fully justified in accepting M. Ferreira's statement that he did not agree with document O.C. 417 (a), but the publication of that document was of importance to the Committee because it showed the extent of the smuggling trade from the Persian Gulf to the Orient. He suggested that M. Ferreira might state by a declaration what he thought was wrong in the document.

Sir John CAMPBELL (India) had understood that M. Ferreira did not accept that solution, but, if he did, he himself would be quite willing that that course should be adopted and that the question should be put to the vote : either that document O.C. 417 (a) with any comment that M. Ferreira might wish to make and sign should be published, or that the document with such extracts as M. Ferreira might select from O.C. 417 should be published.

The question was put to the vote whether document O.C. 417 (a), together with part of document O.C. 417 selected by M. Ferreira, should be published, and whether M. Ferreira, as representing an interested Government, should be allowed to add a comment.

This suggestion was adopted unanimously, M. Sugimura abstaining.

M. SUGIMURA (Japan) submitted a recommendation to the effect that this mode of procedure should not be employed in future by the Comité. If that body published documents with reservations which took away from their value, it would be extremely prejudicial to the work of the Committee.

M. FERREIRA (Portugal) remarked that by acting in this manner the Committee had gained his acceptance of the report.

93. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council (continuation).

Ratification of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925 : Effective control of the International Traffic (continuation).

The CHAIRMAN said that he had come to an agreement with M. Dinichert with regard to the paragraph to be inserted after the paragraph :

“ The fact that the new diplomatic instrument has not yet come into force has led to an unfortunate situation as far as the work of the Committee is concerned. ”

M. DINICHERT (Switzerland) then submitted the following paragraph :

“ The Committee was somewhat embarrassed by the fact that, although it appreciated the urgency of new measures of control, it was yet unwilling to propose their adoption by Governments at a moment when it was awaiting the early execution of a Convention which made provisions for measures of that very kind. ”

This paragraph was adopted.

Special Recommendations (continuation).

The CHAIRMAN stated that he understood Colonel Woods to propose that the paragraph he would insert would be quite short and that the annex would contain an analytical summary of his statement.

He pointed out that reference should be made in the report to Resolution X and he proposed the following draft as an amendment to the original first paragraph :

“ After an exchange of views, the members of the Committee thought it was advisable to ask the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to a certain number of measures referred to in Resolutions VIII, IX and X. These measures are connected with maritime insurance policies, smuggling carried out by means of the post and the necessity of direct contact between the authorities responsible for enforcing the laws regarding the illicit traffic. ”

This was adopted.

The report was then adopted as a whole (Annex 15).

The CHAIRMAN stated that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, he would like the Committee to examine the list of annexes.

The ACTING SECRETARY then read the following list of annexes :

1. List of signatures, ratifications and adhesions to the 1912 Hague Convention.
2. List of signatures, ratifications and adhesions to the Agreement signed at Geneva in 1925.
3. List of signatures, ratifications and adhesions to the Convention signed at Geneva in 1925.
4. List of annual reports received from Governments.
5. System of import certificates.
6. Opium shipments from the port of Bushire.
7. British memorandum as to maritime insurance of consignments of drugs.
8. Circular issued by the Chinese Maritime Customs in regard to smuggling of drugs through the post.
9. Extract from document O.C. 420.
10. Summary of Colonel Woods' suggestions.
11. Extracts from the Indian Excise Reports in regard to cocaine smuggling in India.
12. Memorandum on the situation in Egypt.

94. Close of the Session.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, *which was carried unanimously.*

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking his colleagues for this proof of their esteem, stated that he also wished to thank them for the kindness they had shown him, and the members of the Secretariat for the assistance they had given in the work of the Committee.

He then declared the Eighth Session of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs closed.

LIST OF ANNEXES.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Agenda of the Session | 128 |
| 2. Progress Report by the Acting Secretary | 129 |
| 3. Summary of Annual Reports of Governments | 146 |
| 4. King's Regulations made under Article 55 of the Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council, 1907 | 200 |
| 5. Report by the Rotterdam Police concerning a Seizure of Drugs in Rotterdam . . | 201 |
| 5(a) Letter from Dr. Anselmino concerning a Seizure of Drugs at Rotterdam . . . | 203 |
| 5(b) Letter from the Netherlands Government concerning a Seizure of Drugs at Tientsin on Board the s.s. <i>Westerdijk</i> | 204 |
| 6. Letter and Memorandum from the German Government concerning a Seizure of Drugs at Hamburg | 204 |
| 7. Note by the British Government concerning a Seizure of Drugs at Singapore . . | 205 |
| 7(a) Seizures in the Straits Settlements during March, April and May 1924. | 206 |
| 7(b) Result of Investigations instituted by the German Authorities in the Matter of Export of Narcotics through a German Firm to a Bulgarian Firm | 207 |
| 8. Note by the Japanese Representative concerning the Illicit Traffic in Shanghai | 208 |
| 8(a) Letter from the Secretary of the International Anti-Opium Association enclosing a Report of Shanghai Customs Narcotic Seizures for the Quarter ending March 15th, 1926 | 208 |
| 8(b) Memorandum by the German Government concerning the Smuggling of Drugs . | 209 |
| 9. Report by the Superintendent of Imports and Exports at Hong-Kong concerning the Traffic with the United States of America in Indian Opium obtained from Kwang Chow Wan | 210 |
| 10. Letter from the German Consul-General at Geneva concerning Forged Labels on Packets containing Narcotics | 212 |
| 11. Letter from Dr. Anselmino with regard to Duplicate Export Certificates | 213 |
| 12. Extracts from Intelligence Reports from His Britannic Majesty's Consuls in China for the Half-Year ending September 30th, 1925 | 214 |
| 13. Letter from the Governor of Hong-Kong to the British Government regarding a Seizure of Opium by the Government of Hong-Kong | 215 |
| 14. Summary of a Despatch from the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Soviet Ambassador in Peking protesting against the Smuggling of Russian Opium into Manchuria | 216 |
| 15. Report to the Council on the Work of the Eighth Session of the Committee . . . | 216 |

Annex 1.

AGENDA OF THE EIGHTH SESSION.

Adopted by the Commission on May 26th, 1926.

The items printed in italics were added to the Agenda during the session.

1. Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.
2. Adoption of the Agenda.
3. Progress Report by the Acting Secretary.
4. Annual Reports from Governments :
 - (a) Consideration of reports received ;
 - (b) Omission of certain Governments to furnish an Annual Report to the League or to furnish, to the Netherlands Government, the information stipulated in Article 21 of the Hague Convention.
5. Consideration of the position as regards :
 - (a) Ratification and
 - (b) Application of the Hague Convention in :
 - (i) Turkey ;
 - (ii) Central and South America ;
 - (iii) Other States.
6. Reservation made by the Austrian Government when signing the International Opium Convention of 1925 (extract from the Minutes of the Thirty-ninth Session of the Council).
7. Question of the illicit traffic :
 - (a) Reports of seizures ;
 - (b) Traffic from the Persian Gulf ;
 - (c) The Hai Tung Pharmacy (Shanghai) case ;
 - (d) Hoshi and Miedbrodt prosecutions (Formosa) : request for information ;
 - (e) The position at Dairen ;
 - (f) Report by the Rotterdam police on the proceedings of the firms Buxtorf and Co., of Basle, and A. Broemsen, of Hamburg ;
 - (g) Smuggling operations at Hamburg ;
 - (h) Seizure at Singapore ;
 - (i) Omissions or delays on the part of Governments to notify results of investigations into cases of illicit traffic reported to them ;
 - (j) Other matters.
8. Action to be taken by the Secretariat with regard to the circulation of seizure reports.
- 8 (a) *Situation with regard to the import certificate system.*
9. China.
 - (a) The opium situation : consideration of information available from China ;
 - (b) *Smuggling of opium from China ; smuggling of opium from Russia into China ;*
 - (c) Drug traffic.
10. Opium situation in mandated territories.
11. Report of steps taken by the Health Committee to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of the Convention of the Second Opium Conference.
12. To call attention to the new British regulations for British subjects in Persia and to propose a resolution.
13. To call attention to the clause which is now being inserted in all maritime insurance policies in Great Britain and to propose a resolution that similar action should be taken in other countries.
14. Consideration of the list of drugs established by the Committee of Experts.
- 14 (a) Examination of the situation with regard to ratifications of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925.
15. Matters left over from the last session of the Committee.
 - (a) The export of morphine from France to Greece and Cuba (Annual Report from France, 1923 (O.C. 23 (s) ; page 20 of the Minutes of the last session of the Committee).

- (b) The export of raw cocaine from the Netherlands to France (Annual Report from France, 1923 (O. C. 23 (s) 1 ; page 20 of the Minutes of the last session of the Committee).
 - (c) The question of imports of heroin into Formosa in 1923 (Annual Report from Formosa, 1923 (O. C. 23 (c) 1 ; page 19 of the Minutes of the last session of the Committee).
 - (d) The relation of the quantities of raw opium used in Japan in the manufacture of morphine and heroin to the amounts produced (Annual Report from Japan, 1923 (O. C. 23 (c) 1 ; page 34 of the Minutes of the last session of the Committee, and O. C. 428).
- 15 (a) Questions regarding Extradition Treaties.
 16. Advisability of stating the morphine content of opium imported for uses other than for the manufacture of prepared opium : memorandum by the Secretariat.
 17. *Letter from the Union catholique d'Eludes internationales.*
 18. Consideration of the International Anti-Opium Association : report on new opium substitutes, and Dr. Knaffl-Lenz's notes thereon.
 19. *Budgel.*
 20. Other matters.

Annex 2.

O. C. 421.

PROGRESS REPORT BY THE ACTING SECRETARY

submitted to the Committee on May 26th, 1926.

The report and resolutions of the Seventh Session of the Advisory Committee held from August 24th to August 31st, 1925, were approved by the Council on September 9th, 1925, and adopted by the Assembly on September 26th, 1925.

I. AGREEMENT AND CONVENTION DRAWN UP BY THE FIRST AND SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCES.

LIST OF SIGNATURES, RATIFICATIONS AND ADHESIONS.

First Conference.

| Agreement | Signatures Protocol | Final Act | Ratifications Agreement and Protocol |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------|---|
| France | France | France | France |
| Great Britain | Great Britain | Great Britain | Great Britain |
| India | India | India | India |
| Japan | Japan | Japan | |
| Netherlands | Netherlands | Netherlands | |
| Portugal | Portugal | Portugal | |
| Siam | Siam | Siam | |

Second Conference.

| Convention | Signatures Protocol | Final Act | Convention | Ratifications Protocol |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Albania | Albania | Albania | | |
| Australia | Australia | Australia | Australia | Australia |
| Austria (with reservation) | | | | |
| Belgium | | Belgium | | |
| Brazil | | Bolivia | | |
| Bulgaria | Bulgaria | Brazil | | |
| Canada | Canada | Bulgaria | | |
| Chile | Chile | | | |
| Cuba | Cuba | Cuba | | |
| Czechoslovakia | Czechoslovakia | Czechoslovakia | | |
| Denmark | | Denmark | | |
| France | | France | | |
| Germany | Germany | Germany | | |

Second Conference (continued).

| Convention | Signatures Protocol | Final Act | Ratifications | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | Convention | Protocol |
| 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 | | |
| Netherlands | Netherlands | Netherlands | | |
| New Zealand | New Zealand | | New Zealand | New Zealand |
| Nicaragua | Nicaragua | Nicaragua | | |
| Persia | Persia | Persia | | |
| Poland | | Poland | | |
| 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 | | |
| Sudan | Sudan | | Sudan | Sudan |
| Spain | | Spain | | |
| Switzerland | | Switzerland | | |
| Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa | | Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa |
| Uruguay | | Uruguay | | |

Adhesions

Egypt
Roumania
Salvador
San Marino
Sarawak

II. RESOLUTIONS REQUIRING ACTION PASSED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 1925.

Illicit Traffic : Resolution I of the Advisory Committee.

"1. The Committee desires to call the attention of the Council and the Assembly to the prevalence of the illicit traffic in the drugs at the present time, its organised character and the large financial resources behind it, as indicated by the documents laid before the Committee and appended to its report.

"2. Its examination of these reports and of the action taken by various Governments, as indicated in the reports, leads the Committee to urge, in amplification of its previous recommendations on the subject :

"(a) That in all cases in which illicit transactions are discovered or suspected, the most energetic steps should be taken by the Government to follow up every clue which may lead to the discovery of the persons engaged in the traffic ;

"(b) That any information pointing to the complicity of any person or persons in another country should be *immediately* communicated to the Government of that country with a view to similar investigations being made (the recommendations made by the Committee in 1922 and 1923 have in many cases not been acted upon by the Governments). A report of the results of the investigations should be sent to the Government communicating the information (and to the Secretariat of the League in any case in which the communication is made through the Secretariat) ;

"(c) That the particulars so communicated should be as full as possible and should include in particular, if known, a description of the packages and the *marks* on the packages, the names and addresses of the consignor and consignee, the names and addresses of any agents through whom the goods have passed, the place from which the goods were despatched, the date on which they were despatched, the name of the ship (or description of the route) by which they were despatched, etc. Specimens of the containers and label should also be sent.

"3. The Committee would also lay great stress on the importance of discovering the sources from which the supplies are obtained by the illicit traffickers and of dealing severely with firms of licensed manufacturers and dealers who are found to be knowingly supplying

drugs for the illicit traffic. In the opinion of the Committee, the most effective method of dealing with such manufacturers and dealers is to deprive them of their licence or authorisation to manufacture, deal in or be in possession of the drugs, and it recommends that this course should be considered by the Government in each case.

" 4. The Committee would also draw attention to the fact that, in some of the most important cases mentioned in the documents before it, it has not been possible for the Governments to take any action for the punishment of the persons engaged, for the reason that no offence against the laws of the country had been committed, and it would point out that this fact strongly emphasises the importance of the provisions in Article 29 of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference in February 1925. "

On October 31st, 1925, a letter (C.L. 132, 1925) forwarding this resolution was despatched to all States Members of the League and to the Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912. The only replies received up to date are from the Governments of :

- Cuba stating that the most energetic measures are taken to suppress the illicit traffic in opium and drugs and that it is proposed to establish a special legislation in conformity with the terms of the Opium Convention of 1925 ;
- Finland stating that the attention of the Finnish Government is being drawn to the recommendations contained in the resolution.

A list of departments which the Secretariat has been informed are authorised to exchange information concerning seizures will be found in Appendix I to this document.

Illicit Traffic in the Persian Gulf; Resolution II of the Advisory Committee.

" The Committee desires to call the attention of the Council to the large illicit traffic in opium which is being carried on between the Persian Gulf and the Far East, and it suggests :

" (a) That the Persian Government should be urged to put into force *without delay* an effective system of control over exports of opium from Persian ports, more particularly by the adoption of the system of export authorisations and import certificates in respect of each consignment ;

" (b) That Powers whose flag is carried by ships engaged in trade with the Persian Gulf should be recommended to adopt measures to control the conveyance of opium from the Persian Gulf on such ships and to prevent its diversion into the illicit traffic ;

" (c) That Powers at whose ports vessels conveying opium from the Persian Gulf call should be recommended to put in force at once the measures contained in Chapter V of the Convention concluded by the Second International Opium Conference for the control of transshipment of consignments of opium and dangerous drugs. "

(a) A letter was forwarded to the Persian Government on October 8th, 1925, drawing attention to this resolution and inviting that Government to institute a system of control.

(b) A letter forwarding this resolution was sent to all Governments except Austria, Hungary, Paraguay and Switzerland on October 31st, 1925 (C.L. 133).

The following replies have been received :

- Monaco States that it has no separate customs from France, and no ships flying its flag in the Persian Gulf.
- Norway Forwards a draft law already submitted to the Storting (see Appendix II to this document).

Acknowledgments have been received from :

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Argentine | Germany |
| Cuba | Uruguay |
| Finland | Venezuela |

(c) This resolution was submitted to all Governments on October 31st, 1925 (C.L. 134).

The letter has been acknowledged by the following Governments :

| | |
|---------|-----------|
| Cuba | Uruguay |
| Finland | Venezuela |
| Monaco | |

Date of the Despatch of Annual Reports : Resolution III of the Advisory Committee.

“ The Committee asks the Council to represent to the States Members of the League or parties to the Convention the importance, for the work of the Committee, of the annual reports relating to the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs being despatched in no case later than October 1st following the year to which the reports relate in the case of Far Eastern States, or than July 1st in the case of other States. ”

A letter forwarding this resolution was sent to all States on October 30th, 1925 (C.L. 128). Since the last meeting of the Committee the following countries have sent in reports or statistical information :

| 1924 | | 1925 | |
|----------|-------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Austria | Japan | Belgium | |
| Belgium | Lithuania | Finland | |
| Bulgaria | Netherlands | Great Britain (summary of exports) | |
| Danzig | New Zealand | | |
| Esthonia | Poland | Sudan | |
| Greece | Roumania | Switzerland | |
| India | Siam | Union of South Africa | |
| Italy | Sudan | | |

Colonies.

| 1924 | | 1925 | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| <i>British :</i> | | | |
| Gold Coast | | Basutoland | |
| Malay States (Federated) | | Falkland Islands | |
| Malay States (Unfederated) | | Fiji | |
| Mauritius | | Gambia | |
| St. Lucia | | Jamaica | |
| Seychelles | | Nyasaland | |
| Solomon Islands | | Trinidad and Tobago | |
| Somaliland | | Zanzibar | |
| Straits Settlements | | | |
| Uganda | | | |

French :

Equatorial Africa
Guadeloupe
Guiana
India
Indo-China
Madagascar
Martinique
New Caledonia
Oceania
Reunion
St. Pierre and Miquelon
Somali Coast
West Africa

Japanese :

Chosen
Formosa
Kwantung Leased Territory

Netherlands :

Curaçao
Netherlands East Indies

Surinam

Mandated Territories.

British :

New Guinea (Australian Mandate) New Guinea (Australian Mandate)
Palestine
Tanganyika

French :

Cameroons
Togoland

A detailed statement with regard to annual reports received from Governments Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912, will be found in Appendix III to this document.

Extradition Treaty between the United States and Canada ; Resolution V of the Advisory Committee.

" The Committee, having had its attention called to the extradition treaty recently concluded between the United States and Canada in respect of offenders against the laws relating to opium and dangerous drugs and being impressed with the gravity of many of the offences against those laws, suggests to the Council that the attention of the Governments Members of the League or Parties to the Convention might be called to the conclusion of this treaty, and that they might be asked to examine the question with a view to the possible conclusion of similar treaties. "

This resolution was embodied in a letter sent to all Governments (except Canada and the United States of America) on October 28th, 1925 (C.L. 129).

The following communications have been received :

- Argentine Acknowledgment.
- Cuba An extradition treaty was signed between Cuba and the United States of America on January 18th, 1926 (see Appendix IV to this document).
- Finland Acknowledgment.
- Norway States that it does not appear necessary to conclude such a treaty between Norway and other countries at present.
- Switzerland Due attention will be given to the treaty should Switzerland contemplate concluding a similar one on the same subject.
- Uruguay The matter is being considered by the authorities.
- Venezuela Acknowledgment.

Export Authorisations : Resolution VI of the Advisory Committee.

" The Committee, having considered the method by which the provisions in Articles 13 and 15 of the Convention adopted by the Second International Opium Conference (that a copy of any export authorisation or diversion certificate shall be sent to the Government of the importing country) can be best carried into effect, recommends that the copies should be sent direct by the authority which issues the certificate to the corresponding authority in the importing country, and that, on the Convention coming into operation, a list of the authorities in the different countries charged with the issue and reception of such certificates should be issued by the Council to all the signatory States. Alternatively, a copy might be sent, if preferred, through the consular or diplomatic officer in the importing country. "

All Governments were informed of this resolution by a letter dated October 28th, 1925 (C.L. 130). Replies have been received from the following :

- Cuba The resolution will be considered by the authorities.
- Danzig " Senat der Freien Stadt Danzig, Abteilung für Soziales und Gesundheitswesen, Gesundheitsverwaltung ", is the authority charged with the issue and receipt of certificates.
- Finland The Finnish authorities have been informed of the resolution.
- Germany In order to prevent the illegal export of drugs to a country which has not as yet adopted the import certificate system or with which Germany has not yet concluded a special agreement, the German Government will advise the interested Government each time a permit is given for such export.
- Great Britain The British Government adopts the resolution of the Advisory Committee and is prepared to act on it.
- Greece The Greek Government forwarded a copy of a law dated October 14th, 1925 (see Appendix V to this document).
- Switzerland Note has been taken of the resolution, and it will be considered when the International Drug Convention comes into force in Switzerland.

III. EXTRA-TERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA. -

The following resolution, adopted by the Council and Assembly on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in 1924, was re-affirmed at the last meeting of the Committee :

“ The Advisory Committee recommends that Powers having extra-territorial rights in China should, if they have not already done so, make regulations, the breach of which shall be punishable by adequate penalties, to control the carrying-on by their nationals in China of any trade in the drugs to which Chapter III of the Convention applies. The Committee further recommends that copies of such regulations be communicated to the Secretariat of the League.”

In reply to a circular letter (No. 135) communicated to the Governments of :

| | | | |
|---------|-------------|----------|------------------|
| Belgium | Italy | Norway | Sweden |
| Brazil | Japan | Peru | Switzerland |
| Denmark | Mexico | Portugal | United States of |
| France | Netherlands | Spain | America |

the following replies have been received :

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Netherlands | Encloses police regulations in force in China. |
| Switzerland | States that this question is being studied by the authorities. |
| United States of America | Refers to its reply to document G.L. 126, 1923, communicated to the Advisory Committee at its last session. |

IV. IMPORT-CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

Brazil.

On November 16th, 1925, Dr. Carrière wrote to the Secretariat with regard to the position of Brazil as regards the certificate system. A letter was despatched to Dr. Carrière in reply to his enquiry stating that the Government of Brazil had accepted the system but had not yet notified the Secretariat that it was actually in force in that country. Dr. Carrière then wrote and informed the Secretariat that, in these circumstances, Switzerland would continue to allow drugs to be exported to Brazil without a certificate of import being produced by that Government. On February 26th, 1926, a letter was addressed to M. de Mello Franco, the Brazilian representative in Geneva, by the Secretary-General, enclosing copies of the correspondence which had taken place between Dr. Carrière, Sir Malcolm Delevingne and the Secretariat on this subject, and asking him if he would inform the Secretariat as to the situation in regard to this system in Brazil. No reply has yet been received.

Germany.

A letter, dated March 3rd, 1926, was received by the Secretariat from Dr. Anselmino (see Appendix VI to this document) with reference to the difficulties which arise in the working of the present system of certificates.

Portugal.

The Secretariat has received a copy of a law promulgated in Portugal on December 9th, 1924 (see Appendix VII to this document).

A table giving the position of countries with regard to this system is given in Appendix VIII.

Appendix I.

LIST OF SERVICES AUTHORISED TO EXCHANGE INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO SEIZURES.

| <i>Country.</i> | <i>Service.</i> |
|-------------------|--|
| Albania | Direction de la Santé publique, Tirana. |
| Australia | Trade and Customs Department, Melbourne. |
| Austria | Volksgesundheitsamt in Bundesministerium für soziale Verwaltung, Hofgartenstrasse 3, Vienna. |

| <i>Country.</i> | <i>Service.</i> |
|---|---|
| Belgium | Ministère des Finances, Administration des Contributions directes, douanes et accises, Bruxelles. |
| Brazil | Departamento Nacional de Sanidad Publica, Buenos Ayres. |
| Canada | Deputy Minister, Department of Health, Ottawa. |
| Chile | Direccion General de Sanidad, Santiago. |
| China | Ministry of the Interior, Peking. |
| Czechoslovakia | Ministère de l'Hygiène publique, Praha. |
| Danzig | Sénat de la Ville Libre, Danzig. |
| Denmark | Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Copenhagen. |
| Finland | Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Bureau finlandais de la Société des Nations, Helsingfors. |
| France | Direction des Affaires, administrations et techniques (Sous-direction des Unions), Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris. |
| Germany.. .. . | Reichsgesundheitsamt, Berlin. |
| Great Britain | Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, London, S.W.1. |
| Greece | Direction d'Hygiène du Ministère d'Hygiène et de la Prévoyance sociale, Athens. |
| Hungary | Ministère royal hongrois de la Prévoyance sociale et du Travail, Budapest. |
| India | Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, London, S.W.1. For urgent cases : The Collector of Customs at Bombay, Calcutta, Karachi, Madras or Rangoon. |
| Italy | Ministero degli Interni, Direzione Generale di Sanita, Rome. |
| Latvia | Département de l'Hygiène publique du Ministère de l'Intérieur, Riga. |
| Lithuania | Département de la Santé publique. |
| Netherlands | Division des Affaires de la Société des Nations, Département des Affaires étrangères, La Haye. |
| New Zealand | Comptroller of Customs, Wellington. |
| Norway | Ministère des Affaires sociales, Oslo. |
| Poland | Ministère de l'Hygiène publique. |
| Roumania | Direction générale du Service sanitaire au Ministère Royal du Travail et de la Santé publique. |
| Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes | Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Section pour la Société des Nations. |
| Siam | Foreign Office, Bangkok. |
| Spain | Information to be sent to : Ministerio de Estado, Oficina Espanola de la Sociedad de las Naciones. Information will be forwarded by : Central Administration of Customs. |
| Sweden | Direction générale des services médicaux, Stockholm. |
| Switzerland | Département politique fédéral, Division des Affaires étrangères, Berne. (Provisional.) |
| Union of South Africa | Secretary for Public Health, Department of Public Health, Union Buildings, Pretoria. |
| United States of America | Treasury Department. |

Colonies.

British :

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Gibraltar.. .. . | Colonial Secretary. |
| Cyprus | Colonial Secretary, Nicosia. |
| Palestine | Chief Secretary, Jerusalem. |
| Ceylon | Colonial Secretary, Colombo. |
| Hong-Kong | Colonial Secretary, Hong-Kong. |
| Weihaiwei | Officer Administering the Government. |
| Straits Settlements | Colonial Secretary, Singapore. |
| Federated Malay States | Chief Secretary, Kuala Lumpur. |
| Unfederated Malay States : | |
| Johore | General Adviser, Johore Bahru. |
| Kedah | British Adviser, Alor Star. |
| Perlis | British Adviser, Perlis. |
| Kelantan | British Adviser, Kota Bahru. |
| Trengganu | British Adviser, Kuala Trengganu, <i>via</i> Singapore. |
| Brunei | British Resident, Brunei. |
| North Borneo | Government Secretary, Jesselton. |

| <i>Country.</i> | <i>Service.</i> |
|--|--|
| Sarawak | Chief Secretary, Kuching. |
| Mauritius | Colonial Secretary. |
| Seychelles | Chief Medical Officer. |
| St. Helena | Colonial Surgeon. |
| Nigeria (including the British sphere of the Cameroons) .. | Chief Secretary, Lagos. |
| Gold Coast (including the British sphere of Togoland) | Colonial Secretary, Accra. |
| Gambia | Colonial Secretary, Bathurst. |
| Sierra Leone | Colonial Secretary, Freetown. |
| Kenya | Colonial Secretary, Nairobi. |
| Zanzibar | Chief Secretary. |
| Uganda | Chief Secretary, Entebbe. |
| Nyasaland | Chief Secretary, Zomba. |
| Tanganyika Territory | Chief Secretary, Dar-es-Salaam. |
| Somaliland | Secretary to the Administrator, Berbera. |
| Northern Rhodesia | Chief Secretary, Livingstone. |
| Basutoland | Government Secretary, Maseru. |
| Bechuanaland Protectorate .. | Government Secretary, Mafeking. |
| Swaziland | Government Secretary, Mbabane. |
| Bahamas | Colonial Secretary, Nassau. |
| Bermuda | Colonial Secretary, Hamilton. |
| British Guiana | Colonial Secretary, Georgetown. |
| British Honduras | Colonial Secretary, Belize. |
| Falkland Islands | Colonial Secretary, Port Stanley. |
| Barbados | Colonial Secretary, Bridgetown. |
| Jamaica | Colonial Secretary, Kingston. |
| Trinidad | Colonial Secretary, Port of Spain. |
| Windward Islands | Colonial Secretary, Grenada. |
| Leeward Islands | Colonial Secretary, Antigua. |
| Fiji | Colonial Secretary, Suva. |
| Netherlands : | |
| Netherlands East Indies | For States other than Far Eastern States : Division des Affaires de la Société des Nations du Ministère des Affaires étrangères, La Haye. For Far Eastern States : Chef du Service de la Régie de l'Opium, Weltevreten, Java. |
| Curaçao | For States outside America : Division des Affaires de la Société des Nations du Ministère des Affaires étrangères, La Haye. For American States : Procureur général de la Cour de Justice, à Willemstad. |
| Surinam | For non-American States : Division des Affaires de la Société des Nations du Ministère des Affaires étrangères, La Haye. For American States : Procureur général de la Cour de Justice, à Paramaribo. |

Appendix II.

**NORWEGIAN DRAFT LAW ON THE PUNISHMENT
FOR SMUGGLING OR ASSISTING IN SMUGGLING INTO OTHER COUNTRIES,
DATED DECEMBER 11th, 1925.**

Article 1.

Any shipowner or agent employing a Norwegian vessel for smuggling into a foreign country shall be liable to a fine.
This provision shall also apply to any shipowner or agent hiring out or chartering a Norwegian vessel, if he knows or might reasonably be expected to know that the hirer or charterer intends to employ such vessel in smuggling into a foreign country.

Article 2.

For the purposes of this law, smuggling shall also include the discharge of a ship's cargo outside the Customs frontier of another country under circumstances which give rise to a strong presumption that it is intended to smuggle the cargo.

Article 3.

The proceeds of such illegal transactions shall be confiscated and recovered either from the offender or from the person or persons for whom he acted.

Article 4.

The present law shall come into force immediately.
(It is pointed out in the introduction that the law applies not merely to the smuggling of liquor into the United States—though this is its chief object—but also to the smuggling of arms, cocaine and opium into any country.)

Appendix III.

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 |
|----------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|
| Abyssinia | Letter despatched to the Secretariat on October 23rd, 1924. No manufacture, consumption or traffic. Small quantities imported for medicinal purposes. | | | | |
| Albania | Letter despatched to Secretariat on March 10th, 1923. Cannot answer questions in annual report form. Dangerous drugs only used for medicinal 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 | — | — | — | — | — |
| Esthonia | × | × | × | × | — |
| 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. | | | | |

| | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 |
|---|---|------|------|--|------|
| Honduras | — | — | — | — | — |
| Hungary | × | × | × | × | — |
| Iceland | — | — | — | — | — |
| 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. | | | | |
| Netherlands | × | × | × | × | — |
| New Zealand | × | × | × | × | — |
| Nicaragua | — | — | — | — | — |
| Norway | — | × | × | × | — |
| Panama | Letter despatched on March 26th, 1923, saying 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 | — | — | × | × | — |
| | | | | (first three months only.) | |
| Sweden | — | × | × | × | — |
| Switzerland | Statistics for 1921, 1922 and 1923 were forwarded by Dr. Carrière (document O.C. 206). | | | | × |
| | | | | (Imports and exports for the last five months only.) | |
| 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 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| British : | | | | | |
| Ceylon | × | × | × | × | — |
| Hong-Kong | — | × | × | × | — |
| Straits Settlements | × | × | × | × | — |
| French : | | | | | |
| Indo-China | × | × | × | × | — |
| Japanese : | | | | | |
| Chosen | × | × | × | × | — |
| Formosa | × | × | × | × | — |
| Kwantung Leased Territory | × | × | × | × | — |
| Netherlands : | | | | | |
| Netherlands East Indies | × | × | × | × | — |
| Portuguese : | | | | | |
| Macao | — | × | — | × | — |

Appendix IV.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CUBA.

Letter from the Government of Cuba to the Secretary-General.

Havana, January 25th, 1926.

With reference to your communication No. C.L. 129, 1925. XI, dated October 28th, last, concerning Resolution V of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, in which it was recommended that the Governments Members of the League should conclude extradition treaties in respect of offenders against the laws relating to dangerous drugs on the same lines as the treaty concluded between the United States and Canada, I have pleasure in stating, for the information of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and the other States Members of the League of Nations, that on the 18th instant there was signed an extradition treaty between Cuba and the United States which applies to persons committing offences in connection with the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

(Signed) Miguel Angel CAMPE,
Under-Secretary of State.

Appendix V.

TRANSLATION OF THE GREEK LAW DATED OCTOBER 14th, 1925.

Article 1.

The Greek Government shall alone have the right to import and sell opium and its derivatives, preparations containing opium and coca leaves and coca derivatives, throughout the whole of the Greek State.

Article 2.

The *papaver somniferum* may be cultivated on authorisation being given by the Ministry of Finance after consideration of a declaration made by the party concerned. The product shall only be exported subject to a licence, or, more strictly speaking, a decree, issued by the Ministers of Health, etc., and Finance, according to regulations to be laid down later.

Article 3.

The Minister of Finance is authorised to obtain, for pharmaceutical or therapeutic purposes, either directly or by inviting tenders, supplies of home-grown or foreign opium, morphine or its salts (heroin, etc., pantopon, etc.) and cocaine and its derivatives salts. These supplies may not exceed the amount required for two years.

The preparation of opium may, upon the authorisation of the Supreme Health Council, be entrusted to national factories under a contract for not more than three years. Morphine and its salts and all other pharmaceutical preparations may also be produced by national factories upon the same conditions. The various kinds of morphine and cocaine salts and their preparations shall be regulated by decree.

Article 4.

The sale of opium and its derivatives and of all narcotics referred to in the present legislative decree shall be undertaken by the Administrator of the Central State Depot for Quinine and Saccharine and by the Annexes of the Chemical Laboratory of the Ministry of Finance. These drugs may only be sold to recognised pharmacies and hospitals, by virtue of a licence issued by the Health Department at the Ministry of Health. Notice shall be given annually of the maximum amounts of each drug which may be purchased by the various pharmacies.

Every chemist or manager of a pharmacy shall keep a book, supplied free of charge by the Ministry of Finance, in which he must enter daily in chronological order the quantities and kinds of narcotics, mentioned in the present decree, which are bought from the monopoly, and the quantities and kinds dispensed or sold for pharmaceutical or therapeutical purposes

to holders of medical prescriptions. Similarly, the Monopoly Office at the Ministry of Finance shall keep a register, in which shall be inserted the name of the chemist and the quantities issued to him.

Pharmaceutical preparations of opium and coca and their derivatives may be made up by chemists from opium and coca leaves, in accordance with the official Greek Pharmacopœia.

The price of opium and narcotics sold by the State in conformity with the present decree shall be fixed by means of decrees. This price may not be less than the actual cost of the drugs, plus 10 per cent to cover losses and the cost of handling. The retail price charged by chemists shall be fixed according to the scale in force.

Article 5.

The drugs referred to in the present decree shall not pass in transit through the Greek Customs or be re-loaded in a Greek port. When imported in postal packages or as samples of no value without a special licence from the Ministry of Finance, they shall be confiscated and destroyed so that no use can be made of them. The same rule applies to cigarette paper, playing cards and matches, which are a State monopoly.

Article 6.

The competent court shall impose a fine not exceeding 10,000 drachmæ, or, on reconviction, a fine of from 4,000 to 30,000 drachmæ, upon the following :

(a) Chemists and druggists who do not keep, or do not properly keep, the book referred to in Article 4 above, and sell monopoly drugs at prices higher than those quoted in the official scale ;

(b) Those who sell adulterated monopoly drugs ;

(c) Those who sell or have in their possession monopoly drugs without a licence, even if such drugs come from Government monopoly depots ;

(d) Those who defraud their customers by giving false weight, or those who sell monopoly drugs without requiring a doctor's prescription ;

(e) Doctors who give prescriptions without adequate reason ;

(f) Directors of public, municipal or private hospitals and clinics, whenever they use these drugs for other than hospital requirements.

Article 7.

A fine of 50,000 drachmæ per kilogramme of opium, and 1,000 drachmæ per gramme of salts of morphine, cocaine or other narcotic drugs, referred to in this legislative decree, and imprisonment for from one month to five years may be imposed on any person :

(a) Importing or attempting to import monopoly drugs clandestinely from abroad ;

(b) Preparing or attempting to prepare such drugs ;

(c) Cultivating the *papaver somniferum* without a licence, or making inaccurate declarations to the authorities, or failing to declare the true quantities of opium produced, or surreptitiously exporting opium ;

(d) In possession of opium, morphine, cocaine and other narcotic drugs of any origin whatever, in a vessel of less than 100 tons, at anchor in a roadstead or skirting the coast at a distance of two kilometers, with intent to dispose of such drugs secretly. These vessels are only allowed a small quantity of tincture of opium for medicinal purposes ;

(e) Selling or having in his possession, three months after the entry into force of this decree, monopoly drugs not coming from State depots ;

(f) Accepting postal packages or samples without value, as referred to in Article 5, or ordering or paying for a postal consignment, or merely accepting delivery of such a consignment without official authorisation.

The drugs referred to above shall be confiscated and destroyed.

According to instructions issued by the Minister of Finance, a reward of 25,000 drachmæ per kilogramme of opium, and of not more than 500 drachmæ per gramme of salts of morphine, cocaine or other narcotic drugs referred to in the present decree shall be paid to any person giving information regarding contraband trade in these drugs.

Article 8.

The counterfeiting or the employment for a second time of monopoly banderoles, signs or emblems, and the sale of monopoly drugs in boxes, bottles or receptacles bearing counterfeit monopoly banderoles, signs or emblems, shall be punished in accordance with Article 262 of

the Penal Code. The same shall apply to the making of plates used for printing the said banderoles, signs or emblems, etc.

Article 9.

Any persons who, upon the coming into force of the present decree, have in their possession opium or other narcotics referred to in the decree, and who make a declaration of the fact to the competent financial authorities within 15 days after its coming into force, shall be granted a period of three months from the date of its entry into operation for the sale or consumption of the drugs within the country or abroad, subject to the refunding of the Customs duties and other charges paid by them.

They may also place the drugs in the Customs depots with a view to export provided the Customs and fiscal charges are paid within a period of ten months.

When the period of three months has expired, any drugs which have not been exported or deposited at the Customs must be handed over to the Government, which shall pay compensation as provided for under Law No. 3951 dated December 4th, 1911, and No. 103 dated December 26th, 1913.

Article 10.

This decree shall come into force as soon as it is published in the *Official Journal*.

The Ministers for Health, etc., and for Finance shall be responsible for the publication and the execution of the present decree, which must be communicated to the Constituent Assembly at Athens within three months after its publication.

Hydra, October 14th, 1925.

Appendix VI.

LETTER FROM DR. ANSELMINO WITH REGARD TO DUPLICATE EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

January 6th, 1926.

The working of the system of certificates for narcotics has not infrequently involved unforeseen difficulties, owing to certain countries requiring the certificate to be produced, together with the goods, at their Customs offices, whereas other countries require its submission to the consular offices in the country of export; the latter offices, as a rule, retain the certificates.

As German opium legislation, following the lines recommended by the League of Nations, lays down that the certificates which have to be produced in order to obtain an export permit are to be retained in the Reich Public Health Office, it becomes impossible, in the cases referred to above, to effect deliveries, or, at best, considerable loss of time and expense are incurred owing to the necessity of applying for duplicates of the certificates. It seems to me that these difficulties might be avoided if the certificates were made out in a sufficient number of copies to satisfy the internal regulations of the country concerned and to leave one copy over for retention by the Government of the exporting country. This procedure is adopted in Switzerland and the Philippine Islands.

Until this matter has been settled by the decisions of the Geneva Convention of 1925, I would suggest, with a view to remedying the present difficulties, that countries issuing certificates should send one copy of the certificate to the exporting country for its exclusive use, so that no question of the return of the certificate would arise.

(Signed) ANSELMINO.

Appendix VII.

PORTUGUESE LAW No. 1687.

Article 1.

The importation for consumption of the products referred to in Article 2 through the Customs offices of Portugal and the adjacent islands shall be subject to the conditions laid down in the present law.

Article 2.

Raw opium, officinal opium, the alkaloids of opium (morphine, codein, narcein, papaverin, narcotin, etc.), all opium preparations, the salts and derivatives of opium alkaloids (heroin,

dionin, etc.), cocaine and its derivatives and ecgonin, may only be cleared on production of a certificate issued by the General Health Directorate ; they must be intended for legitimate medical or scientific purposes and may not be re-exported.

1. When the countries of origin demand it, a certificate shall be issued by the Portuguese Government stating that the products are intended for legitimate medical or scientific purposes and will not be re-exported.

2. The list given in the present article may be supplemented by the addition of any derivative of morphine or cocaine or of their salts, or any other alkaloid or drug of any kind which may produce similar effects to those produced by the use of opium, morphine or cocaine.

Article 3.

Any person wishing to import any of the products referred to in the present law shall make an application to the General Health Directorate in the form and on the conditions fixed by that body.

Article 4.

The importers or possessors of the products mentioned above may only sell the said products to pharmacies and scientific establishments on production of a duly authenticated certificate, and shall be obliged to declare each month in writing the quantity of each of the said products they have in stock, the quality and quantity and the names of the purchasers of the said products sold during the month.

Article 5.

Pharmacies may only sell the above-mentioned products to persons producing a medical prescription, and scientific establishments must prove that these products will be consumed for legitimate purposes.

Article 6.

Pharmacies, stores, or any other possessors of the products mentioned in the present law shall be obliged to declare, within 60 days, the quantity of each of the said products they have in stock.

Article 7.

Failure to observe the provisions of Articles 4, 5 and 6 shall be regarded as an offence under Decree No. 2, dated September 27th, 1894, by the authorities mentioned in the said decree, and shall be punishable with a fine of from 6 to 900 dollars ; subsequent offences shall be punished with the maximum fine and with imprisonment.

Article 8.

The fraudulent importation and exportation of the products mentioned in Article 2 shall be regarded as contraband trading and shall be punished as such.

Article 9.

All legislation contrary to the present law is hereby abrogated.
The present law shall be printed, published and applied by the Ministers of Justice, Finance, Foreign Affairs and Labour.

August 6th, 1923.

Appendix VIII.

IMPORT CERTIFICATE SYSTEM.

States which have accepted
the system
and put it into force

Albania
Australia
Austria

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

Netherlands

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

Brazil
Danzig
Lithuania

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

Belgium
Bulgaria
Canada
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Finland
Germany
Great Britain
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
India
Irish Free State
Italy
Japan
Latvia
New Zealand
Norway
Panama
Poland
Portugal
Siam
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of South Africa
United States of America

British Colonies.—The British Government has accepted the system on behalf of 39 colonies and for the following mandated territories :

Palestine
Iraq
Togoland
Cameroons
Tanganyika

Japanese Colonies :

Chosen
Formosa
Kwantung Leased Territory

Netherlands Colonies :

Netherlands East Indies

Appendix IX.

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS AUTHORISED TO ISSUE IMPORT AND EXPORT CERTIFICATES IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Albania | Direction générale de la Santé, Tirana. |
| Australia | Collector of Customs in each State. |
| Austria | Ministère fédéral pour l'administration sociale ; Département pour l'Hygiène publique. |
| Belgium | Ministère de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène. |
| Brazil | Departamento Nacional de Saúde Publica. |
| Bulgaria | Direction de la Santé publique, Ministère de l'Intérieur du Royaume. |
| Canada | Department of Health, Ottawa. |
| Cuba | Direccion de Sanidad. |
| Czechoslovakia | Ministère de l'Hygiène publique. |
| Danzig | Senat der Freien Stadt, Abteilung für Soziales und Gesundheitswesen—Gesundheitsverwaltung. |
| Denmark | Direction de la Santé publique, Ministère de la Justice. |
| Finland | Ministère de l'Intérieur. |
| Germany | Reichsgesundheitsamt. |
| Great Britain | Home Office, London. |
| Greece | Ministère de l'Intérieur, Direction de la Santé. |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Guatemala | Oficina de Inspeccion del Trafico del Opio. |
| Haiti | Secrétaire d'Etat de l'Intérieur. |
| Hungary | Ministère royal hongrois de la Prévoyance sociale et du Travail. |

India :

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Madras | Board of Revenue, Separate Revenue, Madras. |
|----------------|---|

Officer.

Area.

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Bombay | Commissioner in Sind Political Resident. Collector of Bombay. Commissioner of Customs, Salt and Excise. | Province of Sind. Aden. Bombay Town and Island. Rest of the Presidency. |
| Bengal | Excise Commissioner | Bengal |
| Burma | Excise Commissioner | Burma |
| Bihar and Orissa | Commissioner of Excise | Bihar and Orissa. |
| United Provinces | Excise Commissioner | United Provinces. |
| Punjab | Secretary of the Financial Commissioners. | Punjab. |
| Central Provinces | Excise Commissioner | Central Provinces. |
| Assam | Commissioner, Assam Val- ley Division, Gauhati. Commissioner, Surma Val- ley and Hill Division, Silchar. | Assam Valley Division. Surma Valley and Hill Division. |
| | Political Officer, Sadiya. Political Officer, Balipara Political Agent in Manipur. | Sadiya Frontier Tract. Balipara Frontier Tract. Manipur. |
| North-West Frontier Province | Revenue Commissioner | North-West Frontier Pro- vince. |
| Delhi | Chief Commissioner | Delhi. |
| Ajmer-Merwara | Commissioner. | Ajmer-Merwara. |
| Coorg | Commissioner. | Coorg. |
| Baluchistan | Revenue Commission. | Baluchistan, Quetta. |
| Irish Free State | Minister for Justice, Dublin. | |
| Japan | Director of Bureau of Hygiene and Sanitation, Dept. for Home Affairs, Tokio. | |
| Latvia | Pharmaceutical Section of Health Department. | |
| Luxemburg | Service sanitaire. | |
| Mexico | Departamento de Salubridad, Mexico. | |
| New Zealand | Comptroller of Customs, Wellington. | |
| Norway | Ministère des Affaires sociales, Oslo. | |
| Panama | Secretario de Hacienda y Tesoro. | |
| Poland | Direction générale du Service d'Hygiène, Ministère de l'Intérieur (exportation). Ministère de l'Hygiène publique (importation). | |
| Siam | Ministry of Finance (opium for smoking). Department of Public Health (medicinal opium). | |
| Spain | Director General de Sanidad, Madrid. | |
| Sweden | Direction générale des Services médicaux (Kungl. Medici- nalstyrelsen). | |
| Switzerland | Service fédéral de l'Hygiène publique, Berne. | |
| Union of South Africa | Department of Public Health, Union Buildings, Pretoria. | |
| United States of America | Narcotics Control Board. | |

British :

Colonies.

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Gibraltar | Colonial Secretary. |
| Cyprus | Colonial Secretary, Nicosia. |
| Palestine | Chief Secretary, Jerusalem. |
| Ceylon | Colonial Secretary, Colombo. |
| Hong-Kong | Colonial Secretary, Hong-Kong. |
| Weihaiwei | Officer Administering the Government. |
| Straits Settlements | Colonial Secretary, Singapore. |
| Federated Malay States | Chief Secretary, Kuala Lumpur. |
| Unfederated Malay States : | |
| Johore | General Adviser, Johore Bahru. |
| Kedah | British Adviser, Alor Star. |
| Perlis | British Adviser, Perlis. |
| Kelantan | British Adviser, Kota Bahru. |
| Trengganu | British Adviser, Kuala Trengganu, <i>via</i> Singapore. |
| Brunei | British Resident, Brunei. |

| | |
|---|--|
| North Borneo | Government Secretary, Jesselton. |
| Sarawak | Chief Secretary, Kuching. |
| Mauritius | Colonial Secretary. |
| Seychelles | Chief Medical Officer. |
| St. Helena | Colonial Surgeon. |
| Nigeria (including the British sphere of the Cameroons) | Chief Secretary, Lagos. |
| Gold Coast (including the British sphere of Togoland) .. | Colonial Secretary, Accra. |
| Gambia | Colonial Secretary, Bathurst. |
| Sierra Leone | Colonial Secretary, Freetown. |
| Kenya | Colonial Secretary, Nairobi. |
| Zanzibar | Chief Secretary. |
| Uganda | Chief Secretary, Entebbe. |
| Nyasaland | Chief Secretary, Zomba. |
| Tanganyika Territory | Chief Secretary, Dar-es-Salaam. |
| Somaliland | Secretary to the Administrator, Berbera. |
| Northern Rhodesia | Chief Secretary, Livingstone. |
| Basutoland | Government Secretary, Maseru. |
| Bechuanaland Protectorate | Government Secretary, Mafeking. |
| Swaziland | Government Secretary, Mbabane. |
| Bahamas | Colonial Secretary, Nassau. |
| Bermuda | Colonial Secretary, Hamilton. |
| British Guiana | Colonial Secretary, Georgetown. |
| British Honduras | Colonial Secretary, Belize. |
| Falkland Islands | Colonial Secretary, Port Stanley. |
| Barbados | Colonial Secretary, Bridgetown. |
| Jamaica | Colonial Secretary, Kingston. |
| Trinidad | Colonial Secretary, Port of Spain. |
| Windward Islands | Colonial Secretary, Grenada. |
| Leeward Islands | Colonial Secretary, Antigua. |
| Fiji | Colonial Secretary, Suva. |

Japanese :

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Chosen | Governor-General. |
| Formosa | Governor-General. |
| Kwantung Leased Territory | Governor. |

Netherlands :

Netherlands East Indies :

I. Medicinal opium for Government Services :

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Bandoeng | Director of the Central Medical Store at Bandoeng, as regards imports for the use of that Store and other State establishments except the military dispensaries mentioned below. |
| Weltevreden | Senior Dispensing Officer. |
| Samarang | Senior Dispensing Officer. |
| Malang | Senior Dispensing Officer. |
| Padang | Senior Dispensing Officer. |
| Keeta-Radja | Senior Dispensing Officer. (Each as regards imports for the use of the military dispensary established at his station.) |

II. Medicinal opium for private purposes :

L'Inspecteur en chef, chef du Service médical civil, et les fonctionnaires désignés par lui.

III. Raw opium destined for the use of the Regie :

Chef du Bureau de la vente du Département des entreprises du gouvernement et la personne désignée par lui.

IV. Opium for scientific needs :

L'Inspecteur en chef, chef du Service de la Régie de l'opium, et les fonctionnaires désignés par lui.

Annex 3.

O. C. 415

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF GOVERNMENTS

Submitted to the Committee on May 27th, 1926.

PART I.

NOTES BY THE SECRETARIAT.

The following summary of information and statistical tables have been compiled from information contained in annual reports for the years 1924 and 1925 and in other Government statistics received by the Secretariat since the issue of the Summary of Annual Reports numbered O.C. 297, Annex 3 to the Minutes of the Seventh Session of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs. Annual reports for years earlier than 1924, which have not appeared in former statistical documents, are also included.

No separate digest has been considered necessary of the information received from the following countries, colonies or possessions :

1924

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| BRITISH SOLOMON ISLANDS PROTECTORATE. | MARTINIQUE. |
| BRITISH SOMALILAND PROTECTORATE. | MAURITIUS. |
| CURAÇAO. | NEW CALEDONIA. |
| FRENCH CAMEROONS. | NEW GUINEA. |
| FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA. | NEW ZEALAND. |
| FRENCH GUIANA. | REUNION ISLAND. |
| FRENCH INDIA. | ROUMANIA. |
| FRENCH OCEANIC POSSESSIONS. | SAINT LUCIA. |
| FRENCH SOMALI COAST. | ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON. |
| FRENCH TOGO. | SEYCHELLES. |
| FRENCH WEST AFRICA. | SUDAN. |
| GOLD COAST. | SURINAM. |
| GUADELOUPE. | TANGANYIKA. |
| LEEWARD ISLANDS. | ZANZIBAR. |

1925

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| BASUTOLAND. | NYASALAND. |
| FINLAND. | SURINAM. |
| GAMBIA. | SWITZERLAND (Part of 1925). |
| JAMAICA. | ZANZIBAR. |

Statistics of imports and exports during the last five months of the year 1925 have been forwarded by the Swiss Government and incorporated in this summary.

Extracts from reports received from the following countries, colonies or possessions are included in this document :

| 1923 | 1924 | 1924 (continued) | 1925 |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SIAM. | AUSTRIA. | KWANTUNG LEASED TERRITORY. | BELGIUM. |
| | BELGIUM. | NETHERLANDS. | FALKLAND ISLANDS. |
| | CHOSEN. | NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES. | SWAZILAND. |
| | DANZIG. | PALESTINE. | UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA. |
| | FEDERATED MALAY STATES. | POLAND. | |
| | FORMOSA. | PORTUGAL (MACAO). | |
| | GREECE. | SARAWAK. | |
| | HONG-KONG. | SIAM. | |
| | INDIA. | STRAITS SETTLEMENTS. | |
| | INDO-CHINA. | UNFEDERATED MALAY STATES. | |
| | ITALY. | | |
| | JAPAN. | | |

A report from Madagascar (1924) was received too late for inclusion in this summary. Extracts from reports from the following countries, colonies or possessions for the year 1924 received before the drawing up of this Summary have already appeared in document O.C. 297 :

BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.
CANADA.
CEYLON.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.
FRANCE.
GREAT BRITAIN.

The following countries have not sent in any report for the year 1924 :

BOLIVIA.
CHINA.
GERMANY.
HUNGARY
MEXICO.
PERSIA.
PERU.

PORTUGAL.
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES.
SPAIN.
SWITZERLAND.
TURKEY.
UNION OF THE SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Whilst no actual reports have been received from Bulgaria, Esthonia, Lithuania and Uganda for 1924 and from Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago for 1925, those countries have sent in information on imports, etc., or consumption which calls for no comments.

The Swiss Government has not been able to submit a report for 1924, because the Federal legislation in regard to narcotics was not in force during that year and the information in its possession was not sufficiently accurate to permit of a report being drawn up. The Federal Law came into force on August 1st, 1925.

The German Government has informed the Secretary-General that, on account of the special conditions existing towards the end of 1924 in the occupied territory, it is impossible to furnish complete and exact statistics on the traffic in narcotics for the years 1923 and 1924.

As the United States of Mexico do not form part of the League of Nations, the Mexican Government will not forward to the League any information. Nevertheless, in view of the importance, for humanity, of the campaign against the opium traffic, Mexico is prepared to co-operate in this campaign and to supply all information and statistics required to any institution which exists for this purpose, provided it is independent of the League of Nations.

Austria (1924).

No new general measures have been taken in Austria during the year 1924 in connection with the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

The import and export of drugs covered by the Convention continue to be regulated by the system of import certificates.

The illicit and contraband trade in these substances is put down by the Customs authorities, the Public Health Department and the Police.

There was neither production of opium nor manufacture of morphine, heroin or cocaine in Austria during the year 1924.

290 kgs. of cocaine was imported during the year, of which 246 kgs. were imported from Germany. During the same period 263 kgs. of morphine were imported.

Belgium (1924-1925).

The general remarks appearing in the report apply to the years 1924 and 1925, during which no new legal provisions were promulgated or changes made in the existing legislation.

The system of import certificates came into full force in February 1924, since when a certificate drawn up on the lines recommended by the League of Nations has been required.

The inspectors of pharmacies have reported certain cases of attempts to evade the application of the Royal Decree of September 6th, 1921, in the case of certain preparations containing a proportion of narcotics sufficient to render a medical prescription necessary. The device adopted was to increase the vehicle so as to reduce the proportion of the narcotics in the mixture to the amounts permitted under the Decree of September 6th.

The alkaloid content of the raw opium imported during the years 1924 and 1925 ranged from 10 to 19 per cent.

The recorded imports and exports during 1924 and 1925, whether of opium or its derivatives, or of cocaine, do not call for special comments. Exports of hydrochlorate of diacetylmorphine, amounting in 1924 to 60 kgs., of which 58 kgs. were exported to Switzerland, fell in 1925 to about 2 kgs. exported to Germany.

Chosen (1924).

No laws, orders and regulations concerning the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs were issued, amended or abolished during the year 1924.

The policy of not permitting the import of raw or prepared opium and of not granting permits for the importation of dangerous drugs from foreign countries was maintained. Drugs necessary for medical and scientific use are allowed to be imported from Japan proper.

Only those holding a special licence are allowed to produce opium and then only provided the opium produced is sold to the Government at prices varying according to the morphine content of the opium. The opium thus taken over by the Government is sold to specially appointed manufacturers of drugs. The Taisho Seiyaku Kabushiki Kaisha (Taisho Drug Manufacturing Co., Ltd.) is the only manufacturer at present holding such a permit in Chosen. The area under poppy cultivation was 818 acres, which yielded a total production of 1,181 kgs. (with an average morphine content of 10.36%), showing an average yield per acre of 1.443 kgs. The area under cultivation shows a decrease of 83 acres compared with the figures for 1923, whilst the total production shows a decrease of 211 kgs. as compared with the figures for 1923. During the year 1,831 kgs. of opium were used for the manufacture of morphine, tincture of opium and Dover powder. There was neither cultivation of coca nor importation or manufacture of cocaine. The smoking of prepared opium is absolutely prohibited in Chosen.

Opium and other narcotics continue to be smuggled into the districts adjoining China and Siberia.

Danzig (1924).

In 1924 two laws and regulations on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs were promulgated in the territory of the Free City of Danzig.

No difficulties have been experienced in the application of the import certificate system. There are no factories producing morphine, medicinal opium or other dangerous drugs and there are no factories in which cocaine is either extracted from coca leaves or refined from crude cocaine.

Falkland Islands (1925).

An Ordinance (No. 8 of 1925) was passed on November 20th, 1925, giving effect to the provisions of the Dangerous Drugs Convention, 1925.

Federated Malay States (1924).

No new legislation has been passed or regulations issued during the year. The Annual Report of the Commissioner of Trade and Customs will be forwarded to the Secretariat as soon as it is ready.

According to the 1921 Census, there are 298,566 male Chinese over 20 years of age resident in the Federated Malay States; the total amount of prepared opium sold for consumption during the year was 38,771 kgs.

Smokers are not registered, but at each retail shop a register is kept in which is entered the name, address, nationality or tribe and occupation of each customer. By this means the smoking public will become gradually accustomed to the idea of registration and the complete scheme may be introduced later with little difficulty.

The revenue derived from the sale of prepared opium during the year 1924 was \$10,632,135, which is 15 per cent of the total revenue of the Federated Malay States.

There is no production of opium and the coca plant is not grown in the Federated Malay States.

Formosa (1924).

No laws or ordinances concerning the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs were promulgated or amended during the year 1924. The import certificate system was enforced without difficulty. Raw opium is not produced in or exported from Formosa. The raw opium imported is used by the Monopoly Bureau of the Government entirely for the manufacture of prepared opium, which is sold exclusively to licensed opium-smokers.

At the end of 1924 there were in Formosa 28,466 Chinese and 3,778,556 Formosans; the total number of licensed opium-smokers (Formosans) was 37,286.

There was no manufacture of morphine, medicinal opium and other medical preparations.

The prepared opium consumed during the year amounted to 44,230 kgs. and the retail price remained the same as the preceding year, namely, 117 yen per kg. for first-class opium, 87.60 yen per kg. for third-class opium.

There was no importation of crude or refined cocaine or coca leaves. The area under coca plant cultivation was 684 acres.

No particulars are given as to the quantity of coca leaf grown or as to the quantity of any of the crude cocaine or refined cocaine exported.

Greece (1924).

During the year the traffic in opium and other narcotics was carried on in conformity with the new law, which permits of the import of narcotics only on the authorisation of the Minister, acting on the recommendation of the Health Council.

The imports of narcotics into Greece fell considerably short of the actual figures of consumption as established by the Pharmaceutical Association. The surplus opium consumed was obtained from opium manufactured in Greece. Narcotics were obtained from stocks already on the market and representing German reparation deliveries.

There were no imports of opium recorded. Narcotics imported seem to be limited to drugs for medical requirements in the country. No account is apparently taken of imports of opium destined for re-export.

Although Greece is a producer of raw opium, the report does not contain any statistics of production, trade in or export of raw opium from Greece during the year 1924.

Hong-Kong (1924).

The Opium Amendment Ordinance (1924) was passed on August 20th, 1924, for the purpose of further restricting dealings in raw opium. This Ordinance makes it illegal, except under licence from the Governor, to deal in raw opium in any way whatever, and this prohibition extends to transactions which are carried out in another country by a resident in the Colony.

The sales of Government opium during the last quarter of 1924 showed a reduction of about 25 per cent in all districts, while in one district the decrease was 50 per cent. This marked decrease coincides with the appearance on the market of a bountiful crop of Chinese opium. Prepared opium of superior quality was smuggled in large quantities from Amoy and was sold at a very cheap price, from \$3 to \$5 a tael, whilst the selling price of Government-prepared opium, which remained the same throughout the year, was \$14.50 per tael.

The only opium imported into Hong-Kong is that directly purchased from the Government of India, and all of it is used for the manufacture of prepared opium in the Government factory.

The revenue derived from opium, after deducting expenses of purchase and administration, amounted to \$4,459,756, which represents 18.42 per cent of the total revenue of the Colony.

Rewards amounting to \$88,195 were paid to informers during the year in connection with opium and drug cases.

There is no manufacture or export of morphine, heroin, medicinal opium, cocaine or other medicinal preparations, and no opium was exported.

Whilst comparatively little Chinese raw opium was seized, constant seizures were made of Chinese prepared opium, and evidence was obtained of illicit opium being consumed in clandestine divans in appreciable quantities.

The estimated importations of morphine and salts for medical purposes amounted to 126 ozs., and 11,904 ozs. were confiscated during the year; 37 ozs. heroin were imported and 5,280 ozs. confiscated; 62 ozs. of cocaine were imported and 2,000 ozs. confiscated.

Of the 586 chests of opium transhipped during the year, 424 chests were Persian opium, of which 300 chests were taken by Keelung, 120 by Dairen, and 4 chests by Canton; of the 150 chests of Benares opium transhipped, 100 chests were destined for Macao, the remaining 50 for Kobe; the balance of the opium transhipped was Turkish opium destined for Tokio.

India (1924).

During the year two steps of far-reaching importance were taken in connection with the opium policy. In the first place, the Government of India decided not to allow exports of opium to consignees in non-Asiatic countries other than the United Kingdom. In the second place, with a view to counteract the smuggling of Afghan opium into India, the bringing of opium by land into British India from any country situated on the land frontier of India was prohibited from November 24th, 1924. The Government of India also examined with the Provincial Governments the internal opium policy with reference to (1) the co-ordination of policy in regard to the fixing of the sale price; (2) the necessity of special measures to reduce consumption; and (3) investigation of the extent to which the practice of administering opium to babies and children to keep them quiet prevails in each province.

The total number of chests exported during the year amounted to 8,092. The principal destinations and consignments were 3,000 chests of 140 lbs. each to the Straits Settlements, 1,500 to Siam, 1,355 to French Indo-China, 891 to Bushire, 300 to the Netherlands East Indies, 240 to Hong-Kong, 100 to Macao. 545 chests of 160 lbs. each were shipped to the High Commissioner for India in London for disposal for strictly and *bona fide* medical purposes.

The import certificate system adopted since January 1923 has worked easily in the case of exports, and the slight difficulty experienced at the outset regarding imports has now been overcome.

The cultivation of the poppy is confined, except for a few wild and inaccessible regions, to the area which supplies the Government Opium Factory at Ghazipur in the United Provinces, where it can only be cultivated under licence.

In British India, during the official year April 1923-24, 133,500 acres were under poppy cultivation, yielding some 2,122,000 lbs. of opium, to which are to be added the 9,306 lbs. produced during the year under report in the Punjab Hills, where the area under poppy cultivation measures 1,694 acres.

The use of prepared opium for smoking continues to be discountenanced in every possible way by the Government of India. The import of prepared opium into Burma is prohibited, but its manufacture and use are not forbidden. Those who desire to smoke must prepare it themselves, and no statistics are available showing how much of the raw opium consumed in Burma was consumed in the form of prepared opium. The sale of prepared opium being prohibited, there is no revenue derived directly from it. The revenue derived from opium, which is subsequently prepared by consumers themselves, cannot be estimated. The number of Chinese consumers of opium in Burma is estimated at 16,988, whilst the number of registered Burmese consumers, which in 1912 amounted to 14,049, has fallen in 1924 to 1,144.

During the year a further advance in policy was made by the Burmese Government, all smokers being required to declare and register themselves as such, the manufacture and possession of prepared opium by unregistered persons being declared illegal.

The only manufacture of opium derivatives is that conducted at the Government Opium Factory, where the principal alkaloids manufactured during the year November 1923-October 1924 were morphine hydrochlorate 424 lbs., and morphine hydrochlorate crude 4,050 lbs., which were all shipped to the High Commissioner for India, London, for disposal for strictly and *bona fide* medical purposes. Methods for improving the accuracy of statistics relative to consumption are under discussion.

The coca plant is not grown in India and there is no manufacture of cocaine.

The consumption of hemp drugs is controlled on lines very similar to those applied to opium. The plant grows wild in India and there is no Government factory. The drugs are stored after collection in Government depots and issued to licensed vendors under conditions closely analogous to those under which opium shopkeepers work. In addition to *bhang* and *ganja* made from native products, *charas* is imported overland from Central Asia (Yarkand); these imports are controlled as closely as the native production.

Indo-China (1924).

No new regulations were introduced during the year 1924. The system of import and export certificates has been regularly applied in Indo-China since the promulgation of the Decree of June 23rd, 1922.

The quantity of opium seized during the year amounted to some 4,602 kgs., which is considered to be but a trifling proportion of the opium which penetrates by fraud into the colony.

The report repeats its statement that it is impossible to combat smuggling effectively and that smuggling exists on a large scale, Indo-China having over 5,000 kilometers of common frontiers with opium-producing countries.

The purchases of raw opium within the country during the year amounted to 22,454 kgs., or some 6,822 kgs. less than during the previous year.

Imports of raw opium which are solely on behalf of the Monopoly and all come from British India amounted to 122,850 kgs., or 108,293 kgs. less than during the previous year. Purchases continue to be made solely from British India despite the advantageous conditions under which Persian opium could be purchased. Whilst a decrease in the licit consumption of prepared opium in the five provinces of Indo-China of 7,426 kgs. is recorded, it is recognised that the clandestine consumption has increased in a much greater proportion, contraband opium being at the disposal of smokers in abundant quantities and at very low prices.

During the year the Indo-Chinese Regie offered for sale in the five provinces of the Union 66,492 kgs. of prepared opium and 37,800 kgs. of raw opium. In addition, 780 kgs. of prepared opium were offered for sale in the province of Kwang-Chow-Wan, where the sale price of Monopoly opium had to be slightly lowered on account of the influx of contraband opium from the Chinese provinces of Kwang Tung, Kwang Si and Yunnan. Elsewhere the sale price of prepared opium was not changed in 1924.

Smokers are not obliged to provide themselves with a special licence or to register. It would be difficult to impose such an obligation on the natives in a country in which civil administration is still in embryo. It would be ineffective and even dangerous, as it would encourage the present clients of the Regie to address themselves in preference to clandestine purveyors.

No information is given as to the revenue derived from the sale of prepared opium and the proportion it bears to the total revenue of the country.

Italy (1924).

The regulations concerning the traffic in narcotics came into force on June 1st, 1924, and the report accordingly contains statistics for the period when the regulations were enforced, *i.e.*, for the second half of 1924 only. The importation of raw opium during the half-year amounted to some 1,321 kgs., of which some 511 kgs. were imported from Greece. The recorded transit of opium amounts to 5,710 kgs., of which 1,427 kgs. is stated to be of Greek origin, whilst the balance, *i.e.*, 4,283 kgs., was of Turkish origin.

The Ministry of the Interior requires a special licence for each individual consignment of the substances to which the regulations apply in the case of import, export and conveyance in transit.

Japan (1924).

No new laws or regulations were promulgated during the year. No difficulties were experienced in the application of the import certificate system. 1,094 acres of land were used for the cultivation of the poppy, which yielded 3,336 kgs. of opium, having an average morphine content of 13.1129 per cent.

The raw opium (all Turkish) imported during the year amounted to some 10,775 kgs.; 4,912 kgs. came from Marseilles and 5,863 kgs. from Constantinople. The quantity used for the manufacture of drugs amounted to some 17,037 kgs.

1,886 kgs. of morphine salts were manufactured (equal to 1,433 kgs. of morphine), of which 1,466 kgs. were used for the manufacture of heroin, dionin and other drugs. Exports of morphine hydrochloride, whether as morphine or contained in drugs, amounted to less than 3 kgs. Of the 1,481 kgs. of heroin manufactured, less than 1 kg. was exported.

Preparations representing in terms of weight 2,901 kgs. of medicinal opium were imported. 655 kgs. of medicinal opium were manufactured; there were practically no exports of it.

The coca plant is not grown in Japan and there was no import of either cocaine hydrochloride or preparations containing cocaine. 1,024 kgs. of crude cocaine were imported from Germany and South America and used for the manufacture of salts of cocaine; of this some 1,479 kgs. were manufactured during the year. This shows a decrease of 1,834 kgs. on the preceding year.

Kwantung Leased Territory (1924).

The Kwantung Opium Ordinance prohibits opium-smoking in the territory, except for addicts to whom permits have been issued after medical examination by the competent officials.

Poppy cultivation is prohibited. Imports of opium are made under import certificates issued by the Governor of Kwantung Leased Territory. Imports amounted to 8,640 kgs., all from Persia, destined for the manufacture of prepared and medicinal opium, as against a total importation of 14,545 kgs. during the preceding year.

The quantity of raw opium sold for the manufacture of prepared opium amounted to 17,328 kgs. No information is given as to the actual amount of prepared opium manufactured or sold.

The retail price of prepared opium was yen 91.32 per kg. as against yen 110 during the previous year.

The Chinese population of the territory at the end of December 1924 was 638,020.

The coca plant is not grown in Kwantung and neither crude cocaine nor coca leaves were imported into the territory during the year.

Netherlands (1924).

No alterations were made in the legislation concerning opium and other dangerous drugs during the year.

Import and export certificates have not yet been made compulsory and the former are only issued when they are required by the country of origin in connection with exportation.

The amendment to the Opium Law, which had been prepared with a view to the general application of the import certificate system, has been deferred on account of the changes which will probably have to be made as a result of the 1925 Convention.

The use of prepared opium is confined to the Chinese population and is insignificant. At Rotterdam there are about 800 Chinese and at Amsterdam between 200 and 300.

Some 4,955 kgs. of raw opium were imported during the year, of which 4,691 were imported from Turkey, as compared with a total importation of 12,978 kgs. in the preceding year.

The importation of morphine and salts of morphine amounted to 262 kgs. as against 261 during the preceding year. Exports amounted to 576 kgs., of which 224 and 308 kgs. were exported to Germany and Switzerland respectively. 931 kgs. of cocaine and salts of cocaine were exported — 298 kgs. to Switzerland, 228 kgs. to Great Britain and 114 to France — showing a decrease of 226 kgs. as compared with the exports for the preceding years.

Netherlands East Indies (1924).

Owing to a change in the administrative areas of the islands of Celebes, the Ordinance of August 8th, 1924, made certain alterations in the Opium Regulations for the provinces of Celebes and dependencies and Menado.

The import certificate system has given rise to no difficulties.

But for an increase in the illicit imports, ascribed mainly to the large quantity of opium in China available for export and to the considerable difference between the price of monopoly opium in the Netherlands Indies and that of opium on sale in unlimited quantities in the various South China ports, the general situation has undergone little change in 1924.

The total quantity of opium seized — raw, prepared and medicinal opium, morphine, etc. — reduced to good-quality prepared opium, amounted to more than 616 kgs., of which over 565 kgs. were non-monopoly products.

In 1924, 18,528 kgs. of raw opium were imported at Tandjoeng Priok (Batavia) from British India; it was consigned exclusively to the Government for the use of the Monopoly. No other opium was lawfully imported.

The total amount of prepared opium sold in 1924 was 50,341 kgs., as compared with 53,534 kgs. in the previous year. The sale price varied between 18 fls. and 30 fls. per tael, averaging 27.06 per tael.

The gross revenue derived from opium in 1924 was fls. 35,296,031.12, *i.e.*, 5 per cent of the gross revenue. The net revenue derived from opium was fls. 30,985,304, or over 6.3 per cent of the net revenue. By net revenue is meant the yield after all direct expenses have been deducted. Indirect expenses, such as the cost of the police and other similar items, have been disregarded.

No opium is produced and no morphine, medicinal opium or other raw opium preparations were manufactured during the year.

Excluding plantations along roads, in the form of hedges, etc., the total area of coca plantations in the Netherlands East Indies was 2,112 hectares in 1924, whilst the total amount of coca leaf produced was 1,071,485 kgs. Of the coca leaf exported, 791 tons were shipped to the Netherlands, 274 tons to Japan and the remaining 53 tons to Germany.

There are no cocaine factories in the Netherlands East Indies

Palestine (1924).

Palestine adhered to the International Opium Convention on August 21st, 1924. Previous to this date, as the Mandate for the country contemplated accession to the Convention, the Palestine Government had during the past few years made its legislation, regulations and procedure in respect of the dangerous drugs conform as far as possible to the terms of the Convention.

During the year no new legislation came into force, but an Ordinance is being prepared to provide for the control of the cultivation, importation, exportation and possession of certain dangerous drugs.

The import certificate system has been in force since September 1922.

The only difficulty of control mentioned in the report is in the case of drugs arriving by letter post.

Poland (1924).

During the year regulations were made to enable the Customs authorities to extend their supervision of the importation of narcotic substances and preparations over the whole of the Polish Customs territory, including the Free City of Danzig.

Poland produces no raw opium and during the year none was imported or exported. There are no establishments for manufacturing morphine or converting it into heroin, etc.

The total amount of hydrochlorate of morphine imported as such was 289 kgs., excluding transit. During the year 2,112 kgs. of medicinal opium were imported as compared with 1,263 kgs. during the preceding year.

No crude cocaine was imported and there exists no establishment for the manufacture of cocaine in Poland.

The total amount of hydrochlorate of cocaine imported was 69 kgs. and no licences were issued to import products containing cocaine.

Portugal (Macao) (1924).

The only place in Portuguese territory where opium is consumed and sold is Macao. The permanent Chinese population as well as the floating population increased considerably during the year as a result of the political disturbances in the neighbouring districts. The permanent population is not less than 120,000. The prepared opium consumed in the Colony during the year amounted to 5,438 kgs.

During the year a three-years contract was signed with the concessionaire or farmer of the State Monopoly for the exploitation of and trade in opium in the Colony. The contract, which is subject to the regulations already in force, fixes the amount of opium to be imported for preparation and sale at 360, 330 and 300 chests respectively for the three ensuing years.

261 chests of opium were imported during the year.

Some 37 cases of prepared opium were exported to Paraguay. The re-exports of raw opium (in transit) destined for Paraguay amounted during the year to 175 chests.

The quantity of opium (120 cases) destined for exportation was sent to countries which have not prohibited the importation of opium and whose consular authorities issue import licences.

Sarawak (1924).

Under Order XLVII, 1924, the rights under the Sarawak "Farms Syndicate" system are transferred to the Government. This Order, which vests in the Government as a Government Monopoly the internal regulation of the manufacture, sale, distribution, use, etc., of opium, came into force on July 1st, 1924.

The manufacture is centralised in one Government factory in Kuching. Prepared opium is distributed from this factory to Government retail shops, looked after by Asiatics on fixed salaries and under supervision of European Government officers. No commission on sale is paid.

Suppression of opium-smoking has not been attempted. Opium-smoking in Sarawak is practically confined to the Chinese. A few exceptions are Malays or Dyaks married to Chinese.

The retail price of Government Monopoly prepared opium, of which 2,611 kgs. were consumed, was \$8 per tael. The net revenue derived from opium, which amounted to \$300,816.13, was equal to 7.29 per cent of the total revenue of the State.

Smokers are registered and numbered 4,724 at the end of the year.

Siam (1923).

On January 1st, 1923, the Harmful Habit-forming Drugs Law, B.E. 2465 (A.D. 1923), together with the Ministerial Regulations issued under that law, were brought into force all over Siam, placing the control of habit-forming drugs, including medicinal opium, under the single authority of the Minister in charge of the Public Health Administration. The salient feature of the new law is that drugs controlled by the law can only be imported into Siam by the Department of Public Health and, after importation, can only be purchased from that Department under licence. The import certificate system was brought into force at the same time as the new regulations and has worked smoothly since its introduction.

No new points of importance have arisen in relation to the administration of the law, except in the case of violations by subjects of those countries which still possess extra-territorial rights. In some cases the penalties imposed by certain Consular Courts have been very small compared with the penalties which would have been imposed if the accused had been tried and convicted in a Siamese Court. This has had a tendency to encourage smuggling and illicit selling of drugs.

Apart from the use of prepared opium and dross, practically nothing is known of the prevalence of the drug habit in Siam. There exists a certain amount of illicit traffic in morphine and heroin from China in the form of secret preparations for the cure of the opium-smoking habit. Of the 1,603 chests of opium supplied during the year by the Government of India, three chests constituted a trial consignment of a new opium, having a consistency of 91° instead of 71° and corresponding to the type of opium which the Government of India recommended in 1922 should be supplied to Siam.

The total amount of prepared opium sold for consumption in the calendar year 1923 was 50,779 kgs., which was retailed at prices varying from 5.40 ticals to 15 ticals per tamlung (one tamlung = 37.5 grammes). Chinese residents in the country numbered 260,194. The number of those addicted to opium is not known, and cannot be known until a system of registration of opium-smokers is enforced.

There is neither manufacture of morphine, heroin or cocaine, nor is opium or the coca leaf grown.

Siam (1924).

During the year codein, which previously had been scheduled as an exempted drug, was included under those harmful habit-forming drugs controlled by the Harmful Habit-forming Drugs Law, as there was evidence to show that it was imported as a "cure for the opium-smoking habit" and was replacing that habit. The import certificate system continues to work smoothly.

Seizures effected show that most of the illicit opium, both raw and prepared, entered Siam from the North. It is probable that a large part of the opium smuggled into Siam is produced in the Shan States. Of the 816 kgs. of prepared opium seized, 422 kgs. were accounted for in the three northern circles, whilst 251 kgs. were seized on vessels coming into the Port of Bangkok from Hong-Kong, Swatow and Singapore. Of the 522 kgs. of raw opium seized, 345 kgs. were seized in the North and 30 kgs. on various vessels arriving from Hong-Kong, Swatow and Bombay.

The total amount of prepared opium sold for consumption during the year 1924 was 51,589 kgs., showing, as compared with the preceding year, an increase of 810 kgs. The retail price remained the same as in the previous year, varying from 5.40 to 15 ticals per tamlung (1 tamlung = 37.5 grammes). There is no licensing or registration of smokers with the exception of those who are allowed to smoke outside the dens; these during the year 1923-1924 numbered 1,189.

During the year the actual revenue from opium amounted to 17.67 per cent of the total actual revenue. There is neither production of opium or coca leaf nor manufacture of any of their derivatives in Siam.

Straits Settlements (1924).

During the year there was no new legislation affecting opium or dangerous drugs, nor were there any actual changes in administrative arrangements concerning opium. The Government decided that it would take over direct control of the retail sale and distribution of opium at the beginning of 1926 or as soon as possible thereafter. Notices were served on

all holders of licences to retail prepared opium, whether for consumption on or off the licensed premises, warning them that no further licences would be issued after December 1925.

The total quantity of opium imported was 3,103 chests (= 211,128 kgs.), as compared with 2,279 chests in 1923 (weighing 154,896 kgs.). One hundred of these chests were Persian opium, which was subsequently exported to Sarawak (5 chests in 1924 and the rest in 1925) for the use of the Government there. Transshipments of opium during the year totalled 2,834 chests, of which 1,250 chests were destined for Saigon, 1,500 chests for Bangkok and 84 chests for Sandakan.

Whilst the imports for the year are in excess of those for the preceding year, the amount of raw opium cooked at the Government Factory during the year amounted to 2,568 chests, yielding 102,533 kgs. of prepared opium, as compared with 2,762½ chests cooked in 1923. In addition to the chandu manufactured in the Government Factory, some 3,559 kgs. of chandu were recovered from seizures.

Retail prices remained the same as for the preceding year.

The amount of chandu sold for consumption in the Colony was 44,721 kgs., or 5.525 kgs. less than in 1923.

The revenue derived from the sale of prepared opium, including licence fees — some \$11,641,850, represented 40.65 per cent of the total revenue of the Colony. The actual net revenue — not including \$77,394 derived from opium licence fees — was \$11,564,456, showing a deficit of \$2,435,544 as compared with the estimate of \$14,000,000. The deficit is in the main due to sales being affected by the smuggling of illicit chandu from China.

The total Chinese population was 498,547 in 1921, date of the last census, and the number of Chinese males over 21 years of age at that time was estimated at 247,846.

There is no production of raw opium in the Colony; the coca plant is not grown in the Straits Settlements, which does not manufacture morphine, heroin, medicinal opium or cocaine.

Swaziland (1925).

During the year the Swaziland Opium and Habit-forming Drugs Regulation Proclamation of 1922 was amended by Proclamation No. 6 of 1925. No difficulties have arisen or are likely to arise in regard to the import of drugs into or the export of drugs from the territory. It is intended later to forward a single memorandum descriptive of the production and traffic in Indian hemp throughout the British Colonies, Protectorates, etc.

Unfederated Malay States (1924).

Johore.

The only legislation during the year was that contained in Enactment 4/1924 amending the Deleterious Drugs Enactment 1919. This amending Enactment provides for punishment of offences against the laws of other countries which have signed the International Opium Convention.

The first steps were taken to introduce an important change in administrative arrangements, whereby the retail sale of prepared opium for smoking is to be transferred from licensees to the Government.

The total amount of prepared opium consumed was 12,355 kgs., and the retail price was the same as in 1923.

The revenue derived from the sale of prepared opium was \$3,258,029, and fees for licences amounted to \$84,494, making a total of \$3,342,523. Deducting the cost of the Department, amounting to \$10,414, the net revenue was \$3,217,615, which represents 29.39 per cent of the total revenue of the State.

Kedah and Perlis.

The amount of opium consumed in Kedah for the year shows an increase of 17 per cent as compared with 1923. In Perlis the amount consumed was some 148 kgs. more than the amount consumed in the previous year. Increases were due to the influx of Chinese following the revival in the tin and rubber industries and general improvement in trade. In Kedah, with an adult Chinese male population numbering, according to the 1921 census, 40,017, and where it is estimated that 10,000 Malays smoke opium, the total amount of opium sold for consumption during 1924 was 7,144 kgs. and in Perlis 695 kgs.

The proportion of opium revenue — i.e., gross revenue, less cost of purchase of chandu, no allowance being made for cost of administration — was 34.55 per cent in the case of Kedah and 35.85 per cent in that of Perlis.

Kelantan.

Sales of prepared opium amounted to 1,566 kgs. The revenue derived from the sale of opium was \$325,011.03, or 22.85 per cent of the total revenue.

Trengganu.

With the total amount of prepared opium consumed amounting to 1,055 kgs., which was retailed at the same price per tael as during the year 1923, the revenue derived amounted to \$219,666 as against \$263,717 in 1923 and represented 28.2 per cent of the total revenue.

Brunei.

The total amount of prepared opium consumed during 1924 was 336 kgs., as compared with 225 kgs. in 1923. This increase is due : (a) to influx of Chinese labor from Labuan, Sarawak and British North Borneo into the Belait District; (b) to the redemption of the Opium Monopoly in the District of Muara formerly held by His Highness the Rajah of Sarawak. Sales of prepared opium in the Muara district were not taken into account in the reports for 1922 and 1923.

The revenue derived from the sale of prepared opium in 1924 was \$58,363, or 22.7 per cent of the total revenue of \$257,474.

Union of South Africa (1925).

No new legislation was introduced affecting the traffic in opium and other habit-forming drugs, nor were there any rules or regulations issued in this connection during the year 1925.

The import certificate system is working satisfactorily.

Three certificates were issued for the exportation to London of 10,584 lbs. of dagga.

PART I.
I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries whose imports amount to 500 kilogrammes or over.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|-------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands | |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | |
| BELGIUM | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 421 | | 421 | | nil | 421 | | | 802 | | | 7,684 | |
| | 1923 | 5 | France | 322 | nil | 322 | | | | | 105 | 217 | | 7,684 |
| | | 57 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 260 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | 325 | Greece | 597 | nil | 597 | | | | | 30 | 567 | | 7,684 |
| 159 | | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | Other countries | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1925 | 400 | Greece | 562 | nil | 562 | | | | | nil | 562 | | 7,684 | |
| | 100 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 62 | France | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1920 | 12,364 | India | 17,136 | nil | 17,136 | | | | nil | 17,136 | | 258 | |
| | | 4,772 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | 5,955 | nil | 5,955 | | | | nil | 5,955 | nil | 258 | |
| | 1922 | 4,364 | India | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 1,591 | Persia | 14,372 | nil | 14,372 | | | | nil | 14,372 | nil | 258 | |
| | | 7,563 | India | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 6,809 | Persia | 6,108 | nil | 6,108 | | | | nil | 6,108 | nil | 258 | | |
| CEYLON | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 5,115 | India | 5,115 | nil | 5,115 | | | | nil | 5,115 | nil | 4,504 | |
| | 1922 | 3,268 | India | 3,268 | nil | 3,268 | | | | nil | 3,268 | nil | 4,504 | |
| | 1923 | 1,636 | India | 1,636 | nil | 1,636 | | | | nil | 1,636 | nil | 4,504 | |
| | 1924 | nil | | nil | nil | nil | | | | nil | (*) | nil | 4,504 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DANZIG | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 175 | | 175 | nil | 175 | | | | nil | 175 | | 340 | |
| | 1922 | 673 | | 673 | nil | 673 | | | | nil | 673 | | 340 | |
| | (*) 1923 | 2 | Germany | 2 | nil | 2 | | | | nil | 2 | | 340 | |
| | 1924 | 39 | | 39 | nil | 39 | | | | nil | 39 | 4 | 340 | |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (*) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| FRANCE (*) . . . | 1920 | 900 | Great Britain | 9,500 | | nil | 9,500 | | | 2,200 | 7,300 | | 39,402 |
| | | 1,600 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 6,800 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 200 | Other countries | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 300 | Denmark | 7,100 | nil | 7,100 | 500 | Great Britain | 1,700 | 5,400 | | | 39,402 |
| | | 400 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3,000 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 3,400 | Turkey | 9,800 | nil | 9,800 | 1,700 | Norway | 2,400 | 7,800 | | | 39,402 |
| | | 500 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 1,100 | Germany | 9,800 | nil | 9,800 | 100 | Uruguay and Paraguay | 2,000 | 7,800 | | | 39,402 |
| 300 | | Italy | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,000 | | S. C. S. Kingdom | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,300 | | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5,100 | | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 300 | | India | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | Other Asiatic countries | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 300 | Great Britain | 7,200 | nil | 7,200 | 646 | Switzerland | 774 | 6,426 | | | 39,402 | |
| | 100 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 100 | Beigo-Luxemburg Economic Union | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 200 | S. C. S. Kingdom | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1,400 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4,800 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 300 | Other Asiatic countries | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GERMANY | 1920 | | Turkey | 59,882 | | nil | 59,882 | | | | | (*) 86,200 | 59,857 |
| | 1921 | 59,882 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | • 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . | 1920 | | Turkey | 26,437 | | nil | 26,437 | (*) 4,645 | Turkey | 7,124 | 19,313 | (*) 29,749 | (*) 47,350 |
| | 1921 | 18,293 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 7,498 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 646 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 445 | Spain | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 263 | Egypt | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 1,267 | Other countries | | | | |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| GREAT BRITAIN (continued) | 1922 | 61,643 1,365 906 1 304 | Turkey Europe Persia India Kind unknown | 64,219 | | nil | 64,219 | (7) 11,169 6,510 1,061 425 2,827 | Persia U.S.A. Spain Australia Other countries | 21,992 | 42,227 | 61,753 | (19) 44,200 |
| | 1923 | 64,700 374 2 | Turkey Persia Kind unknown | 65,076 | | nil | 65,076 | 5,725 3,252 400 366 1,171 | U.S.A. Persia Australia France Other countries | 10,914 | 54,162 | 49,989 | (19) 44,200 |
| | 1924 | 841 26,768 298 33,815 | Europe Turkey Persia India | 61,722 | | nil | 61,722 | 2,159 3,791 432 305 275 214 104 162 876 | Russia U.S.A. France S. Salvador Brazil U. South Africa Chile Australia Other countries | 8,318 | 53,404 | 51,898 | (19) 44,200 |
| GREECE | 1920 | 2,443 | | 2,443 | | | | | | 1,870 | | | 2,908 |
| | 1921 | 7,097 | | 7,097 | | | | | | 100 | | | 2,908 |
| | 1922 | 176 | | 176 | 250 | 3,600 | 3,776 | | | nil | 3,776 | | 2,908 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HONG-KONG . . | 1920 | 65,527 6,788 31,060 | India Turkey Persia | 103,375 | | nil | 103,375 | 121 41,891 44,818 | Great Britain Macao Japan | 86,830 | 16,545 | nil | 660 |
| | 1921 | 13,481 26,297 | Persia India | 39,778 | | nil | 39,778 | 13,481 19,647 | Formosa Macao | 33,128 | 6,650 | nil | 660 |
| | 1922 | 9,454 | India | 9,454 | | nil | 9,454 | | | nil | 9,454 | nil | 1,000 |
| | 1923 | 18,907 | India | 18,907 | | nil | 18,907 | | | nil | 18,907 | nil | 1,000 |
| | 1924 | 15,998 | India | 15,998 | | nil | 15,998 | | | nil | 15,998 | nil | 1,000 |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------------|------|---------|------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| INDIA. | 1920 | | | | 62,571 | 549,818 | 549,818 | 196,521 184,440 108,120 11,194 3,816 11,448 33,771 60,420 — 57,246 — 2,226 | Straits Settlements Neth. E. Indies Siam Br. North Borneo Ceylon Hong-Kong Macao Fr. Indo-China Bushire Japan Sarawak Mauritius | 669,199 | | (11) 4,481 | 319,075 |
| | 1921 | | | | 46,964 | 526,838 | 526,838 | 191,436 146,280 108,120 15,264 4,452 7,632 27,984 105,258 5,406 9,540 — — | Straits Settlements Neth. E. Indies Siam Br. North Borneo Ceylon Hong-Kong Macao Fr. Indo-China Bushire Japan Sarawak Mauritius | 621,372 | | (11) nil | 319,075 |
| | 1922 | | | | 47,730 | 684,773 | 684,773 | 115,752 114,480 104,940 3,816 3,816 9,500 31,800 108,120 17,999 3,180 3,498 — | Straits Settlements Neth. E. Indies Siam Br. North Borneo Ceylon Hong-Kong Macao Fr. Indo-China Bushire Japan Sarawak Mauritius | 516,941 | | (11) 150 | 319,075 |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|---|-----------|---|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| INDIA (continued) | 1923 | | | | (11) 57,823 | (12) 858,038 | 858,038 | 133,560 57,240 101,760 5,342 1,908 15,264 15,264 189,210 6,360 9,540 7,950 | Straits Settlements Neth. E. Indies Siam Br. North Borneo Ceylon Hong-Kong Macao Fr. Indo-China Bushire Japan Sarawak Mauritius | 543,398 | 314,640 | (13) 590 | 319,075 |
| | 1924 | | | | (11) 51,708 | (12) 968,678 | 968,678 | (14) 39,621 190,800 19,080 95,400 5,342 954 15,264 6,360 86,178 56,668 3,180 763 55 | England Straits Settlements Neth. E. Indies Siam B. North Borneo Ceylon Hong-Kong Macao Indo-China Bushire Japan Sarawak Other countries | 519,665 | 449,013 | (13) 20,330 | 319,075 |
| INDO-CHINA . . . | 1920 | 1,048 117,200 | China India | 118,248 | | 6,000 | 124,248 | | | nil | 124,248 | | 20,000 |
| | 1921 | 335,630 | | 335,630 | | 4,700 | 340,330 | | | nil | 340,330 | | 20,000 |
| | 1922 | 127,314 | | 127,314 | | (Average 10 years) 1,685 | 128,999 | | | nil | 128,999 | nil | 20,000 |
| | 1923 | 231,143 | | 231,143 | | (15) | | | | nil | 260,419 | nil | 20,000 |
| | 1924 | 122,850 | | 122,850 | | (15) | | | | nil | 145,304 | nil | 20,000 |
| ITALY | 1922 | 305 | | | | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | (16) 1924 | 1,321 | | | | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1920 | 197,460 | | 197,460 | 442 | 3,714 | 201,174 | | | 3 | 201,174 | | 77,674 |
| | 1921 | 7,187 18,821 3,074 2,691 9,867 15,907 7,991 | United States Turkey France Hong-Kong India Persia England | 65,538 | 1,160 | 7,619 | 73,157 | | | | 73,157 | (17) | 77,674 |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwangtung, etc.) . . . (continued) | 1922 | 4,530 | France | 78,880 | 813 | 5,305 | 84,185 | | | | 84,185 | (19) | 77,674 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 13,157 | Asiatic Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 19,345 | European Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 7,388 | United States | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 23,235 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 3,636 | India | 95,092 | 740 | 3,551 | 98,643 | | | (19) | 6,123 | (20) | 92,520 | (21) | 14,191 | 77,674 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 7,591 | England | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2,208 | New York | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 43,621 | Constantinople and European Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1,144 | Hamburg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 8,073 | Marseilles | 52,001 | 774 | 4,517 | 56,518 | nil | nil | nil | 56,518 | 18,868 | | 77,674 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3,901 | Asiatic Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10,800 | India | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 25,345 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4,912 | France | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CHOSEN (Korea)(22) | 5,863 | Turkey | 17,264 | 60 | 155 | 155 | | | | | 155 | | 17,264 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 726 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17,264 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 17,264 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | nil | | | | | | | | | | | | 17,264 | nil | 447 | 1,659 | 1,659 | nil | 1,659 | 1,393 | 1,393 | 1,393 | 17,264 | |
| FORMOSA (23) . . . | 1923 | nil | 17,264 | nil | 365 | 1,392 | 1,392 | nil | 1,392 | (24) | 1,638 | 1,638 | 17,264 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | nil | 17,264 | nil | 331 | 1,181 | 1,181 | nil | 1,181 | 1,831 | 1,831 | 1,831 | 17,264 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1920 | 8,189 | Hong-Kong | 158,781 | 6 | 84 | 158,865 | | | | 158,865 | (25) | 36,445 | 3,655 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 8,776 | India | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 21,945 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31,111 | | England | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88,760 | | U.S.A. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1921 | 7,991 | Great Britain | 40,092 | 7 | 91 | 40,183 | | | | 1,091 | 39,092 | | 3,655 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3,636 | U.S.A. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 15,907 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9,867 | India | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2,691 | Hong-Kong | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) ⁽¹⁾ | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kg. | |
| FORMOSA (**) (continued) | 1922 | 3,636 | India | 67,802 | | nil | 67,802 | | | nil | 67,802 | nil | 3,655 |
| | | 22,035 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10,904 | Asiatic Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7,591 | England | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19,345 | European Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4,291 | U.S.A. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1923 | 10,800 | Persia | 60,223 | | nil | 60,223 | | | (1*) 3,888 | 56,335 | (2*) | 3,655 | |
| | 34,722 | European Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3,901 | Asiatic Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 10,800 | India | 32,586 | | nil | 32,586 | | | nil | 32,586 | nil | 3,655 | |
| | 31,860 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 726 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | |
| KWANTUNG (**) | 1920 | 8,100 | Persia | 8,100 | | nil | 8,100 | | | nil | 8,100 | nil | 687 |
| | 1921 | 14,545 | Turkey | 14,545 | | nil | 14,545 | | | nil | | nil | 687 |
| | 1922 | 1,200 | Persia | 1,200 | | nil | 1,200 | | | nil | 1,200 | nil | 687 |
| | 1923 | 14,545 | Persia | 14,545 | | nil | 14,545 | | | (1*) 2,235 | 12,310 | (2*) | 687 |
| | 1924 | 8,640 | Persia | 8,640 | | nil | 8,640 | | | nil | 8,640 | | 687 |
| MACAO | 1920 | (1*) 40,320 | India via Hong-Kong | 40,320 | | nil | 40,320 | | | | | | 74 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | 6,360 | India | 16,600 | | nil | 16,600 | | | | 7,632 | 8,968 | |
| | 2,608 | Kwan Chu-Wan | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7,632 | Persia | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS . . . | 1921 | 68 | Germany | 4,886 | | nil | 4,886 | 1,920 | Danzig | 2,806 | 2,080 | | 7,030 |
| | | 309 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2,634 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1,875 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1922 | 39 | Great Britain | 3,714 | | nil | 3,714 | 863 | Germany | 1,103 | 2,611 | | 7,030 | |
| | 530 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3,145 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 206 | Great Britain | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 34 | Neth. E. Indies | | | | |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) ⁽¹⁾ | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| NETHERLANDS . . . (continued) | 1923 | 7 | Curaçao | 12,978 | | nil | 12,978 | 255 | Great Britain | 403 | 12,575 | | 7,213 |
| | | 234 | Germany | | 143 | | | | | | | | |
| | 30 | Great Britain | 5 | | Neth. E. Indies | | | | | | | | |
| | 561 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 12,146 | Turkey | 4,955 | nil | 4,955 | 103 | Germany | Esthonia | 179 | 4,776 | | 7,213 | |
| | 68 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 25 | France | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 109 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES . . . | 1920 | 172,932 | India | 172,932 | nil | 172,932 | | nil | | 172,932 | | | 49,161 |
| | 1921 | 117,344 | India | 117,344 | nil | 117,344 | | nil | | 117,344 | | | 49,161 |
| | 1922 | 111,155 | India | 111,380 | nil | 111,380 | | nil | | 111,380 | nil | | 49,161 |
| | (²⁰) 1923 | 225 | Smyrna | 55,584 | nil | 55,584 | | negligible | | 55,584 | nil | | 49,351 |
| (²¹) 1924 | 55,584 | India | 18,528 | nil | 18,528 | | 2 | | 18,526 | nil | | 49,351 | |
| PERSIA | 1920 | 130 | | 130 | | 290,089 | 290,219 | | | 166,892 | 123,327 | | 10,000 |
| | 1921 | 436 | | 436 | | 174,660 | 175,096 | | | 116,834 | 58,262 | | 10,000 |
| | 1922 | 6,871 | | 6,871 | | 528,241 | 535,112 | | | 301,864 | 233,248 | | 10,000 |
| SIAM | (²²) 1920 | 113,600 | India | 113,600 | | | | | | | | | |
| | (²³) 1921 | 120,700 | India | 128,021 | | (²⁴) 4,500 | 132,521 | | | | 132,521 | | 9,121 |
| | (²⁵) 1922 | 7,321 | China (Yunan) | 106,500 | | | 106,500 | | | | 106,500 | | 9,121 |
| | (²⁶) 1923 | 106,500 | India | 131,350 | | | 131,350 | | | | 131,350 | | 9,121 |
| | (²⁷) 1923 | 131,350 | India | 96,180 | nil | 96,180 | | | | 96,180 | | | 9,121 |
| | (²⁸) 1924 | 96,180 | India | 90,000 | nil | 90,000 | | | | 90,000 | | | 9,121 |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS. . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 218,909 | India | 222,400 | | | 222,400 | | | 7,224 | 215,176 | | 881 |
| | 1922 | 3,491 | Persia | 127,159 | nil | 127,159 | | | 13,950 | 113,209 | nil | | 881 |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) (1) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS (continued) | 1923 | 152,464 2,432 | India Persia | 154,896 | | nil | 154,896 | | | 16,691 | 138,205 | nil | 881 |
| | 1924 | 204,324 6,804 | India Persia | 211,128 | | nil | 211,128 | | | 1,234 | 209,894 | nil | 881 |
| SWEDEN | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 712 | Turkey | 712 | | nil | 712 | | | | | | 5,954 |
| | 1923 | 460 | Turkey | 460 | | nil | 460 | | | | | | 5,954 |
| | 1924 | 24 | Turkey | 24 | | nil | 24 | | | nil | 24 | | 5,903 |
| SWITZERLAND . . | (*) 1923 | 59,500 10,000 | Turkey Persia and China | 69,500 | | nil | 69,500 | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | (**) 1925 | 36,306 5,983 592 308 9 | Turkey Greece France Netherlands Other countries | 43,198 | | nil | 43,198 | 80 14 12 6 | Germany Belgium Ecuador Other countries | 112 | 43,086 | | 3,880 |
| TURKEY | 1924 | | | | | 565,826 | | | | | | | 13,357 |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 246 21 585 | Turkey Persia Not defined | 852 | | nil | 852 | | | Negligible | 852 | | 6,928 |
| | 1923 | 49 1 287 | Turkey Persia Not defined | 337 | | nil | 337 | | | Negligible | 337 | | 6,928 |
| | 1924 | 84 296 | Turkey Unknown | 380 | | nil | 380 | | | 1 | 379 | | 6,928 |
| | 1925 | 102 215 | Turkey Other countries | 317 | | nil | 317 | | | Negligible | 317 | | 6,928 |

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|--------------------------------|------|--|--|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated (Hectares) ⁽¹⁾ | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manuf. of alkaloids | Used in manufacture of morphine, heroin, etc. | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 27 11,016 22,810 16,809 10,609 | France Greece European Turkey England Asiatic Turkey | 61,271 | | nil | 61,271 | 381 53 45 98 | Guatemala Mexico Colombia Other countries | 577 | 60,694 | 62,175 | 110,000 |
| | 1923 | 5,120 | | 5,120 | | nil | 5,120 | 14 96 | Panama Other countries | 110 | 5,010 | | 110,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(1) 1 hectare = 2.471 acres.
 (2) The demand was met by the balance of opium brought forward at the end of 1923.
 (3) Owing to the fact that the new law came into force on July 26th, 1923, the figures of import, export and consumption for the period January 1st to July 26th, 1923, cannot be guaranteed. Before the application of the new law, only wholesale dealers were obliged to register the movements of the drugs.
 (4) The statistics established by the Customs Administration do not separate raw opium, prepared opium, and medicinal opium. Imports and Exports under "Special Trade".
 (5) Estimated from quantity of morphine, heroin, etc., manufactured.
 (6) Re-export of opium for which a market could not be found in the United Kingdom.
 (7) These exports consisted of opium from Persia unsaleable in the United Kingdom, returned to Persia with the consent of the Persian Government.
 (8) Includes raw opium used in the manufacture of medicinal opium and preparations of opium.
 (9) Includes Irish Free State.
 (10) Excludes Irish Free State.
 (11) Estimated from quantity of morphia manufactured.
 (12) Including Punjab (area under poppy cultivation: 1,889 hectares; opium produced: 4,032 kgs.).
 (13) Including Punjab Hills (area under poppy cultivation: 685 hectares; opium produced: 4,229 kgs.).
 (14) Shipped to the High Commissioner for India, in London, for disposal for strictly and bona-fide medical purposes.
 (15) The opium monopoly bought within the country 29,276 kgs. in 1923; 22,454 kgs. in 1924, which have not been included among imports.
 (16) Second half of 1924 only.
 (17) Used: 15,722 kgs. in Japan proper, 1,409 kgs. in Chosen.
 (18) Used: in Japan proper, 18,158 kgs.; in Chosen, 1,393 kgs.

(19) This quantity was sent back to the country of origin on account of inferior quality.
 (20) The quantities of raw opium used for the manufacture of prepared opium in Formosa and Kwantung are under entries Formosa and Kwantung.
 (21) Excluding 958 kgs. manufactured in narcocon and other drugs, and 1,082 kgs. in medicinal opium. In Japan proper and Chosen no opium was used for other end than manufacturing drugs.
 (22) These figures are included in those for Japan and territories.
 (23) Excluding 18 kgs. used in the manufacture of other drugs.
 (24) Calculated from crude morphia production figures.
 (25) All raw opium imported is used for the manufacture of prepared opium for sale to licensed smokers. The exportation of prepared opium is prohibited. In 1924, 2 kgs. 700 were used in Kwantung for the manufacture of medicinal opium.
 (26) Statistics in chests, which have been taken to contain 70 kgs. per chest.
 (27) All raw opium imported is used in manufacture of prepared opium by the opium monopoly. Exportation negligible for scientific purposes.
 (28) April 1st, 1919, to March 31st, 1920.
 (29) " " " " 1920, " " " " 1921.
 (30) The production is only estimated and corresponds to the 1917 figures.
 (31) April 1st, 1921, to March 31st, 1922.
 (32) " " " " 1922, " " " " 1923.
 (33) Calendar year. Siam statistics no longer given according to the Buddhist Era (April 1st to March 31st), but according to the calendar year.
 (34) The figures now given for 1924 are for the calendar year, and replace former entries, which were for the Buddhist year.
 (35) Approximate figures supplied by the Customs authorities under the category "Vegetable sap, concentrated by evaporation". Most of this is opium imported from Turkey.
 (36) August 1st to December 31st.
 * Statistics cannot be furnished; see note in Summary of Reports.

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS.

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries whose imports plus manufacture are equal to 50 kilogrammes or over.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------------|-------|--|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands | | |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | | |
| ARGENTINE | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 169 | | 169 | | | | | | | | 8,698 | | |
| | 1922 | 130 | | 130 | | | | | | | | 8,698 | | |
| | 1923 | 319 | | 319 | | | | | | | | 8,698 | | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1921 | 724 | Great Britain | 743 | nil | 743 | | | 36 | 707 | | 5,426 | | |
| | | 19 | Switzerland | | | | | | | 4 | 50 | | 5,426 | |
| | 1922 | 52 | United Kingdom | | 52 | 2 | 54 | | | 6 | 62 | | 5,426 | |
| | 1923 | 67 | United Kingdom | 68 | nil | 68 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | Switzerland | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AUSTRIA | (*) 1922 | 740 | Greece | 992 | nil | 992 | | | 359 | 633 | | 6,131 | | |
| | | 250 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1923 | 121 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 10 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | Switzerland | 1,054 | nil | 1,054 | | | 698 | 356 | 800 | 6,131 | | | |
| | 501 | Turkey | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 420 | Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | Several countries | 147 | nil | 147 | | | 49 | 98 | 350 | 6,131 | | |
| BELGIUM | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | 7,684 | | |
| | 1922 | 413 | | 413 | | | | | 77 | | | 7,684 | | |
| | 1923 | 66 | | 66 | | | | | 55 | | | 7,684 | | |
| | 1924 | 84 | | 84 | | | | | 4 | | | 7,684 | | |
| | 1925 | 132 | | 132 | | | | | 1 | | | 7,684 | | |
| BRAZIL | 1922 | 246 | | 246 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CANADA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 109 | United Kingdom | 109 | | | | | nil | | | 8,786 | | |
| | 1923 | 68 | | 68 | | | | | 5 | | | 8,786 | | |
| | 1924 | 106 | United Kingdom | 106 | | | | | 8 | | | 9,030 | | |

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
|--------------------|----------|---------|--|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands | |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | |
| CEYLON | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 8 | United Kingdom | 8 | nil | 8 | | | nil | 8 | | 4,504 | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 68 | United Kingdom | 68 | nil | 68 | | | nil | 68 | | 4,504 | |
| | 1924 | 16 | | 16 | nil | 16 | | | nil | 16 | | 4,504 | |
| CHILE | 1923 | 139 | | 139 | | | | | | | | 3,754 | |
| CHINA | 1920 | 13 | Hong-Kong Great Britain | 53 | | | | | | 53 | | 436,094 | |
| | 1921 | 40 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1923 | 87 | England Italy Germany Austria Greece | 495 | 55 | nil | 495 | | | nil | 495 | | 13,595 |
| | | 50 | | | 273 | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 25 | | 402 | nil | 402 | | | nil | 402 | | 13,595 | | |
| ESTHONIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | 89 | 1,750 | |
| | 1922 | 53 | | 53 | | | | | negligible | | | 1,750 | |
| | 1923 | 113 | | 113 | | | | | | | | 1,750 | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FINLAND | 1930 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1931 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1932 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1933 | 275 | | 275 | | | | | | | | 3,364 | |

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
|----------------------------------|------|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands | |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | |
| FINLAND (continued) | 1924 | 125 23 1 | Great Britain Denmark Germany | 149 | | | | | | | | 3,364 | |
| | 1925 | 44 24 22 | Denmark Germany Other countries | 90 | | | | | | | | 3,364 | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 7 | | 7 | 2,270 | 2,277 | 316 50 35 407 | Australia France South Africa Other countries | 808 | 1,469 | | (*) 47,350 | |
| | 1922 | nil | | nil | 2,052 | 2,052 | 332 314 308 160 737 | Czechoslovakia Australia Canada Finland Other countries | 1,851 | 201 | (*) 257 | (*) 44,200 | |
| | 1923 | 5 | | 5 | 2,599 | 2,604 | 310 286 286 700 | Australia Canada Finland Other countries | 1,582 | 1,022 | (*) 272 | (*) 44,200 | |
| | 1924 | negligible | | negligible | 3,569 | 3,569 | 404 365 354 216 216 807 | Australia Czechoslovakia Canada China Poland Other countries | 2,362 | 1,207 | | (*) 44,200 | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | 1,425 | 2,908 |
| GREECE | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HONG-KONG . . . | 1920 | not available | | not available | 182 | | | | | | 182 | 376 | 625 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | 625 |
| | 1922 | 3 | | 3 | nil | | | | | | | | 625 |
| | 1923 | 25 | | 25 | nil | | | | | | | | 625 |
| | 1924 | 2 | | 2 | nil | | | | | | | | 625 |

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| HUNGARY (*) . . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | 765 | 7,980 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | 518 | 7,980 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | 520 | 7,980 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | 620 | 7,980 |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 720 | England | 765 | 1,338 | 2,103 | | | | 2,103 | 472 | 77,005 |
| | | 45 | Germany | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 81 | | (*) 81 | 343 | 424 | | | | | 452 | 77,005 |
| | 1923 | 901 | Great Britain | (*) 1,275 | 631 | 1,906 | | | neglig. | 1,906 | | 77,674 |
| 225 | | France | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 149 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 231 | Great Britain | (*) 360 | 655 | 1,015 | | | 5 | 1,010 | | 77,674 | |
| | 136 | Germany | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | Switzerland | | | | | | | | | | |
| MADAGASCAR . . . | 1921 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 3,382 |
| | 1922 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 3,382 |
| | 1923 | 146 | | | | | | | | | | 3,382 |
| NETHERLANDS . . | 1921 | 24 | Belgium | 171 | | | 119 | Neth. E. Indies Other countries | 130 | | 7,030 | |
| | | 137 | Germany | | | 11 | | | | | | |
| | | 10 | Great Britain | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 5 | Great Britain | 5 | | 59 | Neth. E. Indies France Other countries | 81 | 7,030 | | | |
| | | | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| 1923 | 54 | Germany | 69 | | | 190 | Neth. E. Indies Other countries | 192 | 7,213 | | | |
| | 15 | Great Britain | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 1924 | 35 | Great Britain | 35 | | | 8 | Germany Neth. Indies | 32 | 7,213 | | | |
| | | | | | | 24 | | | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES . . | 1920 | 622 | Netherlands | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 3 | Germany | 661 | | | | | | | | 49,161 |
| | | 4 | France | | | | | | | | | |
| | 31 | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | Switzerland | | | | | | | | | |

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|----------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally manufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES . . . | 1922 | 112 | | 112 | nil | 112 | | | nil | 112 | | 49,161 |
| | 1923 | 187 | | 187 | nil | 187 | | | nil | 187 | | 49,351 |
| | 1924 | 127 2 | Netherlands Germany | 129 | nil | 129 | | | nil | 129 | | 49,351 |
| NICARAGUA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 87 | | 87 | | | | | | | | 639 |
| | 1922 | 177 | | 177 | | | | | | | | 639 |
| | 1923 | 339 | | 339 | | | | | | | | 639 |
| NORWAY | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | 2,649 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | 2,649 |
| | 1922 | 26 59 21 18 | Germany Sweden Denmark England | 124 | | | | | nil | | | 2,649 |
| | 1923 | 46 17 18 50 111 135 | Germany Denmark Sweden Persia Greece Asia Minor | 377 | | | | | | | 357 | 2,649 |
| | 1924 | 312 | | 312 | nil | 312 | | | | | 518 | 2,649 |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| POLAND | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 1,230 | | 1,230 | nil | 1,230 | | | nil | 1,230 | (*) 3,800 | 26,886 |
| | 1923 | 1,263 | | 1,263 | nil | 1,263 | | | nil | 1,263 | | 27,160 |
| | 1924 | 2,112 | | 2,112 | nil | 2,112 | | | 10 | 2,102 | | 27,160 |
| ROUMANIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 567 | | 567 | nil | 567 | | | nil | 567 | | 17,393 |
| | 1923 | 86 | | 86 | nil | 86 | | | nil | 86 | 273 | 17,393 |
| | 1924 | 135 | | 135 | nil | 135 | | | | | | 17,393 |

II. MEDICINAL OPIUM STATISTICS (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---------------------------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Locally m nufactured | Imports plus manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| SIAM | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | (10) 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | (10) 9 | 9,121 |
| | 1923 | (11) 52 | | 52 | | | | | | | | 9,121 |
| | 1924 | (12) 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | 3 | 9,121 |
| | 1924 | nil | | nil | | 1 | | | | | | 9,121 |
| SPAIN | 1923 | 58 | Several countries | 58 | | | | | | | | 21,658 |
| SWEDEN | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | 5,954 |
| | 1922 | 200 | | 200 | nil | 200 | | | | | | 5,954 |
| | 1923 | (13) | | | | | | | | | 1,050 | 5,954 |
| | 1924 | (13) | | | | | | | 30 | | 717 | 5,903 |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 1923 | nil | | nil | 121 | 121 | | | 3 | 118 | | 110,000 |

(1) From September 1st, 1921, to September 30th, 1922.
 (2) From October 1st, 1922, to December 30th, 1923.
 (3) The figures for 1923 contain raw and medicinal opium.
 (4) Includes Irish Free State.
 (5) Total of sales. Figures admittedly approximate.
 (6) Excludes Irish Free State.
 (7) Approximate figures for consumption.

(8) Contained in preparations.
 (9) Figure admittedly approximate.
 (10) April 1st, 1921, to March 31st, 1922.
 (11) April 1st, 1922, to March 31st, 1923.
 (12) Siam statistics no longer given according to the Buddhist Era (April 1st to March 31st) but according to the calendar year.
 (13) All raw opium imported since June 1st, 1923, has been transformed into medicinal opium.

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries manufacturing morphine and countries which import or consume more than 25 kilogrammes.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kg. | | kg. | kg. | |
| ARGENTINE | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 100 | nil | 100 | | | | | | 8,698 |
| | 1922 | 70 | nil | 70 | | | | | | 8,698 |
| | 1923 | 60 | nil | 60 | | | | | | 8,698 |
| AUSTRALIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 166 | nil | 166 | nil | | | 7 | 159 | 5,426 |
| | 1922 | 148 | nil | 148 | nil | | | 6 | 142 | 5,426 |
| | 1923 | 193 | nil | 193 | nil | | | 11 | 182 | 5,426 |
| AUSTRIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 196 | nil | 196 | | | | 50 | 146 | 6,131 |
| | (¹) 1923 | 404 | nil | 404 | | | | 92 | 312 | 6,131 |
| | 1924 | 264 | nil | 264 | | | | 31 | 233 | 6,131 |
| BELGIUM | 1922 | 195 | | | | | | 53 | | 7,684 |
| | 1923 | 154 | | | | | | 45 | | 7,684 |
| | 1924 | 147 | | | | | | 25 | | 7,684 |
| | 1925 | 123 | | | | | | 33 | | 7,684 |
| BRAZIL | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 27 | | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| | 1922 | 46 | | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| CANADA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 263 | nil | 263 | nil | | | negligible | 263 | 9,030 |
| | 1923 | 177 | nil | 177 | nil | | | negligible | 177 | 9,030 |
| | 1924 | 138 | nil | 138 | nil | | | (²) 106 | 32 | 9,030 |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|--------------------------|----------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| CHINA | 1920 | 25 | nil | 25 | nil | | | nil | 25 | 436,094 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | 13,595 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 61 | nil | 61 | | | | nil | | |
| | 1923 | 107 | nil | 107 | | | | nil | 148 | |
| | 1924 | 148 | nil | 148 | nil | | | nil | 148 | 13,595 |
| DANZIG | (*) 1923 | negligible | | | | | | 2 | | 340 |
| | 1924 | 14 | nil | 14 | nil | | | negligible | 14 | |
| DENMARK | 1920 | 5 | nil | 5 | | | | 8 | | 3,289 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1922 | 5 | nil | 5 | | | | 7 | | 3,289 |
| | 1923 | 60 | nil | 60 | | | | 30 | | 3,289 |
| | 1924 | 74 | nil | 74 | | | | 27 | | 3,289 |
| ESTHONIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| | 1921 | 14 | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| | 1922 | 21 | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| | 1923 | 26 | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| | 1924 | 5 | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| FINLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 148 | | | | | | | | 3,364 |
| | 1924 | 27 | nil | 27 | nil | | | nil | 27 | 3,364 |
| | 1925 | 29 | nil | 29 | nil | | | nil | 29 | 3,364 |
| FRANCE | 1920 | 2,932 | | | | | | 9,114 | | 39,402 |
| | 1921 | 1,215 | | | | | | 472 | | 39,402 |
| | 1922 | 1,814 | | | | | | 1,493 | | 39,402 |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands | |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | | |
| FRANCE (continued) | 1923 | 1,017 | | | | 280 | Cuba China Syria Other countries | 4,025 | | 39,402 | |
| | 1924 | 829 | | | | 155 | | | | | |
| GERMANY | 1920 | | | | | 91 | | France Italy Canada Germany Other countries | 781 | | 59,857 |
| | 1921 | 128 | (⁵) 8,620 | 8,748 | 4,048 | 255 | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | * 1923 * 1924 | | | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . . | 1920 | | | | | 1,023 | France Italy Canada Germany Other countries | | | (7) 47,350 | |
| | 1921 | 6 | 4,198 | 4,204 | (⁶) 910 | 191 181 102 700 | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 19 | 8,958 | 8,977 | 5,236 | 1,226 281 261 208 207 116 1,441 | France Italy Canada Germany Spain Japan Other countries | 3,740 | 1 | (⁶) 44,200 | |
| | 1923 | 123 | 7,225 | 7,348 | 4,727 | 388 272 257 191 180 1,519 | France Japan Spain Australia Netherlands Other countries | 2,807 | — 186 | (⁶) 44,200 | |
| | 1924 | (⁶) 2,583 | 7,405 | 9,988 | 4,411 | 391 216 212 210 172 1,309 | France Austria Germany Japan Canada Other countries | 2,510 | 3,067 | (⁶) 44,200 7,980 | |
| HUNGARY | (¹⁰) | | | | | | | | | | |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| INDIA | 1920 | | 448 | | | 340 | Great Britain | 340 | 108 | 319,075 |
| | 1921 | | nil | | | nil | | nil | | 319,075 |
| | 1922 | | (¹¹) 15 | | | nil | | nil | | 319,075 |
| | 1923 | | (¹¹) 59 | | | nil | | nil | | 319,075 |
| | 1924 | | (¹¹) 2,033 | | | 2,036 | Great Britain | 2,036 | | 319,075 |
| INDO-CHINA | 1920 | 63 | nil | 63 | | | | | | 20,000 |
| | 1921 | 166 | nil | 166 | | | | nil | 166 | 20,000 |
| | 1922 | nil | nil | nil | | | | nil | nil | 20,000 |
| | 1923 | 26 | nil | 26 | | | | | | 20,000 |
| | 1924 | 6 | nil | 6 | | | | | | 20,000 |
| ITALY | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 925 | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | 1922 | 729 | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | (¹¹) 1924 | 212 | | | | | | negligible | | 38,835 |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Formosa, Chosen, Kwantung), etc. (¹¹) | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 5,971 | 5,219 | 11,190 | 960 | | | 5 | 10,225 | 77,674 |
| | 1922 | 316 | 2,131 | 2,447 | 551 | | | 3 | 1,893 | 77,674 |
| | 1923 | (¹¹) 107 | 2,325 | 2,432 | (¹¹) | | | 1 | | 77,674 |
| | 1924 | (¹¹) 242 | 1,491 | 1,733 | (¹¹) | | | 2 | | 77,674 |
| CHOSEN | 1920 | | 542 | 542 | | | | | | 17,264 |
| | (¹¹) 1921 | 40 | 176 | 216 | | | | | | 17,264 |
| | (¹¹) 1922 | | 60 | 60 | | | | | | 17,264 |
| | (¹¹) 1923 | (¹¹) 11 | 43 | 54 | (¹¹) | | | | | 17,264 |
| | (¹¹) 1924 | nil | 6 | 6 | (¹¹) | | | negligible | 6 | 17,264 |
| KWANTUNG | 1920 | 33 | nil | 33 | nil | | | nil | 33 | 687 |
| | (¹¹) 1921 | 5 | nil | 5 | nil | | | nil | 5 | 687 |
| | (¹¹) 1922 | 7 | nil | 7 | nil | | | nil | 7 | 687 |
| | (¹¹) 1923 | (¹¹) 5 | nil | 5 | nil | | | nil | 5 | 687 |
| | (¹¹) 1924 | (¹¹) 17 | nil | 17 | nil | | | nil | 17 | 687 |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|----------------------------------|------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| NETHERLANDS . . . | 1921 | 109 | | | | 7 22 | Italy Other countries | 29 | | 7,030 |
| | 1922 | 311 | | | | 96 67 46 42 24 33 | Italy Switzerland Great Britain Germany Neth. Indies Other countries | 308 | | 7,030 |
| | 1923 | 261 | | | | 526 133 62 45 51 | Switzerland France Germany Finland Other countries | 817 | | 7,213 |
| | 1924 | 262 | | | | 308 224 30 14 | Switzerland Germany Egypt Other countries | 576 | | 7,213 |
| NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES . . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | 49,161 |
| | 1921 | 30 | | | | | | | | 49,161 |
| | 1922 | 46 | nil | 46 | nil | | | nil | 46 | 49,161 |
| | 1923 | 9 | nil | 9 | nil | | | nil | 9 | 49,351 |
| NEW ZEALAND . . . | 1924 | 3 | nil | 3 | nil | | | nil | 3 | 49,351 |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 16 | nil | 16 | nil | | | nil | 16 | 1,218 |
| | 1922 | 12 | nil | 12 | nil | | | nil | 12 | 1,218 |
| NORWAY | 1923 | 38 | nil | 38 | nil | | | nil | 38 | 1,218 |
| | 1924 | 22 | nil | 22 | nil | | | negligible | 22 | 1,218 |
| NORWAY | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 53 | nil | 53 | nil | | | nil | 53 | 2,649 |
| | 1923 | 48 | nil | 48 | nil | | | | | 2,649 |
| | 1924 | 54 | nil | 54 | nil | | | | | 2,649 |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| POLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 184 | nil | 184 | nil | | | nil | 184 | 26,376 |
| | 1922 | 130 | nil | 130 | nil | | | nil | 130 | 26,376 |
| | 1923 | 154 | nil | 154 | nil | | | nil | 154 | 27,160 |
| | 1924 | 309 | nil | 309 | nil | | | nil | 309 | 27,160 |
| ROUMANIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 11 | nil | 11 | nil | | | nil | 11 | 17,393 |
| | 1923 | 16 | nil | 16 | nil | | | nil | 16 | 17,393 |
| | 1924 | 78 | | | | | | | | 17,393 |
| SPAIN | 1923 | 68 | | | | | | | | 21,658 |
| SWEDEN | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 155 | nil | 155 | nil | | | negligible | 155 | 5,954 |
| | 1923 | 232 | nil | 332 | nil | | | 8 | 324 | 5,954 |
| | 1924 | 42 | nil | 42 | nil | | | nil | 42 | 5,903 |
| SWITZERLAND | 1920 | 3,228 | 450 | 3,678 | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1921 | | 2,500 | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1922 | 2,087 | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1923 | 1,175 | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | (^a) 1925 | 497 | | | | | 1,317 100 85 70 182 | Japan Esthonia Spain Turkey Other countries | 1,754 | |

III. MORPHINE AND SALTS OF MORPHINE (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|------------------------------------|------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus manufacture | Used in manufacture of heroin and other alkaloids | Exports (including re-exports) | Countries to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 27 | nil | 27 | nil | | | negligible | 27 | 6,928 |
| | 1923 | 44 | nil | 44 | nil | | | negligible | 44 | 6,928 |
| | 1924 | 14 | nil | 14 | nil | | | (²²) 16 | | 6,928 |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 1925 | 20 | nil | 20 | nil | | | negligible | 20 | |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 8 | 9,120 | 9,128 | | | | 72 | | 110,000 |
| | 1922 | 60 | 5,207 | 5,267 | | 26 11 41 | Mexico Russia Other countries | 78 | | 110,000 |
| | 1923 | 5 | 5,556 | 5,561 | | 4 13 | Porto-Rico Other countries | 17 | 5,544 | 110,000 |

(¹) Period from October 1st, 1922, to December 30th, 1923.
(²) 105 kgs. returned to England by the Department of Customs and Excise.
(³) Danzig has hitherto given a total figure for morphine, cocaine and heroin. This figure was 1,535 kilos in 1921 and 304 kilos in 1922.
(⁴) Last quarter.
(⁵) Of these 8,620 kgs., 3,890 kgs. were manufactured into codeine and dionin.
(⁶) Includes morphine used in the manufacture of preparations containing morphine.
(⁷) Includes Irish Free State.
(⁸) Excludes Irish Free State.
(⁹) Including 439 kgs. seized in Hong-Kong and brought to Great Britain for disposal, and 1,819 kgs. of crude morphine imported from India.
(¹⁰) Approximate figures of consumption, 1920 : 180 kgs. ; 1921 : 137 kgs. ; 1922 : 160 kgs. ; 1923 : 152 kgs.
(¹¹) November 1st, 1921, to October 31st, 1922.

(¹²) November 1st, 1922, to October 31st, 1923.
(¹³) November 1st, 1923, to October 31st, 1924 — Including 1,840 kgs. of raw morphine.
(¹⁴) Second half of 1924 only.
(¹⁵) Movements from Japan proper to Chosen, Formosa and Kwantung are recorded as imports into those territories but they are not considered or recorded as exports from Japan and Territories.
(¹⁶) The drugs containing morphine such as solution, powder and tablets of pantopon, etc., in terms of morphine weight as indicated in the table, have been imported.
(¹⁷) In Japan proper and Chosen, a quantity of 2,617 kgs. in 1923, 1,466 kgs. in 1924, of morphine salts has been used for the manufacture of heroin salts, codeine and dionin.
(¹⁸) These figures are included in those for Japan and Territories.
(¹⁹) Importations from Japan proper.
(²⁰) Importations from Japan and Germany.
(²¹) From August 1st to December 31st.
(²²) Including 15 kgs. of morphine exported to Paris, part of a seizure of 25 kgs. made in 1923. Statistics cannot be furnished; see note in Summary of Reports.

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries manufacturing heroin and countries whose imports or consumption equal 10 kilogrammes or more.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---------------------|----------|---------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Used in manufac- ture of prepara- tions | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| AUSTRALIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 87 | nil | 87 | nil | | | negl. | 87 | 5,426 |
| | 1922 | 11 | nil | 11 | nil | | | 1 | 10 | 5,426 |
| | 1923 | 33 | nil | 33 | nil | | | 1 | 32 | 5,426 |
| AUSTRIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 4 | nil | 4 | nil | | | 1 | 3 | 6,131 |
| | (*) 1923 | 54 | nil | 54 | nil | | | 31 | 23 | 6,131 |
| | 1924 | 27 | nil | 27 | nil | | | negl. | 27 | 6,131 |
| BELGIUM | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | 7,684 |
| | 1922 | 206 | | | | | | 108 | | 7,684 |
| | 1923 | 130 | | | | | | 72 | | 7,684 |
| | 1924 | 19 | | | | | | 60 | | 7,684 |
| | 1925 | 13 | | | | | | 2 | | 7,684 |
| BRAZIL | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | negl. | | | nil | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 19 | | | nil | | | | | 30,845 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| CANADA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1922 | 85 | nil | 85 | | | | negl. | 85 | 9,030 |
| | 1923 | 50 | nil | 50 | | | | negl. | 50 | 9,030 |
| | 1924 | 15 | nil | 15 | | | | negl. | | 9,030 |
| CEYLON | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 91 | nil | 91 | nil | | | | 91 | 4,504 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | negl. | nil | negl. | nil | | | | | 4,504 |

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|-------------------------|----------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Used in manufacture of preparations | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| FINLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 40 | | | | | | | | 3,364 |
| | 1924 | 14 | nil | 14 | nil | | | nil | 14 | 3,364 |
| FRANCE | 1925 | 12 | nil | 12 | nil | | | nil | 12 | 3,364 |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 375 | | | | | | 137 | | 39,402 |
| | 1923 | 320 | | | | | | 344 | | 39,402 |
| GERMANY | 1924 | 317 | | | | | | | | 39,402 |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | 1,140 | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN | (*) 1924 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 8 | 351 | 359 | | 140 125 39 96 | France Italy Spain Other Countries | 400 | — 41 | (*) 47,350 |
| | 1922 | nil | 899 | 899 | 71 | 309 150 95 44 136 | France Spain Italy Canada Other Countries | 734 | 94 | (*) 44,200 |
| | 1923 | 85 | 328 | 413 | | 130 55 31 29 98 | France Canada Spain Australia Other Countries | 343 | 70 | (*) 44,200 |

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Used in manufacture of preparations | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| GREAT BRITAIN (continued) . . . | 1924 | (*) 739 | 474 | 1,213 | | 145 35 14 14 14 82 | France Australia Austria Canada Spain Other Countries | 304 | 909 | (*) 44,200 |
| HUNGARY | (*) 1920 (*) 1921 (*) 1922 (*) 1923 | | | | | | | | | 7,980 7,980 7,980 7,980 |
| ITALY | 1920 1921 1922 1923 (*) 1924 | | | | | | | | | 38,835 38,835 38,835 38,835 negl. |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc. (10) | (*) 1921 1922 1923 1924 | 1,102 395 nil nil | 2,846 652 1,724 1,481 | 3,948 1,047 1,724 1,481 | nil | | | 4 4 nil negl. | 3,944 1,043 1,724 1,481 | 77,674 77,674 77,674 77,674 |
| CHOSEN (Korea) (11) | 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 | | | | | | | | | 17,264 17,264 17,264 17,264 nil |
| FORMOSA (11) | 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 | | | | | | | | | 3,655 3,655 3,655 negl. |

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|-----------------------|------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Used in manufacture of preparations | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| KWANTUNG | 1920 | 125 | | 125 | | | | | 125 | 687 |
| | 1921 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 15 | | 15 | | | | | 15 | 687 |
| | 1923 | (19) 14 | | 14 | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | 11 | nil | 11 | | | | nil | | |
| NETHERLANDS | 1921 | 2 | | | | 25 | Belgium Other Countries Belgium Switzerland Other Countries Switzerland France Germany Other Countries Switzerland Other Countries | 27 | | 7,030 |
| | 1922 | 20 | | | | 25 20 12 | | 57 | | 7,030 |
| | 1923 | 5 | | | | 25 18 10 3 | | 56 | | 7,213 |
| | 1924 | 1 | | | | 20 10 | | 30 | | 7,213 |
| | 1920 | | | | | | | | nil | 26 |
| NEW ZEALAND | 1921 | 26 | nil | 26 | | | | nil | 6 | 1,218 |
| | 1922 | 6 | nil | 6 | | | | nil | 11 | 1,218 |
| | 1923 | 11 | nil | 11 | | | | nil | 11 | 1,218 |
| | 1924 | 11 | nil | 11 | | | | nil | 11 | 1,218 |
| POLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | nil | | |
| | 1921 | 2 | nil | 2 | nil | | | nil | 2 | 26,886 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | nil | | |
| | 1923 | 23 | nil | 23 | nil | | | nil | 23 | 27,193 |
| 1924 | 7 | nil | 7 | nil | | | nil | 7 | 27,193 | |
| SPAIN | 1923 | 106 | | | | | | | | 21,658 |
| SWEDEN | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 1 | nil | 1 | | | | nil | 1 | 5,904 |
| | 1923 | 15 | nil | 15 | | | | nil | 15 | 5,904 |
| 1924 | 4 | nil | 4 | | | | nil | 4 | 5,904 | |

IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Used in manufacture of preparations | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| SWITZERLAND | 1920 | | 143 | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | 774 | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1922 | 356 | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1923 | 651 | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | (12) 1925 | 1 | | | | | 97 66 56 30 11 | Turkey Netherlands France Italy Other Countries | 260 | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | negl. | 472 | 472 | | | | | | 110,000 |
| | 1922 | 8 | 510 | 518 | | 15 16 | Mexico Other Countries | 31 | 461 487 | 110,000 |
| | 1923 | nil | 880 | 880 | | 3 9 | Porto Rico Other Countries | 12 | 968 | 110,000 |

(1) October 1st to December 31st, 1923.

(2) Imports include a certain amount of transit.

(3) Statistics cannot be furnished; see note in Summary of Reports.

(4) Includes Irish Free State.

(5) Excludes Irish Free State.

(6) Including 734 kgs. seized in Hong-Kong and brought to Great Britain for disposal.

(7) Approximate figures for consumption: 1920: 19 kgs.; 1921: 10 kgs.; 1922: 12 kgs.; 1923: 18 kgs.

(8) Second half of 1924 only.

(9) Of the heroin manufactured, 1,934 kgs. were manufactured from crude morphine imported from Formosa, which is not shown under morphia imports. Seizures during the year amounted to 99 lbs. Exports include 36 kgs. of heroin hydrochloride for Japanese colonies.

(10) Movements from Japan proper to Chosen, Formosa and Kwantung are recorded as imports into those territories, but they are not considered or recorded as exports from Japan and territories.

(11) These figures are included in those for Japan and territories.

(12) Imports from Japan proper.

(13) August 1st to December 31st.

V. COCA LEAVES

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries producing, importing or exporting 500 kilogrammes or more.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|---------------------|--------|---------|------|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total Imports | Surface cultivated : Hectares (¹) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manufacture of cocaine | Used in manufacture of cocaine | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| BELGIUM | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | | | 7,684 |
| | 1922 | 916 | | 916 | nil | nil | 916 | | | nil | 916 | | 7,684 |
| | 1923 | 241 | | 241 | nil | nil | 241 | | | nil | 241 | | 7,684 |
| | 1924 | 149 | | 149 | nil | nil | 149 | | | nil | 149 | | 7,684 |
| | 1925 | 315 | | 315 | nil | nil | 315 | | | nil | 315 | | 7,684 |
| BOLIVIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | (*) 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 315,628 57,500 208 84 | Argentine Chile Germany Great Britain | 373,420 | | | 2,889 |
| | 1922 | | | | | (*) 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 278,817 35,705 531 | Argentine Chile Germany | 315,053 | | | 2,889 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | 312,554 30,052 | Argentine Chile | 342,606 | | | |
| CHILE | 1923 | 242,000 | | | | | | | | | | | 3,754 |
| FORMOSA | 1922 | | | | 201 | | | | | | | | 3,655 |
| | 1923 | | | | 51 | | | | | | | | 3,655 |
| | 1924 | | | | 277 | | | | | | | | 3,655 |
| GERMANY | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 558,000 | | 558,000 | nil | nil | 558,000 | | | | | | 59,857 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | * 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | * 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . . . | 1923 | 800 | | 800 | nil | nil | 800 | 48,240 4,165 681 | France Germany Other countries | 53,086 | | nil | (*) 44,200 |

V. COCA LEAVES (continued)
(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|------|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total imports | Surface cultivated : Hectares (¹) | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manufacture of cocaine | Used in manufacture of cocaine | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| GREAT BRITAIN . . . (continued) | 1924 | 40 | | 40 | nil | nil | 40 | 36,192 3,511 555 541 | France Germany Russia Other countries | 40,799 | | | (²) 44,200 |
| JAVA | 1920 | | | | | | | 677,000 | Netherlands | 1,137,000 | | | 34,984 |
| | 1921 | | | | (²) 1,400 | | | 5,000 455,000 | Singapore Japan | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | (²) 1,400 | | | 903,290 656 1,250 378,307 | Netherlands Germany Spain Japan | 1,283,503 | | nil | 34,984 |
| | 1923 | | | | (²) 1,600 | | | 505,665 3,408 8,800 25,843 363,619 | Netherlands • à ordre Germany U.S.A. Japan | 907,335 | | | 34,984 |
| | 1924 | | | | (²) 2,112 | 1,071,485 | | 786,000 5,000 53,000 274,000 | Netherlands • à ordre Germany Japan | 1,118,000 | | nil | 34,984 |
| PERU | 1920 | | | | | (²) | | | | 453,067 | | | 4,634 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | 87,849 | | | 4,634 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | 124,357 | | | 4,634 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | 907,335 | | | 4,634 |
| SWITZERLAND . . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1921 | 28,100 | | 28,100 | nil | nil | 28,100 | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | (²) 1925 | 135 | | 135 | nil | nil | 135 | | | | | | 3,880 |

V. COCA LEAVES (concluded)
(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|------------------------------------|------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | From | Total imports | Surface cultivated Hectares ⁽¹⁾ | Locally produced | Imports plus production | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption or manufacture of cocaine | Used in manufacture of cocaine | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 175,998 | | 175,998 | nil | nil | 175,998 | | | 432 | 175,566 | | 110,000 |
| | 1922 | 14,995 10 | Peru Germany | 15,005 | nil | nil | 15,005 | 129 47 41 58 | Cuba Australia Canada Other countries | 275 | 14,730 | | 110,000 |
| | 1923 | 132,200 | | 132,200 | nil | nil | 132,200 | 168 33 | Cuba Other countries | 201 | 131,999 | | 110,000 |

(¹) 1 hectare = 2.471 acres.
(²) Figures given for production are admittedly approximate. They are stated to be based on the production of La Paz, *i.e.*, 7,500,000 Spanish pounds, which has been calculated as being more than three-quarters the total production of Bolivia.

(³) Excludes Irish Free State.
(⁴) Excluding plantations along roads, in the form of hedges, and so on.
(⁵) Production in 1880 and 1883 estimated at 10,000,000 kgs.
(⁶) August 1st to December 31st.
(⁷) Statistics cannot be furnished; see note in Summary of Reports.

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries manufacturing, importing, exporting or consuming 10 kilogrammes or more.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------------|----------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| ARGENTINE | 1920 | | | | | | | | 8,698 |
| | 1921 | 119 | | | | | | | 8,698 |
| | 1922 | 122 | | | | | | | 8,698 |
| | 1923 | 195 | | | | | | | 8,698 |
| AUSTRALIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 81 | nil | 81 | | | nil | 81 | 5,426 |
| | 1922 | 109 | nil | 109 | | | nil | 109 | 5,426 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | |
| AUSTRIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 411 | nil | 411 | | | 251 | 160 | 6,131 |
| | (1) 1923 | 476 | nil | 476 | | | 141 | 335 | |
| | 1924 | 290 | nil | 290 | | | 14 | 276 | |
| BELGIUM | 1920 | | | | | | | | 7,684 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | 7,684 |
| | 1922 | 407 | | | | | 346 | | 7,684 |
| | 1923 | 73 | | | | | 58 | | 7,684 |
| | 1924 | 62 | | | | | 16 | | 7,684 |
| | 1925 | 77 | | | | | 21 | | 7,684 |
| BRAZIL | 1920 | | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| | 1921 | 29 | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| | 1922 | 139 | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | 30,645 |
| CANADA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 93 | nil | 93 | | | negligible | 93 | 9,030 |
| | 1923 | 48 | nil | 48 | | | negligible | 48 | 9,030 |
| | 1924 | 42 | nil | 42 | | | (?) 2 | 40 | 9,030 |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------|----------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| CHILE | 1923 | 21 | nil | 21 | | | nil | 21 | 3,751 |
| CUBA | 1923 | 25 | nil | 25 | | | nil | 25 | 3,754 |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | 13,595 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | 13,595 |
| | 1923 | 94 | nil | 94 | | | nil | 94 | 13,595 |
| | 1924 | 137 | nil | 137 | | | nil | 137 | 13,595 |
| DANZIG | 1923 | 11 | nil | 11 | | | 6 | 5 | 340 |
| | 1924 | 21 | nil | 21 | 10 | Russia | 10 | 11 | 340 |
| DENMARK | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1922 | 5 | nil | 5 | | | negligible | 5 | 3,289 |
| | 1923 | 14 | nil | 14 | | | 4 | 10 | 3,289 |
| | 1924 | 28 | nil | 28 | | | 6 | 22 | 3,289 |
| ESTHONIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 25 | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 30 | | | | | 1 | | 1,750 |
| | 1924 | 21 | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| FINLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | 1,750 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | nil | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 42 | nil | 42 | | | | | 3,335 |
| | 1924 | 16 | nil | 16 | | | | | |
| | 1925 | 41 | nil | 41 | | | nil | 16 | 3,364 |
| | | | | | | | nil | 41 | 3,364 |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| FRANCE | 1920 | 718 | | | | | 2,578 | | 39,402 |
| | 1921 | 855 | | | | | 738 | | 39,402 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | 214 | | 39,402 |
| | 1923 | 462 | | | | | 176 | | 39,402 |
| | 1924 | 229 | | | | | 23 | | 39,210 |
| GERMANY | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | 6,302 | 6,302 | | | 5,291 | 1,011 | 59,857 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | |
| | • 1923 • 1924 | | | | | | | | |
| GREAT BRITAIN (1) . . . | 1920 | | | | 235 | France | | | |
| | | | | | 105 | Netherlands | | | |
| | | | | | 53 | Australia | | | |
| | 1921 | 705 | nil | 705 | 23 | Egypt | 539 | 166 | (2) 47,350 |
| | | | | | 16 | Canada | | | |
| | | | | | 107 | Other countries | | | |
| | | | | | 372 | France | | | |
| | 1922 | 210 | nil | 210 | 66 | Netherlands | 622 | — 412 | (2) 44,200 |
| | | | | 39 | Australia | | | | |
| | | | | 33 | Canada | | | | |
| 1923 | 351 | nil | 351 | 21 | India | | | | |
| | | | | 92 | Other countries | | | | |
| | | | | 37 | Australia | | | | |
| 1924 | 419 | nil | 419 | 18 | Canada | 145 | 206 | (2) 44,200 | |
| | | | | 90 | Other countries | | | | |
| | | | | 43 | Australia | | | | |
| | | | | 22 | India | | | | |
| | | | | 16 | China | 176 | 243 | (2) 44,200 | |
| | | | | 15 | Russia | | | | |
| | | | | 80 | Other countries | | | | |
| HUNGARY (2) | 1920-1923 | | | | | | | | 7,980 |
| INDIA | 1920 | 3 | nil | 3 | | | nil | 3 | 319,075 |
| | 1921 | (3) 21 | nil | 21 | | | | | 319,075 |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|----------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| INDIA (continued) . . . | 1922 | | nil | | | | | | 319,075 |
| | 1923 | 39 | nil | 39 | | | | | 319,075 |
| | 1924 | 21 | nil | 21 | | | | | 319,075 |
| INDO-CHINA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 31 | nil | 31 | | | nil | 31 | 20,000 |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | negligible | nil | negligible | | | nil | negligible | 20,000 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | |
| ITALY | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 827 | | | | | | | 36,120 |
| | 1922 | 551 | | | | | | | 38,835 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | |
| | (*) 1924 | 100 | | | | | negligible | | 38,835 |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) (10) | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 2,063 | 2,324 | 4,387 | | | 18 | 4,369 | 77,005 |
| | 1922 | 195 | 3,680 | 3,875 | | | 10 | 3,865 | 77,005 |
| | 1923 | nil | (11) 3,313 | 3,313 | | | (12) 5 | 3,308 | 77,674 |
| | 1924 | nil | (13) 1,479 | 1,479 | | | 7 | 1,472 | 77,674 |
| CHOSEN (Korea) . . . | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | (14) 37 | nil | 37 | | | nil | (15) 37 | 17,264 |
| | 1922 | (16) 45 | nil | 45 | | | nil | (16) 45 | 17,264 |
| | 1923 | (17) 19 | nil | 19 | | | negligible | (16) 19 | 17,264 |
| | 1924 | nil | nil | nil | | | negligible | nil | 17,264 |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| FORMOSA | 1920 | | | | | | | | 3,655 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | 3,655 |
| | 1922 | (17) 27 | nil | 27 | | | nil | (18) 27 | 3,655 |
| | 1923 | (17) 24 | nil | 24 | | | 1 nil | (18) 23 | 3,655 |
| | 1924 | nil | nil | nil | | | nil | nil | 3,655 |
| KWANTUNG | 1920 | 65 | nil | 65 | | | nil | 65 | 687 |
| | 1921 | (17) 19 | nil | 19 | | | nil | (18) 19 | 687 |
| | 1922 | (17) 8 | nil | 8 | | | nil | (18) 8 | 687 |
| | 1923 | (17) 32 | nil | 32 | | | nil | (18) 32 | 687 |
| | 1924 | 15 | nil | 15 | | | nil | (18) 15 | 687 |
| NETHERLANDS | 1921 | 337 | | | 463 | Great Britain | 1,515 | | 7,030 |
| | | | | | 414 | France | | | |
| | | | | 318 | Italy | | | | |
| | | | | | 75 | Belgium | | | |
| | | | | | 60 | Japan | | | |
| | | | | | 185 | Other countries | | | |
| | 1922 | 224 | | | 166 | France | 1,151 | | 7,030 |
| 152 | | | | | Belgium | | | | |
| 143 | | | | | Italy | | | | |
| 137 | | | | | Switzerland | | | | |
| 122 | | | | | Great Britain | | | | |
| 102 | | | | | Mexico | | | | |
| 57 | | | | | Syria | | | | |
| 272 | Other countries | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 71 | | | 215 | Japan | 1,157 | | 7,213 |
| 200 | | | | | Switzerland | | | | |
| 184 | | | | | Great Britain | | | | |
| 151 | | | | | France | | | | |
| 131 | | | | | Czechoslovakia | | | | |
| 53 | | | | | Austria | | | | |
| 223 | Other countries | | | | | | | | |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------|--------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands | | | |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS (continued) | 1924 | 89 | | | 298 228 114 75 60 31 125 | Switzerland Great Britain France Czechoslovakia Australia Germany Other countries | 931 | | 7,213 | | | |
| | NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES | 1920 | | | | | | | | | 49,161 | |
| | | 1921 | 28 | nil | 28 | | | | | | | 49,161 |
| | | 1922 | 12 | nil | 12 | | | | | | | 49,161 |
| | | 1923 | 10 | nil | 10 | | | | | | | 49,351 |
| | 1924 | 11 | nil | 11 | | | | 49,351 | | | | |
| NEW ZEALAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1921 | 8 | nil | 8 | | nil | 8 | 1,218 | | | |
| | | 1922 | 16 | nil | 16 | | nil | 16 | 1,218 | | | |
| | | 1923 | 15 | nil | 15 | | nil | 15 | 1,218 | | | |
| | | 1924 | 13 | nil | 13 | | | | 1,218 | | | |
| NORWAY | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1921 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1922 | 9 | nil | 9 | | nil | 9 | 2,649 | | | |
| | | 1923 | 14 | nil | 14 | | | | 2,649 | | | |
| | | 1924 | 8 | nil | 8 | | | | 2,649 | | | |
| POLAND | 1920 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1921 | 84 | nil | 84 | | nil | 84 | 26,886 | | | |
| | | 1922 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1923 | 117 | nil | 117 | | nil | 117 | 27,160 | | | |
| | | 1924 | 69 | nil | 69 | | nil | 69 | 27,160 | | | |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| ROUMANIA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 30 | nil | 30 | | | nil | 30 | 17,393 |
| | 1924 | 15 | nil | 15 | | | nil | 15 | 17,393 |
| | 1924 | 24 | nil | 24 | | | nil | 24 | 17,393 |
| SPAIN | 1923 | 25 | | | | | | | 21,658 |
| SWEDEN | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | 125 | nil | 125 | | | negligible | 125 | 5,954 |
| | 1923 | 41 | nil | 41 | | | | | 5,954 |
| | 1924 | 19 | nil | 19 | | | | | 5,903 |
| SWITZERLAND | 1920 | 892 | 321 | 1,213 | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1921 | 881 | 732 | 1,613 | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1922 | 997 | 391 | 1,388 | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1923 | 551 | 186 | 737 | | | | | 3,880 |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | 3,880 |
| | (19) 1925 | 140 | | | | 31 25 19 43 | Spain Italy Sweden Other countries | 118 | |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 4 | nil | 4 | | | negligible | 4 | 6,928 |
| | 1923 | 14 | nil | 14 | | | negligible | 14 | 6,928 |
| | 1924 | 14 | nil | 14 | | | negligible | 14 | 6,928 |
| | 1925 | 20 | nil | 20 | | | negligible | 20 | 6,928 |

VI. COCAINE AND SALTS OF COCAINE (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------------------------------|------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| | | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | negligible | 2,311 | 2,311 | | | 225 | 2,086 | 110,000 |
| | 1922 | 127 | 1,656 | 1,783 | 22 14 | Canada Japan | 96 | 1,687 | 110,000 |
| | 1923 | 71 | 1,623 | 1,694 | 14 46 | Russia Other countries | | | |
| | | | | | | 11 7 12 | Cuba Canada Other countries | 30 | 1,664 |
| URUGUAY ⁽¹⁹⁾ | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | 18 | | | | | | | 1,407 |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | |

(¹) Figures for the period October 1st, 1922, to December 30th, 1923.
 (²) 2 kgs. have been returned to Germany.
 (³) Last quarter.
 (⁴) No direct manufacture or refining carried out in the United Kingdom.
 (⁵) Includes Irish Free State.
 (⁶) Excludes Irish Free State.
 (⁷) Approximate figures for consumption : 1920 : 46 kgs. ; 1921 : 50 kgs. ; 1922 : 40 kgs. ; 1923 : 48 kgs.
 (⁸) Fiscal year 1920-1921 (April 1st, 1920, to March 31st, 1921).
 (⁹) Second half of 1921 only.
 (¹⁰) Movements from Japan proper to Chosen, Formosa and Kwantung are recorded as imports into those territories, but they are not considered or recorded as exports from Japan and Territories.
 (¹¹) In 1923, 1,874 kgs. of raw cocaine were imported for the manufacture of this quantity. This quantity of crude cocaine was a part of the raw material from which the 3,313 kgs. of cocaine were manufactured.

(¹²) The exports were as follows : 3 kgs. 851 from Japan proper to China ; 1 kg. 360 from Formosa to a hospital in China under the management of the Government of Formosa, and 0 kg. 040 to Russia.
 (¹³) A part of this quantity was manufactured with the raw cocaine imported. See Table VIa.
 (¹⁴) Importation from Japan proper, except 5 kgs. from the Netherlands.
 (¹⁵) These figures are included in those for Japan and dependencies, column 9.
 (¹⁶) Importation from Japan proper, except 5 kgs. from the Netherlands and 4 kgs. from China.
 (¹⁷) Importation from Japan proper.
 (¹⁸) August 1st to December 31st.
 (¹⁹) Average for the years 1921, 1922, 1923.
 * Statistics cannot be furnished : see note in Summary of Reports.

NOTE. — In 1924 Greece and French West Africa each consumed 10 kgs. of cocaine.

VI a. RAW COCAINE

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries manufacturing, importing, exporting or consuming 10 kilogrammes or more.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--|----------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Countries | Year | Imports | Manufacture | Imports plus Manufacture | Exports (including re-exports) | Country to which exported | Total Exports (including re-exports) | Available for internal consumption | Population in thousands |
| FRANCE | 1920 | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | kgs. | | kgs. | kgs. | 39,402 |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | 826 | | | | | | | 39,402 |
| GERMANY | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 51 | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | |
| | • 1923 | | | | | | | | |
| | • 1924 | | | | | | | | 59,857 |
| GREAT BRITAIN | (1) 1921 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | nil | | | (2) | | | | (2) 44,200 |
| | 1923 | negligible | | | 57 | France | 58 | | (2) 44,200 |
| | 1924 | nil | | | 1 | Other countries | | | (2) 44,200 |
| JAPAN AND TERRITORIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.) | 1920 | | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | 1,530 | | | | | | | 77,674 |
| | 1922 | 1,014 | | | | | | | 77,674 |
| | 1923 | 1,874 | | | | | | | 77,674 |
| | 1924 | 1,024 | | | | | | | 77,674 |

(1) Distinction between crude and refined cocaine not made.

(2) Excludes Irish Free State

• Statistics cannot be furnished; see note in Summary of Reports

PART II.
PREPARED OPIUM STATISTICS

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

This table gives countries where the use of prepared opium is still permitted.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----|------|
| Countries | Year | Locally manufactured | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population (in thousands) | Adult Chinese male population | Number of registered smokers | Remarks | | |
| BRITISH NORTH BORNEO | 1920 | kgs. 8,435 | kgs. 8,435 | kgs. 7,712 | 258 | 20,700 | (1) | <p>(1) Smokers not registered.</p> <p>(2) 5,911 kgs. raw opium were used for manufacture of prepared opium. As the origin of this opium was not given, it was not possible to calculate the exact quantity of prepared opium in 1923.</p> <p>(3) 5,459 kgs. of raw opium were used for the manufacture of prepared opium.</p> | | |
| | 1921 | | | 5,124 | | 21,100 | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | 4,396 | | 21,500 | | | | |
| | 1923 | (4) | | 4,209 | | 21,800 | | | | |
| | 1924 | (5) | | 4,137 | | | | | | |
| BRUNEI | 1920 | | | | 40 | 884 | (6) | <p>(4) The sale of prepared opium in the district of Muara is not taken into account.</p> <p>(5) The increase is due to a large influx of Chinese labour for work on rubber estates and a new oil-field.</p> <p>(6) Including Muara District formerly not reported or accounted.</p> | | |
| | 1921 | | | 178 | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | (7) | | (8) 225 | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | (9) 336 | | | | | | |
| | (10) 1924 | | | | | | | | | |
| BURMA | 1920 | | | (11) 41,924 | 13,000 | | 5,405 | <p>(7) The increase is due to the continual influx of Chinese labour into the Belait District.</p> <p>(8) No statistics as to quantity used ; statistics refer to Excise opium issued to retailers for ultimate preparations. The figures recorded in column 5 have been considered as representing prepared opium, although the Report of the Administration of the Excise Department does not qualify it as prepared opium.</p> | | |
| | 1921 | | | 37,946 | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | (12) 30,778 | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | (13) | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | (14) | | | | | | |
| CEYLON | 1920 | | | 323 | 4,504 | 688 | 780 | <p>(9) From April 1st, 1922, to March 31st, 1923.</p> <p>(10) Sale of prepared opium prohibited ; quantity of raw opium prepared by consumers unknown.</p> | | |
| | 1921 | 636 | 3,818 | 306 | | | | | 674 | 688 |
| | 1922 | 340 | | 288 | | | | | 674 | 666 |
| | 1923 | 302 | | 256 | | | | | 643 | (15) |
| | 1924 | 219 | | 216 | | | | | | |
| CHINA (16) | 1920 | | | | 436,094 | | | <p>(11) The number of Chinese consumers of opium in Burma is estimated to be 16,988. Registered Burman consumers were 14,049 in 1912 ; in 1924 this number had fallen to 1,144.</p> <p>(12) Total number of consumers (smokers and eaters) using opium, 1920 : 11,842 ; 1921 : 10,645 ; 1922 : 9,908 ; 1923 : 8,647 ; 1924 : 8,323.</p> <p>(13) No legitimate trade. Amount of illicit consumption unknown.</p> | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | | | |

PREPARED OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---------------------------------|------|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Countries | Year | Locally manufactured | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population (in thousands) | Adult Chinese male population | Number of registered smokers | Remarks |
| FORMOSA | 1920 | kgs. 65,443 | kgs. 65,443 | kgs. 66,517 | 3,654 | | 49,036 | ⁽¹⁴⁾ Adult male population not known. Total Chinese population at the end of 1922 : 27,066. ⁽¹⁵⁾ 33,965 men, 5,498 women. ⁽¹⁶⁾ Number of smokers given approximately. 1922 : 7,840 ; 1923 : 8,780. ⁽¹⁷⁾ Importation : 524 kgs. ⁽¹⁸⁾ Number of smokers presumably estimated. Consumption reduced from 136,300 kgs. in 1916. ⁽¹⁹⁾ Quantities of opium placed on the market by the monopoly : 64,510 kgs. prepared opium and 9,408 kgs. raw opium. In Kwang-Chow-Wan 41,362 kgs. raw opium and 10,660 kgs. prepared opium have been placed on the market. ⁽²⁰⁾ Quantities of opium placed on the market by the monopoly, in the five countries of the Union: 66,492 kgs. prepared opium and 37,800 kgs. raw opium. In Kwang-Chow-Wan 780 kgs. prepared opium have been placed on the market. ⁽²¹⁾ Licit consumption decreased by 7,426 kgs. in the five countries of the Union. ⁽²²⁾ Chinese population. ⁽²³⁾ About 50 per cent of Chinese population estimated in 1924 to 1,000,000. ⁽²⁴⁾ Figures calculated assuming that 40 per cent in weight is lost preparing chandu from raw Indian opium. ⁽²⁵⁾ No prepared opium is manufactured by the Government, nor is manufacture by private persons for sale permitted. Prepared opium can only be made by private individuals (within the limits of legal possession) for their own use. |
| | 1921 | | | 52,838 | | | 45,832 | |
| | 1922 | | | 54,166 | | ⁽¹⁴⁾ | 42,923 | |
| | 1923 | | | 48,126 | 48,126 | 3,643 | ⁽¹⁵⁾ 39,463 | |
| | 1924 | | | 44,230 | 44,230 | 3,807 | 37,286 | |
| FRENCH INDIA | 1920 | | | | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | 524 | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | 524 | 263 | | ⁽¹⁹⁾ | |
| | 1923 | | ⁽¹⁷⁾ | 516 | | | | |
| | 1924 | | ⁽¹⁷⁾ | 516 | | | | |
| FRENCH INDO-CHINA | 1920 | 53,616 | 53,616 | 63,000 | 20,000 | | ⁽²⁰⁾ 110,000 | |
| | 1921 | | | 73,211 | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | 68,254 | | | | |
| | 1923 | | ⁽¹⁸⁾ | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | ⁽¹⁸⁾ | ⁽²¹⁾ | | | | |
| HONG-KONG | 1920 | 10,975 | 10,975 | 11,127 | ⁽²²⁾ 635 | ⁽²³⁾ | ⁽²⁴⁾ | |
| | 1921 | 10,205 | 10,205 | 9,934 | 675 | | | |
| | 1922 | ⁽²⁵⁾ 11,887 | 11,887 | 13,999 | 705 | | | |
| | 1923 | ⁽²⁵⁾ 8,072 | 8,072 | 14,520 | 1,000 | | | |
| | 1924 | ⁽²⁵⁾ 10,995 | 10,995 | 13,288 | 1,000 | | | |
| INDIA ⁽²⁵⁾ | 1920 | | | | 319,075 | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | | | | | |

PREPARED OPIUM STATISTICS (continued)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Locally manufactured | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population (in thousands) | Adult Chinese male population | Number of registered smokers | Remarks |
| KWANTUNG | 1920 | kgs. 8,161 | kgs. | kgs. 8,636 | 600 | 216,745 | (²⁰) 2,808 2,430 | <p>(²⁰) All the smokers are Chinese.</p> <p>(²¹) The quantity of raw opium used for the manufacture of prepared opium amounts to 14,464 kgs. in 1923, to 17,328 in 1924.</p> <p>(²²) It has been assumed that each chest of raw opium yields 40 kgs. of prepared opium. The export is authorised and is said to have been to Chile.</p> <p>(²³) The difference between the figures of local manufacture and the amount available for internal consumption is due to the fact that 9,600 kgs. were exported from Macao.</p> <p>(²⁴) It has been assumed that each chest of raw opium yields 40 kgs. of prepared opium. The difference between the figures of manufacture and the amount available for internal consumption is due to the fact that 2,353 kgs. prepared opium were exported to Paraguay.</p> <p>(²⁵) Quantity sold for consumption.</p> <p>(²⁶) The consumption was increasing only in Perlis and Kedah owing to the influx of Chinese following the revival of tin and rubber and general improvement of trade.</p> <p>(²⁷) Total number of Chinese population according to 1921 census was 876,000.</p> <p>(²⁸) Number of consumers unknown.</p> <p>(²⁹) Total number of Chinese population : 809,647.</p> <p>* The prepared opium consumed is manufactured at the Singapore Government Factory and supplied by the Singapore Monopolies Department.</p> |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | (²⁷) | | | | | | |
| | 1924 | (²⁷) | | | | | | |
| MACAO | (²⁸) 1920 | 20,500 | (²⁸) 10,900 | 10,622 | 74 | | | |
| | 1921 | | | | | | | |
| | 1922 | | | | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | | | | | |
| | (²⁹) 1924 | 10,440 | 8,087 | 5,438 | 120 | | | |
| MALAY STATES (FEDERATED) * | 1920 | | | 59,708 | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | 37,390 | 1,036 | 298,566 | | |
| | 1922 | | | 32,140 | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | 38,072 | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | (³¹) 38,771 | | | | |
| MALAY STATES (UNFEDERATED) | 1920 | | | 37,724 | | | | |
| | 1921 | | | 23,641 | 984 | 121,809 | | |
| | 1922 | | | 20,364 | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | 23,483 | | | | |
| | 1924 | | | (³²) 22,815 | | | | |
| NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES | 1920 | 126,817 | 126,817 | 100,665 | 49,161 | | | |
| | 1921 | | | 83,399 | | (³³) | (³⁴) | |
| | 1922 | | | 64,450 | | | | |
| | 1923 | | | 53,534 | 49,351 | | 142,730 | |
| | 1924 | | | 50,341 | 49,351 | (³⁵) | 133,512 | |

PREPARED OPIUM STATISTICS (concluded)

(Weight given in kilogrammes throughout)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Countries | Year | Locally manufactured | Available for internal consumption | Actually consumed | Population (in thousands) | Adult Chinese male population | Number of registered smokers | Remarks |
| SARAWAK | (¹⁰) 1924 | kgs. (¹¹) | kgs. | kgs. 2,611 | | | (¹²) 4,724 | <p>(¹⁰) Period July 1st to December 31st, 1924. The rights under the " Farms system " were transferred to the Government as from July 1st, 1924.</p> <p>(¹¹) 3,786 kgs. of raw opium were used for the manufacture of prepared opium.</p> <p>(¹²) Number of Chinese residents in 1920 : 260,194.</p> <p>(¹³) From April 1st, 1920, to March 31st, 1921.</p> <p>(¹⁴) Number of smokers is estimated at 200,000. The figures for consumption represent the amount of opium sold for smoking or consumption.</p> <p>(¹⁵) From April 1st, 1921, to March 31st, 1922.</p> <p>(¹⁶) From April 1st, 1922, to March 31st, 1923.</p> <p>(¹⁷) Siam statistics now established according to the calendar year.</p> <p>(¹⁸) The figures for 1924 are for the calendar year and replace those given previously for the Buddhist Era.</p> <p>(¹⁹) Including the prepared opium manufactured for use in the Malay States, as well as for use in the Colony itself.</p> <p>(²⁰) Quantity of prepared opium sold for consumption in the Colony. This figure does not include direct sales to the Malay States.</p> |
| SIAM | 1920 | | | | 9,121 | (²⁰) | (²¹) | |
| | (²²) 1921 | 70,054 | 70,054 | 58,484 | | | | |
| | (²³) 1922 | 57,418 | 57,418 | 50,160 | | | | |
| | (²⁴) 1923 | 48,169 | 48,169 | 47,097 | | | | |
| | (²⁵) 1923 | | | (²⁶) 50,779 | | | | |
| | (²⁷) 1924 | | | (²⁷) 51,589 | | | (²⁸) | |
| STRAITS SETTLEMENTS | 1920 | 168,144 | 72,000 | 68,638 | 881 | 244,600 | (²⁹) | |
| | 1921 | 126,612 | (³⁰) 126,612 | 57,392 | | 247,846 | | |
| | 1922 | 109,152 | (³¹) 109,152 | 51,492 | | | | |
| | 1923 | 110,847 | (³²) 110,847 | (³³) 50,246 | | | | |
| | 1924 | 102,533 | (³⁴) 102,533 | (³⁴) 44,721 | | | | |

KING'S REGULATIONS MADE UNDER ARTICLE 55 OF THE PERSIAN COASTS AND ISLANDS ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1907.

Communicated by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and submitted to the Committee on June 1st, 1926.

1. If any British subject shall, within the limits of the Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council, 1907, either on his behalf or on behalf of or as agent for any other person :

(a) Import, export, manufacture, buy, sell, or deal in opium or any dangerous drug ;

(b) Procure for any person, whether such person be within the said limits or elsewhere, any opium or dangerous drug ;

(c) Attempt to do or aid any other person in doing any of the things aforesaid ;

unless expressly permitted by general or special licence granted by the Consul-General, or if any person shall violate any condition of any such licence, he shall be guilty of an offence against these Regulations.

2. (a) If any British subject, within the limits of the Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council, 1907, aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission in any place outside the said limits of any offence punishable under the provisions of any law in force in such place and providing for the control or regulation of the manufacture, sale, use, export and import of opium or dangerous drugs in accordance with the provisions of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23rd, 1912, or of the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19th, 1925, he shall be guilty of an offence against these Regulations.

(b) For the purpose of a prosecution under the preceding paragraph, the Court may receive in evidence a certificate purporting to be issued by or on behalf of the Government of any place outside the limits of the Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council, 1907, and stating that any law mentioned in the said certificate is a law providing for the control or regulation in such place of the manufacture, sale, use, export and import of opium or dangerous drugs in accordance with the provisions of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23rd, 1912, or of the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19th, 1925 ; and any statement in any such certificate as to the effect of the law mentioned in the certificate, or any statement in any such certificate that any facts constitute an offence against that law, shall be conclusive.

3. Any person guilty of an offence against these Regulations shall on conviction be liable to a fine of 1,500 rupees or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding three months or to both ; and any opium or dangerous drug in relation to which the offence has been committed shall be forfeited.

4. For the purposes of these Regulations :

“Opium ” includes raw opium, prepared opium (including dross) and medicinal opium ;

“ Dangerous drugs ” includes morphine, cocaine (including synthetic cocaine), ecgonine, diacetyl-morphine (commonly known as diamorphine or heroin), and their respective salts, and any extract or tincture of Indian hemp, and any preparation, admixture, extract or other substance containing not less than one-fifth per cent of morphine or one-tenth per cent of cocaine or ecgonine.

For the purpose of the foregoing provision the expression “ ecgonine ” means lævo-ecgonine and includes any derivatives of ecgonine from which it may be recovered industrially, and the percentage in the case of morphine shall be calculated as in respect of anhydrous morphine.

5. These Regulations shall come into force on.

KING'S REGULATIONS MADE UNDER THE PERSIA (REGULATIONS) ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1901.

1. If any British subject shall, within the limits of the Persia Order in Council, 1889, either on his behalf or on behalf of, or as agent for, any other person :

(a) Import, export, manufacture, buy, sell or deal in opium or any dangerous drug ;

(b) Procure for any person, whether such person be within the said limits or elsewhere, any opium or dangerous drug ;

(c) Attempt to do or aid any other person in doing any of the things aforesaid ;
unless expressly permitted by general or special licence granted by the Consul-General, or if any person shall violate any condition of any such licence, he shall be guilty of an offence against these Regulations.

2. (a) If any British subject, within the limits of the Persia Order in Council, 1889, aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission in any place outside the said limits of any offence punishable under the provisions of any law in force in such place and providing for the control or regulation of the manufacture, sale, use, export and import of opium or dangerous drugs in accordance with the provisions of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23rd, 1912, or of the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February, 19th, 1925, he shall be guilty of an offence against these Regulations.

(b) For the purpose of a prosecution under the preceding paragraph, the Court may receive in evidence a certificate purporting to be issued by or on behalf of the Government of any place outside the limits of the Persia Order in Council, 1889, and stating that any law mentioned in the said certificate is a law providing for the control or regulation in such place of the manufacture, sale, use, export and import of opium or dangerous drugs in accordance with the provisions of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23rd, 1912, or of the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19th, 1925; and any statement in any such certificate as to the effect of the law mentioned in the certificate, or any statement in any such certificate that any facts constitute an offence against that law, shall be conclusive.

3. Any person guilty of an offence against these Regulations shall on conviction be liable to a fine of £100 or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding three months or to both ; and any opium or dangerous drug in relation to which the offence has been committed shall be forfeited.

4. For the purposes of these Regulations :

“ Opium ” includes raw opium, prepared opium (including dross) and medicinal opium ;

“ Dangerous drugs ” includes morphine, cocaine (including synthetic cocaine), ecgonine, diacetyl-morphine (commonly known as diamorphine or heroin), and their respective salts, and any extract or tincture of Indian hemp, and any preparation, admixture, extract, or other substance containing any proportion of diacetyl-morphine or containing not less than one-fifth per cent of morphine or one-tenth per cent of cocaine or ecgonine.

For the purpose of the foregoing provision the expression “ ecgonine ” means laevo-ecgonine and includes any derivatives of ecgonine from which it may be recovered industrially, and the percentage in the case of morphine shall be calculated as in respect of anhydrous morphine.

5. These Regulations shall come into force on

Annex 5.

O. C. 360.

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT ROTTERDAM.

Report by the Rotterdam Police, submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

[Translation.]

In continuation of our report No. 430, we, Jan Cornelis de Jong and Gérard Willem Valken, Police Inspectors at Rotterdam, both sworn guardians of the peace, have opened a more detailed enquiry, the former at Basle and the latter at Darmstadt and Hamburg.

On August 25th, 1925, and the following days, I, the former of the above-named officers, began enquiries at Basle at the firm of Buxtorf & Co., A.G., of that town, as a result of which I obtained the following information :

On April 27th, 1925, 23 cases of medicines from the firm of Merk at Darmstadt arrived for the firm of Buxtorf & Co. at Basle. These cases were to be held by Buxtorf & Co. at the disposal of the firm of Arwed Broemsen, Monckebergstrasse 5, at Hamburg, which was to wind up the transaction at a later date, and the cases were to be stored in Messrs. Buxtorf's free warehouse at the Federal Railway Station at Basle. Up to June 18th, 1925, the firm of Buxtorf & Co. at Basle received from all parts of Germany and Switzerland and from a large number of chemical factories consignments of chemical products which were to be stored in the same way and in the same free warehouse on behalf of Broemsen. I was refused information as to whence

Buxtorf had received these products and what was their quantity, on the ground that the enquiry did not relate to a punishable act committed in Switzerland. On June 5th, 1925, the director of the firm of Broemsen of Hamburg, in company with another person, visited the office of Messrs. Buxtorf. M. Buxtorf knew the former as Alexander Vierhuff, and the second person was introduced to him as Vierhuff's brother-in-law, George Dittmar. These two men went themselves to the warehouse and repacked the chemical products in other cases and placed new marks on the cases. No one assisted them in this work. When a consignment was ready, Buxtorf was instructed to despatch it. According to Buxtorf, consignments were sent through all the principal ports of the continent. On June 18th last, for example, on Vierhuff's instructions, Buxtorf sent 34 cases through the forwarding agency of Ch. Natural at Basle to the firm of Hermann en Theilnahmen at Rotterdam, these cases to be consigned in transit to the "Holland Amerika Lijn" at Rotterdam on behalf of the firm of Broemsen at Hamburg. These cases had the same marks and numbers as those specified on Buxtorf's invoices Nos. 2378 and 2379, which were annexed to report No. 430. They constituted the first consignment sent from the warehouse and despatched through Rotterdam. Buxtorf was not aware of the final destination of these goods. The firm of Ch. Natural, as agents of the "Holland Amerika Lijn", had only been instructed to forward them as far as Rotterdam, but the goods were despatched and loaded by Buxtorf. Buxtorf knew that part of the chemical products he had received from Broemsen were packed in these cases and hidden under the soap, etc., described as the contents of the cases in the invoices. On July 3rd, 1925, there were still 27 cases of this kind at the warehouse when news was received that the consignment sent through Rotterdam had been seized. At the same time the firm of Broemsen sent word from Hamburg that these 27 cases were to be immediately despatched to the Balkans, and Buxtorf sent them on the same day to this agent at Buchs (on the Austro-Swiss frontier). He refused to say to whom and in whose name these cases were to be despatched. The most careful enquiry at Basle failed to disclose whether any person had played a part in sending this consignment. Buxtorf alone had seen it and knew that it had been sent off. Vierhuff and Dittmar stayed at an hotel at Basle from June 5th, 1925, to June 18th, 1925. They were known in this hotel as being friends and not relations. The tradesman who supplied the cases in which were packed the boxes containing the chemical products has not been discovered. All the preparations were made by Vierhuff. Buxtorf was unable to say how Vierhuff had obtained the soap, gelatine, etc., with which the chemical products were covered. The people at the warehouse were also unable to give any information on this subject, as they were unable to see what Vierhuff and Dittmar were doing in their compartment.

The enquiries made at the firm of E. Merck & Co. at Frankfort-on-Main elicited the fact that on April 25th, 1925, this firm, acting on the instructions of the firm of Arwed Broemsen at Hamburg, sent 25 cases containing morphine to Buxtorf & Co. at Basle. These cases were all supplied with the trade-mark $\frac{M}{S}$ and were bound with iron bands provided with two lead seals. A licence, numbered 60386/A — 653, had been issued on March 1st, 1925, for the exportation of this morphine. The firm of Merck believed that the destination of these cases was Optekaroki Blagiweschensk in Russia or China. They denied any knowledge of what happened later to this consignment. On being shown the photograph of the confiscated goods, they recognised the cases provided with the trade mark $\frac{M}{S}$ when this mark was painted or stamped on the cases, but not when it was drawn on them, apparently by hand. They also observed that the original iron bands were absent, from which it may be concluded that the cases were repacked in Switzerland. They could give no information with regard to the cases provided with other marks.

Enquiry at Hamburg elicited the fact that the present director of the firm of A. Broemsen in that town, named Alexander Vierhuff, born on April 7th, 1877, at Riga, is regarded as responsible for the offence. The police in that town have drawn up an accusation against Vierhuff for illicit exportation of narcotics and have taken penal proceedings against him. For that reason, objections were made to allowing me to question Vierhuff on the matter. I was assured, however, that on request from the judicial authorities, the documents in the possession of the Public Ministry at Hamburg in file No. XI 1281/25 would no doubt be shown. According to Bulletin No. 218, dated September 18th, 1925, of the Central Police Department at Hamburg, the above-named Alexander Vierhuff, and Margarethe Christlieb, born at Altona, on August 22nd, 1900, have been arrested in connection with this case and are at present undergoing detention.

The above report has been drawn up by us on oath, the which we have concluded and signed this 19th day of September 1925.

(Signed) DE JONG.

VALKEN.

Annex 5 (a).

O. C. 360 (a).

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT ROTTERDAM.

*Letter from Dr. Anselmino to the Secretary of the Committee,
submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.*

[Translation.]

Berlin, March 25th, 1926.

With reference to the letter of September 15th, 1925, I have the honour to enclose a copy of the reply sent by the Health Office of the Reich to the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Cases of the kind referred to will no longer be possible when Switzerland has adopted the certificate system.

(Signed) DR. ANSELMINO,
(on leave).

Certified,

(Signed) BLOCK,
Chief Secretary (Reich Health Office).

*Reply sent by the Health Office of the German Government
to the Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs.*

[Translation.]

Berlin, March 25th, 1926.

I have the honour to inform you of the result of the enquiries which were made on receipt of your letters of July 20th, 1925, No. 19789, and August 27th, 1925, No. 23504. The penal proceedings are still pending. The results of the enquiries so far carried out confirm the statements made in your letter of December 24th, 1925, No. 33482.

The consignment of 144,750 kgs. of morphine seized at Rotterdam was packed at Basle in 31 cases, together with other goods, by the Hamburg firm of Arwed Broemsen, and was despatched to Rotterdam, whence it was to be shipped to the Far East.

The consignments of five and seven cases which were seized at Shanghai on the steamers *Oostkerk* and *Ouderkerk*, and which had been declared to consist of starch and soap, but were found to contain morphine in addition to those articles, were despatched by Messrs. Rudolf Oskar Raeber, of Frankfort-on-Main. Penal proceedings have been taken against this firm. The other 18 cases seized on the steamer *Ouderkerk* were despatched by Messrs. Arwed Broemsen. This firm imported the morphine from Basle into the free port of Hamburg without authorisation as "harmless chemicals", packed it there with other goods and then shipped it.

The firm state that they acted for A. S. Goldberg, authorised representative of Daltotat Abthekersky Sojus, of Blagovyeshchensk, who is now said to be staying in Paris.

Messrs. Broemsen have now had their licence to trade in narcotics withdrawn, and the manager who was responsible in this matter has been punished. Further penal proceedings against him are also pending.

Messrs. Ullrich Strobel, of Frankfort-on-Main, and J. Hevecke, of Hamburg, who are also mentioned in connection with this affair, merely acted as forwarding agents for their principals.

The morphine seized at Tientsin on the steamer *Westerdyk* was sent by Messrs. Julius Grossmann, of Hamburg. This firm purchased the goods from Messrs. C. N. Schmidt, of Damrak 28/30, Amsterdam, and shipped them first to Hamburg and then to Eastern Asia. The goods were ordered by Messrs. Coantzaki, Mattai & Co., Harbin, who had also given instructions for them to be packed in cocoa-butter.

Correspondance on this matter was exchanged between the German Foreign Office and the Netherlands Legation in the winter of 1924-25.

The following sentence from the report attached to the letter of December 24th, 1925, requires some explanation: "Messrs. Merck thought that these cases were to be sent to Optekaroki Blagovyeshchensk in Russia or China." It might be inferred from this statement that Messrs. Merck knew when selling the drugs to Messrs. Broemsen that they were intended to be sent to the Far East. This is not the case, however. It was not until August 1925, when the consignment had already been seized and they had been notified of the seizure by the Hesse police, that Messrs. Merck learnt on enquiry from Messrs. Broemsen that the latter had sold the drugs to a purchaser in the Far East.

The correspondence on the subject was shown to the Netherlands police official at the time when the case was under consideration at Darmstadt—not, as stated in the report, at Frankfort—and it is probable that the Netherlands official, when drawing up the report, did not

remember the date of this correspondence and assumed that Messrs. Merck made this enquiry of Messrs. Broemsen at the time of the purchase.

As at that time there was a keen demand for drugs by Swiss firms, Messrs. Merck might quite reasonably have believed that Messrs. Broemsen purchased the goods from them for a Swiss firm.

Moreover, Messrs. Merck's papers contain an entry to the effect that Inspector Valken stated that he was satisfied they were not a party to the breaches of the Opium Convention which were shown to have been committed by Messrs. Broemsen.

(Signed) BUMM.

Annex 5 (b).

O. C. 360 (b).

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT TIENTSIN ON BOARD THE S.S. "WESTERDIJK".

Letter from the Netherlands Government, submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

The Hague, May 25th, 1926.

[Translation.]

The Section for League of Nations Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as the central authority for opium seizures, desires to place before the Secretariat of the League of Nations the following information.

In Document O. C. 360, dated April 20th last, a communication from Dr. Anselmino was submitted to the members of the Advisory Committee on Opium. This communication, which deals among other subjects with the seizures of morphine on board the Dutch s.s. *Westerdijk*, of which the Netherlands Government had already informed the Secretariat before that date, contains a reference to a consignment of morphine from the firm of C. N. Schmidt, Amsterdam.

The enquiry carried out by the Netherlands authorities has failed to show that the firm in question has infringed the legal regulations or that the consignment was irregular.

Annex 6.

O. C. 372.

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT HAMBURG.

*Letter and Memorandum from the German Government,
submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.*

Geneva, February 11th, 1926.

[Translation.]

I am instructed by my Government to forward to you the annexed copy of a communication from the German Ministry of the Interior regarding the smuggling operations discovered at Hamburg and to request you to communicate its contents to the members of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and to the countries concerned.

The Swiss Government has already received a copy of this communication through the German Legation at Berne.

(Signed) ASCHMANN,
Consul-General.

Memorandum from the German Government.

The smuggling of narcotic drugs on a large scale has been brought to light by the police authorities at Hamburg. The offenders have been sentenced by the Hamburg Courts to various terms of imprisonment or fines. The smuggled goods came exclusively from the chemical factory of Hoffmann, La Roche & Co., at Basle, and were introduced under a false declaration as "harmless chemicals" into the free port of Hamburg, where they were placed by the smugglers together with other goods destined for shipment to the Far East. According to the store register of the Spiero Forwarding Agency at Hamburg, to which the consignments were addressed, one of these traders, a Russian of the name of Aisenberg, was continually receiving narcotics from Hoffmann, La Roche & Co., between November

13th, 1923, and January 1925. The police authorities at Hamburg have ascertained that twenty consignments were delivered during that period. At the time of the enquiry seven postal boxes addressed to Aisenberg, and containing morphine hydrochlorate, etc., were seized.

The principals of the man Aisenberg, two Russians named Talan and Schklowsky, in order to conceal the true character of these consignments, sent them marked as "boot-nails" to Dairen, and in safes to Shanghai. In two cases it was proved that Talan had exported 26 and 15 kgs. of heroin respectively to Shanghai.

Another dealer in these "harmless chemicals" was the Pole Strykowski, to whom a series of consignments was sent by Hoffmann, La Roche & Co. between December 31st, 1923, and November 21st, 1924.

The police have obtained proof of the delivery of thirty-three consignments during that period. Accounts of this firm found in the possession of Strykowski contained references to "Yeaxt", "Yaril", and "Yamyk". These appear to be code names for morphine, diacetyl-morphine (heroin) and cocaine.

In addition, a certain Chan Sham, of British nationality, received from the Swiss firm in question 21 kgs. of diacetyl-morphine in four small cases, which were seized.

According to a letter from Hoffmann, La Roche & Co., to the Spiero Forwarding Agency at Hamburg, found in the possession of one of the offenders, this Swiss firm sent two further consignments to a Japanese of the name of Tanaka on April 28th, 1924, and September 24th, 1924, respectively, the former of 50 kgs. of diacetyl-morphine and the latter of four further postal boxes of "harmless chemicals".

The information obtained by the authorities unfortunately does not allow of an exact estimate of the quantity of narcotics delivered by Hoffmann, La Roche & Co., as it was only possible to ascertain the net weight of the above-mentioned consignments which were seized. Judging by the correspondence between the Swiss firm and the offenders, which from the outset was intended to conceal these transactions, many hundreds of kilogrammes must have been smuggled into the free port of Hamburg during the period in question.

The following sentences were pronounced :

| | |
|------------|--|
| Talan | A fine of 3,500 marks or 160 days' imprisonment. |
| Schklowsky | " 2,500 " 100 " " |
| Strykowski | " 4,500 " 220 " " |
| Chan Sham | " 1,500 " 40 " " |
| Tanaka | One month's imprisonment. |

Aisenberg is still at large, but a warrant has been issued for his arrest.

All the other offenders left Hamburg soon after their release. The Hamburg police have ascertained that Strykowski proceeded to Switzerland.

Particulars concerning the offenders :

1. Mendel Talan, merchant, born March 20th, 1874, at Zasnicky, Russia (Russian national).
2. Hersch Strykowski, merchant, born January 13th, 1891, at Bielsk, Poland (Polish national).
3. Chan Sham, agent, born May 16th, 1883, at Hong-Kong (British subject).
4. Schmaria Sammilowitsch Schklowsky, merchant, born February 25th, 1880, at Gluchow, Russia (Russian national).
5. Tamasaburo Tanaka, merchant, born July 13th, 1886, at Osaka, Japan (Japanese subject).

Annex 7.

C. 725. M. 267. 1925. XI.
O. C. 351.

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT SINGAPORE.

Note by the British Government, submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

On March 25th, 1924, a seizure was made at Singapore ex s.s. *Sarvislan* arriving from China ports of six $\frac{1}{4}$ -lb. packets of morphine hydrochloride bearing the label of the firm of C. H. Boehringer Sohn, of Nieder Ingleheim-am-Rhein. One of these labels, which bore the manufacturer's private marks, was forwarded by the British Government to the German Government for investigation. The German Government has informed the British Government that the Chemical factory of C. H. Boehringer Sohn in Hamburg state that the label belonged to a consignment which was sent to Rotterdam for the account of a Bulgarian firm; that an export licence had been granted to this firm on April 26th, 1923, for the export to Bulgaria of 100 lb.

of morphine and that the goods in question left for Rotterdam in a consignment of four cases marked C.H.B.S. 1025-6-9 in the s.s. *Maas* on June 16th, 1923. The competent German Authorities considered that they should abstain from ascertaining from C. H. Boehringer Sohn the name of the Bulgarian firm to which the consignments had been exported, in view of the fact that Boehringer Sohn could not be held responsible for the whereabouts of the morphine after it had been duly exported from Germany in accordance with the terms of the export licence.

The Netherlands Government were asked by the British Government to ascertain, if possible, to what destination the four cases which arrived at Rotterdam on the s.s. *Maas* were ultimately consigned, on what vessel, etc., and that Government has now communicated the following particulars to the British Government :

"The German s.s. *Maas* brought to Rotterdam on June 16th, 1923, amongst other cargo, five cases of chemicals, marked C.H.B.S. 1025/1/5, weighing 324 kgs. ; four cases of chemicals marked C.H.B.S. 1025/6/9, weighing 277.7 kgs. The shipbrokers of the s.s. *Maas* were the firm of Wambersie and Son, whose offices are at 5, Calandstraat, Rotterdam. The cases originated from Hamburg and were forwarded by Paul Klemmt, a firm of forwarding agents at Hamburg.

"The firm of Wambersie handed the cases to the firm Steinmann & Co., forwarding agents, whose offices are at 39B, Wijnhaven, Rotterdam, on the instructions of C. H. Boehringer Sohn, residing at 49, Schmilinskystrasse, Hamburg.

"Steinmann & Co. received a communication from Boehringer that the cases in question were to be held at the order of the firm of Meffert, Chemikaliengresshandlung & Exp. Zippelhaus, 18, Hamburg. Steinmann & Co. received instructions from the firm of Meffert a few days later to hand the cases to Wm. H. Müller & Co., whose offices are at 5, Willemsplein, Rotterdam. On June 23rd, 1923, Müller & Co. transported these cases back to Hamburg by the s.s. *Bernisse*, after the marks on the cases, under instructions from Meffert, had been altered to C.C.N. 1025 1/5 (five cases) C.C.N. 1025 6/9 (four cases).

"The bills of lading accompanying the cases were 'to order' but were destined for the firm of Meffert at Hamburg."

Annexe 7 (a).

O. C. 198 (a).

SEIZURES DURING MARCH, APRIL AND MAY 1924
IN THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

Enclosure to Strails Despatch No. 369 of July 10th, 1924.

Opium seized during March all came from China and comprised about 600 tahils of raw opium and 2,322 tahils of prepared opium.

One seizure of dangerous drugs was made on March 25th, when a number of packets containing morphine hydrochloride, cocaine hydrochloride, and novocaine were found hidden in a passenger's cabin on board the s.s. *Sarvistan* from China ports. No arrest was made.

The following are details of this seizure :

36 tahils morphine hydrochloride, contained in six $\frac{1}{2}$ -lb. packets labelled "Morphinum hydrochloricum pulv. Ingelheim. Ph. G.V. Austr. VIII., Belg. III., Dan. VII., Helv. IV., Hung. III., Jap. III., Ned. IV., Ross. VI., Suec. IX., Cod. Franc. 1908 U.S.P., IX., Ph. Brit. C. H. Boehringer Sohn, Nieder-Ingelheim a Rh. "

19.8 tahils cocaine hydrochloride, in two packets of 1 lb. each (apothecaries' weight) unlabelled. One packet contained a test instruction sheet issued by Ferdinand Roques, 36 rue Ste-Croix-de-la-Bretonnerie, Paris.

37.6 tahils novocaine, in four 1-lb. packets unlabelled (apothecaries' weight).

One of the morphine wrappers, together with the test instruction sheet above referred to, are enclosed. It is regretted that the other wrappers have not been preserved.

Opium seized in April consisted of approximately 382 tahils of raw opium and 6,722 tahils of prepared opium. Except for two small lots of Netherlands Indies prepared opium, whose combined weight was about 30 tahils, all the opium seized was of Chinese origin. The largest individual seizure was of 1,640 tahils of prepared opium in two sacks fished up from the sea by the lighthouse-keeper on the breakwater, to which they were moored by means of a rope. There were no drug seizures in April.

Opium seizures in May comprised roughly 2,489 tahils of raw opium and 5,506 tahils of prepared opium, all from China.

One drug seizure was made during the month, ten 1-oz. packets of cocaine hydrochlorate in plain blue wrappers bearing no marks being found on May 21st on board the s.s. *Chin Hua* on her arrival from China ports. The drugs were concealed behind the cushions in the officers' saloon. There was no arrest. The wrappers are attached.

(Signed) G. Gordon WILSON,
Supl. Govt. Monopolies, S.S.

Annex 7 (b).

O. C. 451.

SEIZURE OF DRUGS AT SINGAPORE.

Result of the Investigations instituted by the German Authorities in the Matter of the Export of Narcotics through C. H. Boehringer Sohn to a Bulgarian Firm.

Submitted to the Commillee on June 2nd, 1926.

Berlin, May 14th, 1926.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has the honour to inform His Britannic Majesty's Embassy, with reference to their note No. 140 (156/72/25) of November 25th, 1925, and in continuation of the Ministry's note No. III R. 354, of April 30th, 1926, of the result of the investigations instituted by the German Authorities in the matter of the export of narcotics through C. H. Boehringer Sohn to a Bulgarian firm :

The nine cases marked C.H.B.S. 1025/1-9, which were shipped on the s.s. *Maas* in June 1923 from Hamburg to Rotterdam and a few days later sent back on board the s.s. *Bernisse* to the port of shipment, contained morphine and diacetyl-morphine. The purchaser of these goods was the Bulgarian, Josef Lederer, of Sofia, Levski 5 ; they were ordered under his instructions by Hermann Meffert, of the firm, Albert Panzer, the Hamburg representative of the chemical factory C. H. Boehringer Sohn, Ingelheim, all in Hamburg.

Chemical export licences were issued for the goods by the Export Trade Department, first for Bulgaria, then for Holland. Boehringer Sohn had asked permission for the export to Bulgaria because the order came from Bulgaria, and there were no special instructions from the customer. Subsequently, at the request of the latter, the export permit was altered to Holland by the Chemical Export Department. The Ministry of Health received no information about this alteration from the Export Trade Department, which had meanwhile been closed. The part played by the firm Boehringer Sohn came to an end with the despatch of the narcotics to the forwarding agent, Steinmann and Company, in Rotterdam, in accordance with the instructions of the customer. The firm did not know about the return of the consignment to Hamburg, nor what was done with it subsequently. The accusation of having infringed the German opium laws cannot accordingly be made against the firm Boehringer Sohn.

The order for the sending back of the nine cases from Rotterdam to Hamburg was made under instructions of the Bulgarian merchant Lederer through Meffert. The latter then stored the consignment received with the warehouse, Suhr and Company. According to the storehouse books of this firm, the nine cases were unpacked and their contents divided among forty-five other cases. Meffert claims that he had nothing to do with the repacking and the fresh shipment of the goods. This was undertaken either by Lederer himself, who was temporarily in Hamburg, or by the business manager, Kellner, of the *Wiking-Handelsgesellschaft*, who has since died. It has subsequently not been possible to obtain more exact details concerning this matter.

Meffert does not possess permission to trade in narcotics. Therefore he has been punished in conformity with paragraph 8, section I, sub-paragraph 3, of the German Opium Law of March 21st, 1924, for infringement of the Opium Law and the export regulations connected therewith in accordance with the verdict of the Court of Hamburg given on February 10th, 1926.

Annex 8.

O. C. 438.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN SHANGHAI.

Note by the Japanese Representative, submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

The Japanese Consulate-General at Shanghai received about February 5th, 1926, the information from the police authorities of Kobe that one Ichiro Morizumi and three others, all Japanese subjects, left Kobe for Shanghai in connection with the shipment of morphine which was to be landed in Shanghai from the s.s. *Angkor*. The Consular officials were especially detailed for them and upon their arrival they were arrested; after investigation they confessed to the purpose of their journey and produced the bill of lading.

According to this bill of lading, which was issued by the Messageries Maritimes of Geneva, Switzerland, the eight boxes were declared to be "parfums synthétiques et produits pharmaceutiques", weighing 828 pounds. They were shipped by the Usine de l'Allondon S.A., La Plaine, Geneva, and sent "to order" via Marseilles. The marks on the cases were G.T.L.

It was learned that the accused had arranged to receive the cargo off the coast of Woosun.

While this investigation was proceeding, the s.s. *Angkor* left Shanghai for Kobe and Yokohama, where thorough searches were made to verify the testimony of the accused. These searches have proved that the shipment had been already landed before the ship reached Japan. The Japanese Government immediately ordered the Consul-General at Shanghai to report to the Customs authorities in order to find the illicitly imported drugs.

The accused were handed to the Consular court at Shanghai for trial. They were sentenced to one month's imprisonment.

Annex 8 (a).

O.C. 404.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN SHANGHAI.

*Letter from the Secretary of the International Anti-Opium Association,
enclosing a Report of Shanghai Customs Narcotic Seizures for the Quarter ending March 17th, 1926,
submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.*

Peking, March 30th, 1926.

I enclose a copy of Shanghai Customs narcotic seizures for the quarter ending March 15th, 1926.

Some weeks ago we received an anonymous communication that a big consignment of morphia was *en route* for Shanghai from Germany consigned as calcium lactate. As so many details were given, we forwarded the anonymous letter to the Shanghai Commissioner of Customs, and from the seizure it is suggestive of intimate knowledge on the part of the informant. We are informed that a further consignment is *en route* from Germany also under the label of calcium lactate.

I enclose the original labels¹ as sent by Customs: Exhibit No. 1, the small red label, is the only clue to the origin of 3,240 ozs. of heroin from Marseilles.

Exhibit No. 2 may enable the source of the morphia to be traced.

These two seizures complete the year April 1925 to March 1926, and the 16 seizures made at Shanghai during that year amount to 14,224 ozs. of which all but 192 $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. were unlabelled or mislabelled narcotics.

Before posting this letter, I shall lay the matter before the German Minister, and give it publicity, but beyond that we can do nothing. The Chinese Press makes much propaganda out of foreign narcotic seizures, and this helps to tone down poppy cultivation in China.

(Signed) W. H. Graham ASPLAND,
General Secretary.

¹ These labels are in the archives of the Secretariat.

Peking, March 31st, 1926.

P.S.—Since writing the above I have visited the German Legation and they disclaim any and all connection between the drugs and Germany. They declare the transaction belongs entirely to Holland.

The Netherlands Legation declare that the spelling of certain words on the calcium lacticum label is German and not Dutch.

The steamer *Bessa* is a German steamer.

The Netherlands Legation suggests that this consignment is of the same character as previous ones which we reported to them and the League Secretariat in 1925. These former seizures were made on board the Dutch steamers *Ooskerk* and *Ouderkerk* in Shanghai, but were seizures of morphia sent from Hamburg by Ulrich Strobel to Antwerp for shipment. As no indication was given of manufacture and origin, the onus for the time being fell on the port of shipment.

(Signed) W. H. G. ASPLAND.

SHANGHAI CUSTOMS.

Labels detached from Packages containing Narcotics seized during the Period December 19th, 1925, to March 15th, 1926, to be sent to the International Anti-Opium Association, Peking (VIDE I. G. Circular 3076).

| Exhibit number | Name of Firm | Country in which located | Date of Seizure | Vessel | From | Packages | Quantity | Description |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Unknown | — | Feb. 8th, 1926 | <i>Anghor</i> | Marseilles | 648 tins | 3,240 oz. | Diocetyl-morphine. Hydrochloride (Heroin). |
| 2 A, B & C | do. | — | March 6th, 1926 | <i>Bessa</i> | Antwerp | 50 tins | 273 lb. 40 oz. (4,410 oz.) | Morphia Hydrochloride. |

Prepared by W. G. ROBERTS,
Transport Officer,
Chinese Maritime Customs.

(Signed) COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS.

Shanghai, March 22nd, 1926.

Annex 8 (b).

C. 243. M. 91. 1926. XI.

O. C. 398.

ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN SHANGHAI.

Memorandum by the German Government, submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

Penal proceedings for the smuggling of narcotic drugs have been instituted by the Hamburg Public Prosecution against Heinrich Retter, born August 18th, 1893, living at Spaldingstrasse 30, Hamburg, the owner of an export and import business, as a result of the following information discovered by the Hamburg police :

During the period from November 10th, 1924, to July 29th, 1925, Retter received nine cases marked " pharmaceutical products " and in part containing narcotic drugs from the " Usines de l'Allondon, S.A., " La Plaine, Geneva. As appears from a letter seized by the police, each of these cases contained other chemicals as well, so that the consigning firm could claim to describe the whole contents as pharmaceutical products. After their arrival at Hamburg, the consignments were repacked by Retter and the narcotics apparently disposed of by him to a Greek named Anastopoulos, of Athens. Retter's statement regarding the disposal of the narcotics is probably false ; the Greek Anastopoulos is unknown at Hamburg and has never registered with the police.

According to the invoices and accounts from the Usines de l'Allondon, S.A., found in Retter's possession, he received the following consignments from that firm :

1. November 10th, 1924, A.H. 3455 br. 27 kgs. containing 1 kg. cocaine.
2. November 27th, 1924, R. 3641 br. 47 kgs. containing 5 kgs. cocaine, 3 kgs. diacetyl-morphine.
3. December 27th, 1925, H.R. 270 br. 42.5 kgs. containing 6 kgs. cocaine, 3 kgs. diacetyl-morphine.
4. February 25th, 1925, H.R. 492 br. 42 kgs. containing 6 kgs. cocaine, 3 kgs. diacetyl-morphine.
5. April 30th, 1925, H.R. 958/9 br. 64 kgs. {
6. May 30th, 1925, H.R. 1191 br. 26 kgs. { Contents not known, as no invoice
7. July 1st, 1925, H.R. 2125 br. 27 kgs. { was forthcoming.
8. July 29th, 1925. H.R. 2936 br. 26.5 kgs. containing 3 kgs. diacetyl-morphine.

It was further ascertained that a case marked R.H. 2955, sent on July 31st, 1925, by the Usines de l'Allondon, S.A., and containing 35 kgs. of cocaine and 3 kgs. of diacetyl-morphine (packed in seven separate boxes) was introduced into the free port of Hamburg. This consignment remained at the disposal of the above-mentioned firm. The recipients, the forwarding agency of Carl Lassen & Co., of Hamburg, received instructions from the firm only to deliver the separate boxes marked with numbers to the person producing their order of delivery, i.e., to Retter. In view of the large sum for which these boxes were insured, the forwarding agency of Lassen & Co. became suspicious and asked the Usines de l'Allondon, S.A., to inform them of their contents. The Geneva firm replied that they contained "milk sugar with santonin". The authorities were in time to seize two cases each containing 6 kgs. of cocaine, while Retter claims to have disposed of the remaining five to the above-mentioned Greek of the name of Anastopoulos.

The penal proceedings instituted have not yet been concluded.

Annex 9.

O. C. 405

TRAFFIC WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN INDIAN OPIUM
OBTAINED FROM KWONG CHOW WAN.

Report by the Superintendent of Imports and Exports at Hong-Kong, transmitted by the British Government and submitted to the Committee on June 2nd, 1926.

February 2nd, 1926.

I forward herewith a report on the examination of some papers found by Senior Revenue Officer Watt recently in a house in Chiu Long Street. The importance or interest of the series is that this is the first time that I have been able to reveal that some of the Indian opium sold at Kwong Chow Wan does actually go to the United States of America. It also shows that the Indian raw opium market at Kwong Chow Wan is still being permitted to be carried on.

2. Only a small amount of illicit opium was found in the house, and one man was convicted. This man, however, could not be connected with the documents found in the house, no mention was made of his name and no proper books of account were found in his possession, the documents found being only fragmentary papers, and letters to one of firm names used from Kwong Chow Wan. No further action was therefore possible against him. He will be kept under observation.

3. Among the papers found was a book of addresses in Seattle and a sales account for opium received, from a Chinese firm in Seattle. I have at once communicated with the Consul-General for the United States of America, giving him all particulars.

(Signed) J. D. LLOYD,
Superintendent of Imports and Exports.

Report on Documents found at 7, Chiu Loong Street.

The person who used the floor carried on his business as usual in such cases under several different firm names. It is impossible to be certain whether there was any genuine business carried on besides the sending of prepared opium in 5-tael tins in considerable quantities to Seattle, United States of America. The papers found covered a period of about six months up to the end of 1925, during which time mention was found of the despatch of 17,235 taels of prepared opium to Seattle.

2. I attach an account of one consignment showing the profit made of 13 per cent only, this appears to have been the usual rate of profit made by the person concerned, who only financed part of each consignment, part being financed by his friends, generally in about equal proportions, occasionally in the ratio of 3 to 7.

3. The importance of these papers is that they disclose the source of the opium to have been Kwong Chow Wan.

The firm here bought from their friends in Kwong Chow Wan raw Indian opium by the chest from the licensed dealers, who alone have the privilege of purchasing from the French authorities. The opium was then boiled in Kwong Chow Wan at an inclusive cost per chest, packed into tins and smuggled into Hong-Kong by means not disclosed. An account for an order for 2,000 taels for the United States of America is instructive :

| | Dollars |
|---|------------------|
| Two chests Indian opium at \$5,550 each | 11,100.00 |
| Labour and expenses, boiling at \$250 | 500.00 |
| Additional opium to make 2,000 taels (39 taels) | 218.40 |
| | <hr/> |
| Cost of 2,000 taels ready packed | <u>11,818.40</u> |

These two chests produced, on boiling, 979 and 982 taels of prepared opium respectively. That is, the opium was boiled down to the consistency of the first quality opium known commonly as "Kam Shan", i.e., specially prepared, originally, for the American market. The opium was packed in 400 tins containing 5 taels each, and was despatched to Hong-Kong about the middle of December last.

4. The following details gathered from the papers are of interest.

On November 1st, 1925, the price fixed by the French authorities per chest was \$4,400, the right to buy cost \$800 per chest, and interest was charged at \$140 per chest, making the cost of each chest \$5,240. Whether the charge for the right to buy is in the nature of an illegal or unofficial gratification is not clear, the expression has been encountered before in connection with the sale of official imports of Indian opium at Kwong Chow Wan. It may mean the brokerage or commission paid to one of the many officially recognised opium dealers to buy for another unauthorised person. But this fee and a charge for interest is always included in the price quoted per chest of Indian opium at Kwong Chow Wan.

The following are quotations for Indian opium on the opium market at Kwong Chow Wan.

| | Dollars |
|--|---------|
| November 1st, 1925, basic price, direct purchase | 5,240 |
| December 10th, 1925, market, actual purchase | 5,550 |
| December ? date, just after the former | 5,350 |
| December 22nd, market strong and rising | 5,750 |
| January 2nd, 1926 | 6,050 |
| January 10th, 1926, for lots of two or three chests only, higher for larger lots | 5,900 |

The above figures show a considerable rise as the China New Year demand affects the market, the fall by January 10th can be interpreted as being due to the fact that by that time there would be no time to boil and pack and ship to Hong-Kong in time for the China New Year shipments to United States of America. The former quotations I have obtained for Kwong Chow Wan Indian opium have been considerably higher when Shanghai was in the market. It is said that Shanghai is not a strong buyer at present. These figures seem to show that the United States of America is the main support.

5. The prices charged per 5-tael tin varied from \$28.50 to \$32 and \$33.

(Signed) J. D. LLOYD,
Superintendent of Imports and Exports.

February 3rd, 1926.

Sales Account for the Sale of 200 Taels of Prepared Opium to Seattle, United States of America, in Tins containing Five Taels Each (date not given).

| | H-K Dollars |
|--|-----------------|
| Received in United States of America notes : \$6,350, equals | 10,768.75 |
| By telegraphic transfer | 6,419.60 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 17,088.35 (sic) |
| Deduct sale of Ah Yung's ten tins | 589.20 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 16,499.15 |
| Original capital invested | 14,560.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| Net profit | <u>1,939.15</u> |

To be divided into three and seven shares respectively.
Average sale price per tin : \$58.92.

Another sale :

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|--------------|
| 330 tins of 5 taels each.. | :: | :: | :: | :: | :: | \$11,114.896 |
| Profit | :: | :: | :: | :: | :: | \$1,577.99 |

(Initialed) J. D. L.
S. I. E.

February 3rd, 1926.

Annex 10.

O. C. 416.

FORGED LABELS ON PACKETS CONTAINING NARCOTICS.

Letter from the German Consul-General at Geneva.

[Translation.]

Geneva, December 9th, 1925.

I am instructed by my Government to make the following communication in reply to your note of July 1st, 1925 (12A/44861/24297), to the German Minister for Foreign Affairs.

At about the same time that the Secretariat informed the German Government in the note already referred to of the seizure at Singapore on board the *Tilawa* of a consignment of cocaine hydrochlorate purporting, according to the labels on the wrapping, to come from the firms of "E. Merck, Darmstadt" and "Boehringer", the British Government drew attention to the seizure (mentioned in League document O. C. 270) at Calcutta, on board the steamship *Kum Sang*, of a consignment of cocaine hydrochlorate manufactured, according to the labels on the wrapping, by the firm of "C. F. Boehringer & Sohne, Mannheim". The chemical factories of C. F. Boehringer & Sohne, G.m.b.H., at Mannheim and E. Merck at Darmstadt have declared that the labels, seals and paper covers sent to them are obvious forgeries. The firm of C. F. Boehringer & Sohne has referred, in connection with the indications of forgery, to the declarations already made by it in the *Nam Sang* case (see letter from the Secretariat dated April 9th, 1924-12A/34656/24297—and the letter from this Consulate dated March 11th, 1925, No. 438/25), and has added that cocaine in packets weighing 24 and 25 ounces has not been sold by it for many years. The firm E. Merck declares that the blue bag in question is manufactured of a kind of paper which has never been used by it. The fastening is also not of the kind ordinarily employed in the factory. Moreover, the paper bag does not bear any label or any sign that a label has been there and has fallen off. Packets of cocaine without description labels are never issued by the firm of Merck. The seals are also declared to be forgeries; they are very clever imitations. If the labels, etc., are forgeries, it is extremely probable that the goods which were seized were not of German origin. I may refer to the Annex to League of Nations document C. 385 (a). M. 128 (a). 1925. XI—O. C. 274 (a) of July 25th, 1925. It would appear that international smugglers deliberately put narcotics which are not of German origin on the market bearing marks which are more or less successful imitations of German merchandise marks in order that, if any of the goods are seized, the suspicion of having engaged in illicit traffic should fall upon German firms. Reference is made in League of Nations document O. C. 295 of August 14th, 1925, to the fact that falsifications of the merchandise marks of German firms have been discovered in connection with the seizure of narcotics at Hong-Kong, Singapore and Calcutta, and falsifications have also been noted, according to that document, in the case of English and American products.

In these circumstances, the German Government considers it regrettable that before a case of smuggling has been thoroughly investigated the Secretariat of the League of Nations should forward to the States Members of the League and to the Parties to the Hague Opium Convention in a circular note a communication from another Government, according to which, in the case in question, narcotics manufactured by "German firms" have been seized. Communications of this kind made without previous investigation of the facts of the case have been published in the last few months not only in League of Nations document O. C. 270—undated (C. F. Boehringer & Sohne, Mannheim)—already referred to, but also in the following League of Nations documents :

O. C. 261, of May 28th, 1925 (C. Boehringer & Son, Mannheim) ;

O. C. 263, of May 28th, 1925 (Boehringer, Mannheim, and C. F. Boehringer, Mannheim) ;

O. C. 274, C. 395, M. 128, 1925, XI, of July 2nd, 1925 (E. Merck, Darmstadt and Boehringer) ;

O. C. 198 (a) C. 376. M. 123. 1925. XI, of July 9th, 1925 (C. H. Boehringer Sohn, Nieder-Ingelheim) ;

O. C. 287, of July 31st, 1925 (Chemische Werke Grenzach, A.G., Grenzach, Baden).

As the Secretariat of the League of Nations is aware, the German Government is doing everything in its power to prevent the illegal exportation of narcotics to the Far East. In view of this fact and in consideration of the prejudice caused by falsifications to the German firms concerned, the German Government would be glad if an opportunity were afforded to it in such cases of investigating any question which arises and obtaining the necessary information on the subject.

The German Government ventures at the same time to point out that if in a particular case the labels and other merchandise marks of German firms which are forwarded to it are shown to be forgeries, it is hardly possible for the competent German authorities to discover the sender and the place of origin of the goods which have been seized merely by virtue of such forged indications. In order to trace the forgers it would seem to be necessary that the authorities of the Government in whose name the seizure was effected should also make further enquiries as to the sender and the place of origin of the goods on the basis of the ship's papers and any other evidence which they may have at their disposal as a result of the seizure. In view of the common interest which all Parties to the Opium Convention have in the suppression of opium smuggling, and for this purpose in the discovery of forgeries, the German Government has entered into negotiations with the British and Japanese Governments with a view to instituting further enquiries for the purpose of discovering the forgers.

(Signed) ASCHMANN,
Consul-General.

Annex 11.

O. C. 375.

DUPLICATE EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

Letter from Dr. Anselmino, submitted to the Commillee on June 4th, 1926.

[Translation from the German.]

Berlin, January 6th, 1926.

The working of the system of certificates for narcotics has not infrequently involved unforeseen difficulties, owing to certain countries requiring the certificate to be produced, together with the goods, at their Customs offices, whereas other countries require its submission to the Consular offices in the country of export ; the latter offices, as a rule retain the certificates.

As German opium legislation, following the lines recommended by the League of Nations, lays down that the certificates which have to be produced in order to obtain an export permit are to be retained in the Reich Public Health Office, it becomes impossible, in the cases referred to above, to effect deliveries, or at best considerable loss of time and expense are incurred owing to the necessity of applying for duplicates of the certificates. It seems to me that these difficulties might be avoided if the certificates were made out in a sufficient number of copies to satisfy the internal regulations of the country concerned and to leave one copy over for retention by the Government of the exporting country. This procedure is adopted in Switzerland and the Philippine Islands.

Until this matter has been settled by the decisions of the Geneva Convention of 1925, I would suggest, with a view to remedying the present difficulties, that countries issuing certificates should send one copy of the certificate to the exporting country for its exclusive use, so that no question of the return of the certificate would arise.

(Signed) ANSELMINO.

Annex 12.

**EXTRACTS FROM INTELLIGENCE REPORTS FROM HIS BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S
CONSULS IN CHINA FOR THE HALF-YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30TH, 1925,**

Forwarded by the British Government and submitted to the Committee on June 4th, 1926.

**I. EXTRACT FROM CHENGTU CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.**

Opium.

A journey by boat made in May from Chungking to Chengtu *via* Suifu showed that opium is being openly and extensively cultivated in this province. Large fields of opium poppy in full bloom were seen on both banks of the Yangtze and Min rivers, especially in the regions between Luchow and Siufu and between Siufu and Chiating.

An opium smokers' tax was instituted in Chengtu by Yang Sen at a fixed price of four dollars per month per lamp. Opium only costs about one dollar and fifty cents per ounce and most chair- and carrier-coolies are opium addicts.

**II. EXTRACT FROM CHINKIANG CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.**

Opium.

Conditions remain unchanged.

A correspondent writing from Tungtai, east of the Grand Canal, says: "During the earlier part of the year General Ma Yu-jen introduced a large consignment of opium into Northern Kiangsu in order to improve his exchequer. A large proportion of this opium was prepared for consumption in Tungtai, where it was easily obtained and comparatively cheap. Supplies of opium are now reduced to their normal proportions, and opium-smoking again limited to the few who can either afford it as a luxury, or are unable to do without it. No opium is actually grown in this district."

**III. EXTRACT FROM CHUNGING CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.**

Opium.

A communication received from the Foreign Affairs Commissioner in August stated that, according to a report from the Opium Prevention Office, Butterfield & Swire's s.s. *Wanh sien* had carried a large cargo of smuggled opium and asked that the ship's comradore be handed over to be dealt with. I replied that British ships were strictly prohibited from transporting smuggled opium and that if it was suspected that there was any on board the matter should be reported to the Maritime Customs for appropriate action; that as, in this case, this had not been done, there was no reliable evidence in the case, and I was therefore, unable to deal with it.

Opium is openly smoked everywhere.

**IV. EXTRACT FROM KIUKIANG CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.**

Opium.

The traffic in opium goes on unchecked. It indirectly causes the British Municipal Council considerable trouble, as the importers are apparently prepared to pay large bribes to the Municipal police to prevent any interference with the opium whilst in transit through the concession. One sum mentioned recently by a clerk in the police-station was \$700 a month. There are only twenty-five police in Municipal employ and the result of bribery on such a large scale must be, and is, inefficiency and constant quarrels in the police force itself.

V. EXTRACT FROM MUKDEN CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.

Opium.

According to the Press, the cultivation of the poppy in Jehol has been legalised, as the revenue which will accrue therefrom is urgently needed to meet the military expenditure of the district.

VI. EXTRACT FROM TSINGTAO CONSULAR INTELLIGENCE REPORT FOR HALF-YEAR ENDED
SEPTEMBER 1925.

Opium, etc.

The following contraband drugs, etc., were confiscated by the Customs during the half-year :

| | Quantity Tael | Value Hk. Tael |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Opium, native, raw | 330 | 660 |
| Opium, foreign, raw | 161 | 322 |
| Morphia | 830 | 18,260 |
| Cocaine | 309 | 2,250 |
| Opium pills, etc. | — | 28 |
| Total value | | <u>21,520</u> |

Annex 13.

C. 90. M. 46. 1926. XI.
O. C. 371.

SEIZURE OF OPIUM BY THE GOVERNMENT OF HONG-KONG.

Letter from the Governor of Hong-Kong to the British Government.

Hong-Kong, December 24th, 1925.

With reference to your despatch No. 206 of June 5th, 1925, I have the honour to forward a translation of a set of labels found on a cake of opium recently seized in this colony, together with a report by the Superintendent of Imports and Exports on the seizure.

The original labels have been forwarded to His Majesty's Minister, Peking, and I regret that duplicate copies are not available.

(Signed) C. CLEMENTI.
Governor, etc.

Labels on Opium from China.

The opium came from Foochow and was packed in sixteen-tael cakes and enclosed in a sealed tin. It was carefully wrapped up in paper to which were attached these interesting labels. The opium was brittle, with a fracture something like a cake of bitumen, and it was very hard and jet black. Heat had obviously been applied to drive out the moisture, but it still retained to some extent the smell of raw opium. The quality was high; in aroma it was very similar to Indian opium, and smokers who tried it without any further preparation pronounced it to be exactly like Indian opium. The colour, however, was different. We have never come across this kind of opium before.

It is apparently meant for taking internally and not specially for smoking.

(Signed) J. D. LLOYD,
Superintendent of Imports and Exports.

November 23rd, 1925.

[Translation.]

1.
The Genuine Yi Hing.
Extra weight.
Genuine package.
The Yi Hing Company of Tsun Chau of Fokien.

2.
The Yi Hing Company.
San Gie Hing & Company.
Package of 16 (taels).

3.
The Yi Hing.
The Yi Hong Company.
Trade Mark—Double Dragons.
Special Class.

4.
The Yi Hong Company in Tsun Chau of Fokien.
Trade Mark—Double Dragons.
Purely goods of our own nation.
Restoration of our privileges.
Cheap in price and excellent in quality.
No fraud to anyone, old or young.

Notice.—Our company is established in Fung O Hill and has existed for many years. We have had long experience in drugs. We make selection personally of the best kind of white flower and manufacture Opium Substitution Drug cakes with it. These cakes can keep away malaria and foul air, stimulate the spirits and moisten the throat and tongue. They are as efficacious as gods in curing all kinds of extraordinary and difficult diseases. They are better than those imported from abroad. For fear of imitation, we have specially added the trade-mark of double dragons, so that you, gentlemen, who may favour us with your patronage, may be saved from being cheated.

(Signed) PROPRIETOR OF THE YI HING COMPANY.

Annex 14.

O. C. 449.

SUMMARY OF A DESPATCH FROM THE CHINESE MINISTER
FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR IN PEKING, ON
FEBRUARY 24TH, 1926, PROTESTING AGAINST THE SMUGGLING
OF RUSSIAN OPIUM INTO MANCHURIA.

*Submitted to the Committee by M. Chao-Hsin Chu (Chinese representative),
on June 4th, 1926.*

May 29th, 1926.

Having received a report from the Governor-General of Fengtien stating that poppy plantation has widely been spreading along the coasts of the Russian territory; Chinese farmers have been solicited to cross the frontier and work in the fields for opium growing; and after the harvest the products were smuggled into the Chinese side.

And a Report from the Civil Governor of Kilin stating that a large quantity of Russian opium has been seized by the Sui-Fin Customs Office, and such smuggling has greatly interfered with the work of suppressing opium traffic in the province.

In view of China's obligations of the Hague Convention, protest is hereby lodged against the Russian plantation of poppy, the products of which are being smuggled into China.

Annex 15.

A. 20. 1926. III.

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON THE WORK OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE
COMMITTEE.

Adopted by the Committee on June 8th, 1926.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs has the honour to submit to the Council of the League of Nations the following report on the work of its Eighth Session.

All the members of the Committee were present with the exception of the representative of Bolivia.

The Committee had the pleasure of welcoming for the first time Colonel Arthur Woods, former Police Commissioner for New York City, whom the Council had appointed as assessor on the Committee by reason of his special knowledge of police measures to suppress the clandestine traffic.

M. Brenier had expressed his regret at not being able to attend this session, and the third assessor had not yet been appointed by the Council.

Mr. Pinkney Tuck, Consul of the United States of America at Geneva, had been appointed by his Government to attend in an unofficial capacity.

The following is a complete list of the persons present during the session :

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| M. BOURGOIS (Chairman) | France |
| Dr. ANSELMINO (Vice-Chairman) | Germany |
| Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE, K.C.B. | British Empire |
| His Excellency M. CHAO-HSIN CHU | China |
| Sir John CAMPBELL, C.S.I. | India |
| M. SUGIMURA | Japan |
| M. W. G. VAN WETTUM | Netherlands |
| His Excellency M. FERREIRA | Portugal |
| M. Constantin FOTITCH | Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes |
| His Highness Prince CHAROON | Siam |
| M. DINICHERT | Switzerland |
| <hr/> | |
| Mr. S. Pinkney Tuck | United States of America |
| <hr/> | |
| Colonel Arthur Woods | Assessor |

After the election of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman and the adoption of the agenda, the Committee held twenty-one public meetings and four private meetings.

M. von PFLÜGL, on behalf of the Austrian Government, attended one of the meetings of the Committee, and, after discussion, announced that his Government would withdraw the reservation which it had attached to its signature of the Convention adopted by the Geneva Convention of 1925.

The documents which were submitted to the Advisory Committee during this session have led it to form two important conclusions, namely, that the illicit traffic is very great, and that the data at the disposal of the Committee for keeping in touch with international traffic, both licit and illicit, are insufficient.

The present position appears to be a very serious one. The seizures of manufactured drugs and of opium have been very large, and there is no doubt that the quantity of drugs manufactured is considerably in excess of medical and scientific requirements.

The Committee had before it a long list of seizures reported to the Secretariat by different Governments and detailed reports of investigations undertaken in various countries into important cases of illicit traffic. These documents are too voluminous to print *in extenso*, but the Committee thinks it advisable to extract and quote from the mass of information before it two sets of figures which illustrate the scale on which the illicit traffic is carried on.

The authorities at Hong-Kong seized during 1924, 338 kilogrammes of morphine, 150 kilogrammes of heroin and 57 kilogrammes of cocaine.

The Chinese Maritime Customs, during the years 1923 to 1925, seized 70,652 kilogrammes of home-produced opium, 13,919 kilogrammes of foreign opium, 114 kilogrammes of opium dross, 1,204 kilogrammes of morphia and 816 kilogrammes of cocaine and heroin.

Until the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925, comes into operation, effective control of the international traffic will be extremely difficult. In its first resolution, the Committee desired to express its strong desire that the various countries should ratify this new Convention as soon as possible in order that all the machinery of control set up by it might be brought into operation. It will be seen from Annex 3 that very few countries have so far ratified or adhered to this convention.

Ratification by countries Members of the Council is of particular importance, since, under Articles 36 and 19, the coming into force of the Convention depends on their ratification.

The fact that the new diplomatic instrument has not yet come into force has led to an unfortunate situation so far as the work of the Committee is concerned.

The Committee was somewhat embarrassed by the fact that, although it appreciated the urgency of new measures of control, it was yet unwilling to propose their adoption by Governments at a moment when it was awaiting the early execution of the Convention which makes provisions for measures of that very kind.

APPLICATION OF THE HAGUE CONVENTION.

Examination of the Annual Reports.

Pending the coming into force of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925, the Committee has been obliged to confine itself generally to an examination of the manner in which the Hague Convention is applied. The Committee has attached special importance to

the examination of the annual reports supplied by the Governments. It would call attention to Appendix 4 to this report and would point out that some countries have sent in no report to the League, that others have sent in reports at irregular intervals and that some have sent in reports which are incomplete. The Committee has thought fit to draw the attention of the signatory States by various resolutions to the importance that it attaches to the annual reports, as otherwise it is unable to form an estimate of the world situation as regards the traffic in drugs.

The Committee has therefore voted the following resolutions :

- Resolution III dealing with the regularity of annual reports ;
- Resolution IV dealing with statistics of seizures ;
- Resolution V dealing with statistics concerning coca.

A special resolution (No. VI) deals with the ratification of the Hague Convention by Turkey.

The Committee is impressed by information it has received which indicates that illicit traffic is being carried on in certain countries which have not yet furnished the annual reports which the League has asked for, nor any information as to the laws which have been adopted for the control of the traffic in opium and the drugs, in accordance with the provisions of the Hague Convention. The Committee would be glad if the Secretary-General would make every effort in his power to ensure the transmission of these reports and of the laws in question. It has decided to adjourn further consideration of the matter until it has learnt the result of such action.

During the discussion on the present situation, M. van Wettum made a statement to the effect that, as a consequence of the lack of purchasers, the stock of coca leaves in Amsterdam had never been so high as now, and reached a figure of about 860 tons. A Coca Planters' Association had been formed in November 1925 and had concluded an agreement with most of the cocaine manufacturers in Europe. Some producers had already diminished the area of their coca plantations and others had decided this year to grow only a partial crop.

EXPORT OF OPIUM FROM THE PERSIAN GULF.

In its last year's report, the Committee had devoted a special paragraph to the question of the exports of opium from the Persian Gulf to the Far East and had submitted a series of resolutions on this subject. The Committee has once more examined this question and has noted that the situation has not improved (see Appendix 6 to this report).

The Committee therefore considers it its duty to lay particular stress in resolution VII on the recommendations regarding the regulation of ships engaged in carrying opium in the Persian Gulf similar to those which it made last year and to which effect has not yet been given. The report which the Commission of Enquiry recently sent to Persia will shortly submit to the Council will be particularly interesting to the Advisory Committee in its work.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

After an exchange of views, the members of the Committee thought that it was advisable to ask the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to a certain number of measures referred to in resolutions VIII, IX and X. These measures are connected with maritime insurance policies (see Appendix 7), smuggling carried out by means of the post (see Appendix 8), and the necessity of direct contact between the authorities responsible for enforcing the laws regarding the illicit traffic. The Committee also calls attention to a new method of smuggling adopted by the illicit traffickers with the Far East which is described in Appendix 9.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the value of having two copies of the import certificates sent to the exporting country. It took no resolution on this subject, as it considered that it was for the Governments concerned, if they thought it advisable, to come to a direct agreement between themselves on this point.

During the session, Colonel Arthur Woods made a statement on the control of the drug traffic. This statement was regarded by the members of the Committee as of particular importance. At the suggestion of the Chairman, Colonel Woods has prepared a summary of his specific recommendations, which are herewith submitted in Appendix 10.

POSITION IN THE FAR EAST.

The Agreement drawn up by the First Geneva Conference will come into force between three of the signatory countries on July 28th, 1926. It still remains to be ratified by four States, and the Committee would ask the Council to use its utmost efforts to secure the early ratification of the Agreement by those States.

The representative of the Government of India made an important declaration on the policy which his Government had adopted in respect of the export of opium. This policy is stated in the following resolution, which has been unanimously accepted by the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly in India :

“ This Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that immediate steps should be taken to give effect to the policy of progressively reducing the exports of opium from India, except for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes, so as to extinguish them altogether within a definite period. ”

The representative of India informed the Committee that, though he was not in a position at present to state what period would be fixed for the extinction of all exports of opium from India except for medicinal and scientific purposes, he could give them an assurance that that period would not be unduly prolonged. It is understood that an announcement, definitely fixing the period, may be expected from the Government of India in the near future. It was also intimated that, when the agreement for the direct sale of raw opium to the Government of Indo-China came into force, the Calcutta auction sales would be abandoned.

The representative of the Japanese Government informed the Committee that a Supreme Council, composed of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and high Government officials, will be instructed to examine, among other questions, the most suitable measures for the suppression of the illicit traffic.

The situation in China does not appear to have changed much since the last session.

DOCUMENTS AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Committee thought it necessary to ask the Secretariat to take a certain number of steps to complete its collection of documents, particularly in respect of the legislation of the various countries (see resolution XI) and the regime of free ports. It considered it desirable to have exact information on the regime for ensuring the control of opium and drugs in free ports and free zones, and has therefore asked the Secretariat to prepare as complete a list as possible of free ports and free zones and a summary of the systems by which the control in question is exercised.

The Committee also took cognisance of the report of the Office international d'hygiène publique, which dealt with Article 8 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925. Certain points were raised by Dr. Anselmino on this report, and the Committee agreed to ask the Health Committee to confer with Dr. Anselmino before taking a decision on the report.

The Committee has also asked the Secretariat to draw up a list of the documents already published by the Section and to collect all the resolutions adopted by the Advisory Committee, by the Council and by the Assembly. A list of books dealing with drug problems will be made.

The Committee took note of a document drawn up by Dr. Anselmino with regard to the conditions governing the import and export of narcotics in various countries, colonies, and territories, whether by the ordinary channels or by post. Copies of this list can be obtained from the Secretariat by the countries interested when it has been revised by its author.

The Committee had before it a summary of the annual reports received from Governments, with statistical tables, which had been prepared by the Secretariat, and which will be printed as an annex to the minutes of its proceedings. The Committee noted a number of discrepancies between the figures of exports and imports as returned by different countries; and it recommends that in future all important discrepancies should be examined by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Governments concerned, before the summary is submitted to the Committee (see the resolution adopted by the Committee at its meeting last year, which received the approval of the Council and of the Assembly). The work of the Committee would also be greatly facilitated if the statistics could be analysed and summarised before the meeting of the Committee, so as to present a general view of the world situation in regard to the production, manufacture and distribution of the drugs. It recognises that this will place additional work on the Secretariat, and it accordingly welcomes the proposal, which it understands has been made by the Secretary-General, to add an additional member to the Section. For some time this Section will be responsible for particularly important work, but part of that will, when the new Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925, comes into force, be transferred to the organisation provided for by that Convention.

RESOLUTIONS.

I.

The Committee, after examining the information before it relating to the illicit traffic, points out the gravity of the present situation. Considerable seizures of the manufactured drugs and of opium continue to be made, and there is no doubt that the drugs continue to be manufactured on a scale vastly in excess of the world's medical and scientific requirements. Pending the coming into operation of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925, it is

extremely difficult to secure an effective control of the international traffic, and the Committee desires to urge as strongly as possible that all States should complete their ratification without delay in order that the machinery of control provided for by the Convention may be brought into operation during the present year. It is, in particular, important to secure ratification by the States Members of the Council in view of the provisions of Articles 36 and 19.

II.

The Committee recommends that the administrations called upon to decide on an application for export of drugs to a country not applying a system of import authorisations should endeavour to ascertain whether the application submitted to them is a legitimate one. This recommendation is made in the spirit which inspired Article 18 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925.

III.

The Committee requests the Council to draw the attention of those States Members of the League of Nations and Parties to the Hague Convention which do not regularly send in annual reports on the traffic in opium and dangerous drugs, or whose reports are incomplete, to the great importance that the Advisory Committee attaches to the regular receipt of full reports, which are the only means by which the Committee can keep informed on the international traffic.

IV.

The Committee recommends that the Governments, in their annual reports to the League, should be asked to state the total quantities of each of the drugs (including opium) seized by their authorities during the year, taking care to distinguish the seizures made by the Customs authorities from other seizures.

V.

The Committee desires to draw the attention of the Council to the desirability of obtaining from all countries producing coca the statistics provided for in Article 22 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925, in so far as they relate to the export of this raw material and of crude cocaine.

The Committee requests the Council to ask the Secretary-General to approach the Governments of those producing States which have not yet supplied these statistics with a view to obtaining this information.

VI.

In view of the fact that Turkey has not yet adhered to the Hague Convention and that a control over the export of opium from Turkey in accordance with the provisions of the Convention is not, so far as the Committee is aware, being exercised by the Government of that country ;

In view also of the resolution of the fourth Assembly of the League of Nations calling attention to the fact that the Government of Turkey has undertaken in the Treaty of Lausanne to adhere to the Convention :

The Committee asks the Council to request the Government of Turkey to adhere to the Convention as soon as possible.

VII.

The Committee has again examined the situation in regard to the export of opium from the Persian Gulf to the Far East. The bulk of the opium exported from the Gulf continues to be sent to the Far East under false declaration of destination and undoubtedly finds its way into the illicit traffic. The Committee notes that the recommendation made by it in paragraph (b) of resolution II of its Report for 1925, that Powers whose ships are engaged in traffic with the Persian Gulf should adopt measures to control the conveyance of opium from the Persian Gulf on such ships and to prevent its diversion into the illicit traffic, has not been carried out except by one of the States whose ships are engaged in the traffic with the Far East. The result has been that, while the measures taken by the latter Power have prevented the traffic from being carried on in the ships of that Power, the traffickers continue to carry it on on the ships of other countries. It accordingly asks the Council to make urgent representations to the Governments of the countries whose ships were engaged in the traffic during the past year to take the necessary measures for the control of the traffic. Further, the Committee recommends that the Governments of Powers having extra-territorial rights in Persia should be asked to institute a control over their nationals in Persia on the lines of the regulations already made by some Powers in order to prevent their engaging in the illicit traffic in opium.

VIII.

The Committee desires to call special attention to the steps taken in Great Britain in regard to maritime insurance with a view to preventing the insurance of consignments of

opium or drugs destined for illicit purposes, and would urge that similar steps should be taken as soon as possible in other countries whose nationals undertake the business of maritime insurance.

IX.

The Committee draws special attention to the evidence it has received of the extensive use of the post by illicit traffickers in morphine and the other drugs with the Far East. As this is a danger to which all countries are exposed, the Committee recommends :

(a) That the Council should bring the matter to the notice of all Governments and of the Universal Postal Union ;

(b) That notice of any seizure of drugs sent from abroad through the post should be sent immediately, with particulars of the place at which and the date on which the drugs were posted, to the authorities of the country from which the drugs were sent ;

(c) That a list of all such seizures and of the results of the investigations made should be included in the annual reports of the Governments to the League.

X.

The Advisory Committee asks the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to the importance of direct communication between the authorities which are entrusted with the enforcement of the laws on the suppression of the illicit traffic. The Committee has already several times laid stress on this point, and the matter is dealt with in Article 3 of the Final Act of the Second Opium Conference.

Communications of this kind might be established either by exchange between these authorities of information on administrative or police measures or by direct contact between the said authorities.

XI.

The Advisory Committee requests the Council to instruct the Secretary-General to ask those States which have not yet communicated their legislation on opium and drugs to do so and to give notice of any new laws which may be promulgated.

President :

(Signed) G. BOURGOIS.

Acting Secretary :

(Signed) H. C. BERG.

Vice-President :

(Signed) Dr. ANSELMINO.

LIST OF APPENDICES.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. The Hague Opium Convention of 1912 : List of Ratifications, etc. | 223 |
| 2. Agreement drawn up by the First Opium Conference, February 11th, 1925 : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions | 224 |
| 3. Convention drawn up by the Second Opium Conference, February 19th, 1925 : List of Signatures, Ratifications and Adhesions | 224 |
| 4. Statement with regard to Annual Reports received from Governments Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912 | 225 |
| 5. Import Certificate System | 227 |
| 6. (a) Extract from Document O. C. 417 : " List of Ships known to have carried Opium from the Port of Bushire. " | 228 |
| (b) Shipments of Persian Opium known to have been shipped from Bushire during the Period June 1st, 1925, to April 30th, 1926 | 228 |
| 7. Memorandum on Insurance of Consignments of Opium and Dangerous Drugs . | 230 |
| 8. Circular issued by the Inspector-General of Customs in China | 231 |
| 9. Extract from Memorandum on Smuggling at Dairen | 233 |
| 10. Brief Summary of Colonel Woods' Suggestions | 234 |
| 11. Extract from Note on the Egyptian Decree-Law of March 21st, 1925 | 234 |
| 12. Cocaine Smuggling in India | 235 |

Appendix 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 | Ecuador |
| Esthonia | |
| Finland | Finland |
| France | France |
| *Germany | Germany |
| Great Britain | Great Britain |
| Greece | Greece |
| Guatemala | Guatemala |
| Haiti | Haiti |
| Honduras | Honduras |
| Hungary | Hungary |
| *Iceland | Iceland |
| India | India |
| Irish Free State | Irish Free State |
| Italy | Italy |
| Japan | Japan |
| Latvia | Latvia |
| Liberia | Liberia |
| Luxemburg | Luxemburg |
| *Mexico | Mexico |
| *Monaco | Monaco |
| 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 | United States of America |
| Uruguay | Uruguay |
| Venezuela | Venezuela |

* Not members of the League.

Appendix 2.

AGREEMENT DRAWN UP BY THE FIRST OPIUM CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 11TH, 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 | | |
| Portugal | Portugal | Portugal | | |
| Siam | Siam | Siam | | |

Appendix 3.

CONVENTION DRAWN UP BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 19TH, 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 (with reservation) | | | | |
| Belgium | | Belgium | | |
| Brazil | | Bolivia | | |
| Bulgaria | Bulgaria | Brazil | | |
| Canada | Canada | Bulgaria | | |
| Chile | Chile | | | |
| Cuba | Cuba | Cuba | | |
| Czechoslovakia | Czechoslovakia | Czechoslovakia | | |
| Denmark | | Denmark | | |
| 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 | | |
| Netherlands | Netherlands | Netherlands | | |
| New Zealand | New Zealand | New Zealand | New Zealand | New Zealand |
| Nicaragua | Nicaragua | Nicaragua | | |
| Persia | Persia | Persia | | |
| Poland | | Poland | | |
| 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 | | |
| Sudan | Sudan | | Sudan | Sudan |
| Spain | | Spain | | |
| Switzerland | | Switzerland | | |
| Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa | | Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa |
| Uruguay | | Uruguay | | |

Adhesions

Egypt
Roumania
Salvador
San Marino
Sarawak

Appendix 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 |
|----------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|
| Abyssinia | Letter despatched to the Secretariat on October 23rd, 1923. No manufacture, consumption or traffic. Small quantities imported for medicinal purposes. | | | | |
| Albania | Letter despatched to Secretariat on March 10th, 1923. Cannot answer questions in annual report form. Dangerous drugs only used for medicinal 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 | — | — | — | — | — |
| Esthonia | × | × | × | × | — |
| 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 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 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. | | | | |
| Netherlands | × | × | × | × | — |
| New Zealand | × | × | × | × | — |
| Nicaragua | — | — | — | — | — |
| Norway | — | × | × | × | — |
| Panama | Letter despatched on March 26th, 1923, saying that details were sent in reply to questionnaire of 1921. | | | | |
| Paraguay | — | — | — | — | — |
| Persia | × | × | — | — | — |
| Peru | — | — | — | — | — |
| Poland | × | × | × | × | — |
| Portugal | — | — | — | — | — |
| Roumania | × | × | × | × | — |

| | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924. | 1925 |
|---|---|------|------|---------------------------|------|
| Salvador | No year given. General information despatched to the Secretariat on June 20th, 1923. | | | | |
| Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes | — | — | — | — | × |
| Siam | × | × | × | × | — |
| Spain | — | — | × | × | — |
| | | | | (first three months only) | |
| Sweden | — | × | × | × | — |
| Switzerland | Statistics for 1921, 1922 and 1923 sent by Dr. Carrière (doc. O. C. 206 ¹). | | | | |
| 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.

| <i>Colonies, etc.</i> | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| British : | | | | | |
| Ceylon | × | × | × | × | × |
| Hong-Kong | — | × | × | × | — |
| Straits Settlements .. | × | × | × | × | — |
| French : | | | | | |
| Indo-China | × | × | × | × | — |
| Japanese : | | | | | |
| Chosen | × | × | × | × | — |
| Formosa | × | × | × | × | — |
| Kwantung Leased Territory | × | × | × | × | — |
| Netherlands : | | | | | |
| Netherlands East Indies | × | × | × | × | — |
| Portuguese : | | | | | |
| Macao | — | — | — | × | — |

¹ Imports and exports for last five months only.

Appendix 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

Albania
 Australia
 Austria
 Belgium
 Bulgaria
 Canada
 Cuba
 Czechoslovakia
 Danzig
 Denmark
 Finland
 Germany
 Great Britain
 Greece
 Guatemala
 Haiti
 Hungary
 India
 Irish Free State
 Italy
 Japan
 Latvia
 New Zealand
 Norway
 Panama
 Poland
 Portugal
 Siam
 Spain
 Sweden
 Switzerland
 Union of South Africa
 United States of America

Netherlands

Brazil
Lithuania

Colonies, Possessions and Mandated Territories

British :

Note : The British Government has accepted the system on behalf of 39 colonies and for the following mandated territories :

Palestine
Iraq

Togoland
Cameroons

Tanganyika Territory

Japanese :

Chosen
Formosa
Kwantung Leased Territory

Netherlands :

Curaçao
Netherlands East Indies

Appendix 6.

(a) EXTRACT FROM DOCUMENT O. C. 417 : LIST OF SHIPS KNOWN TO HAVE CARRIED OPIUM FROM THE PORT OF BUSHIRE.

| Vessel | Date | Number of cases of opium | Declared destination of opium | Flag | Remarks |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|---|
| <i>Joh. Ludw. Mowinckel.</i> | 5. VII. 25 | 100 813 | Keelung Vladivostock | Norwegian | Sailed with 100 cases of opium declared for Keelung and 813 cases declared for Vladivostock. According to the <i>Macao Gazette</i> , the s.s. <i>Mowinckel</i> arrived at Macao on August 5th and departed on the same day for Keelung. On August 15th the vessel was at Keelung and unloaded 100 cases of opium. The s.s. <i>Mowinckel</i> is registered at Lloyd's and her port of registry is Bergen. |

Note : This information was furnished by the British representative in a letter to the Secretariat dated October 28th, 1925.

O. C. 417 (a).

(b) SHIPMENTS OF PERSIAN OPIUM KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN SHIPPED FROM THE PORT OF BUSHIRE DURING THE PERIOD JUNE 1ST, 1925, TO APRIL 30TH, 1926.

(Communicated by Sir Malcolm Delevingne on May 12th, 1926, in continuation of previous memorandum appearing as Annex 4 to the Report on the Seventh Session of the Advisory Committee.)

| Vessel | Date | Number of cases of opium | Declared destination of opium | Flag | See Note |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----------|
| <i>Tai Tak</i> | 5. VI. 25 | 181 | Keelung | Portuguese | A. |
| <i>Neidenfels</i> | 21. VI. 25 | 30 | New York | German | |
| <i>Joh. Ludw. Mowinckel</i> | 5. VII. 25 | 813 | Vladivostock | Norwegian | B. |
| <i>Honan</i> | 21. VII. 25 | 400 | Keelung | Chinese | C. |
| <i>Vasna</i> | 26. VII. 25 | 100 | Vladivostock | British | F. |
| <i>Kibi Maru</i> | 23. VII. 25 | 171 | Kobe | Japanese | |
| <i>Varela</i> | 23. VIII. 25 | 100 | Vladivostock | British | F. |
| <i>Varsova</i> | 9. X. 25 | 100 | Keelung | British | F. |
| <i>Nagasaki</i> | 4. XI. 25 | 151 | Keelung | Chinese | |
| <i>Sanyo Maru</i> | 7. XI. 25 | 239 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Yeroppa Maru</i> | 7. XI. 25 | 531 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Yieloku Maru</i> | 20. XI. 25 | 490 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Lotte Leonhardt</i> | 21. XI. 25 | 10 | Marseilles | German | |
| <i>Philadelphia</i> | 27. XI. 25 | 279 | Vladivostock | Chinese | D. |
| <i>Tai Tak</i> | 9. XII. 25 | 326 | Vladivostock | Portuguese | A. |
| <i>Bankura</i> | 21. XII. 25 | 100 | Dairen | British | F. |
| <i>Varsova</i> | 31. I. 26 | 100 | Keelung | | |
| <i>Honan</i> | 2. III. 26 | 550 | Dairen | British | F. |
| <i>Prominent</i> | 10. III. 26 | 445 | Vladivostock | Chinese | C. |
| <i>Kuma Molo Maru</i> | 13. III. 26 | 319 | Vladivostock | Norwegian | |
| <i>Sanyo Maru</i> | 24. III. 26 | 413 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |
| <i>Hachiro Maru</i> | 20. IV. 26 | 621 | Vladivostock | Japanese | |

The total amount of Persian opium mentioned in this table as having been exported from Bushire is 6,669 cases, or approximately 477 tons.

Total amount of Persian opium declared for :

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|--------|----|---------------|-----|-----------------|
| Vladivostock | was | 5,784 | cases, | or | approximately | 422 | tons. |
| Dairen | » | 200 | » | » | » | 14 | $\frac{1}{4}$ » |
| Keelung | » | 581 | » | » | » | 41 | $\frac{1}{2}$ » |
| Kobe | » | 100 | » | » | » | 7 | » |

Of that declared for Vladivostock, 2,784 cases were carried upon Japanese, 1,101 on Chinese, and 1,258 on Norwegian vessels.

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

Notes.

A. For the previous history of the s.s. *Tai Tak*, see Note G in Annex 4 to the report of the Seventh Session of the Opium Advisory Committee, and the notes on the s.s. *Coloane* (the previous name of this vessel) in Note 7 of League document C. 515. M. 185. 1924. XI. Under the name of the s.s. *Dashlistan*, she was owned by Nemazee & Co. (see note B), but was sold by them on September 26th, 1923, to one H. H. d'Acquico Camiero, a Portuguese subject.

B. The s.s. *Joh. Ludw. Mowinckel* was chartered on time charter from the Norwegian owners by the firm of Nemazee & Co., of Bombay, who are connected with or are a branch of the firm of that name at Shanghai with branches at Macao, Hong-Kong and in Persia. This firm is notorious for its connection with the illicit opium traffic between Persia and the Far East; they were for instance responsible for the shipments of opium upon the s.s. *Ferrara*, *Frangistan*, *Tangistan* and *Georgistan* referred to in Note 7 of League document C. 515. M. 185. 1924. XI, and Note D of Annex 4 of the report above mentioned. According to the *Macao Gazette*, the s.s. *Joh. Ludw. Mowinckel* arrived at Macao on August 5th and departed the same day for Keelung, and, in a statement made by the Norwegian shipowner to the Norwegian Foreign Office and communicated to the Secretary-General, he says that he was informed by the master that the vessel left Bushire on July 4th with 100 tons of opium for Macao and that an arrangement had been made that a Portuguese gunboat should meet the vessel off the China Coast to protect it against pirates and escort it to port. The official Macao opium return for August shows the import of 360 cases of Persian and 100 cases of Benares opium.

On August 15th, the vessel was at Keelung and unloaded 100 cases there. No information has been received as to its subsequent movements.

C. The s.s. *Honan* is identical with the s.s. *Promethean* (cf. Annex 4 of the report above mentioned). She arrived at Shanghai on March 26th, 1925, under the Chinese flag, having been registered at Canton and being owned by Li Po San, a Chinese citizen. She was sold at Shanghai by the latter to a man named Chow Chin Liu, a Brazilian citizen. After the sale her name was changed to *Ad Infinitum* and she cleared from Shanghai under the Brazilian flag for Keelung on March 28th, 1925. In July she appears again in the Persian Gulf under the Chinese flag. This vessel was known to have been chartered by the group of Chinese merchants who were working with A. T. Woodward, a citizen of the U. S. A., who was arrested and subsequently convicted by the American Vice-Consul at Bushire on August 26th, 1925, for dealing illicitly in opium. The papers found in Woodward's possession disclosed the rami-fication of a very extensive organisation for purchase of opium on a very large scale and its ultimate disposal in China.

D. This vessel is identical with the s.s. *Cochin China* referred to in Note 7 of League document C. 515. M. 185. 1924. XI and Note C of Annex 4 of the report above mentioned. The master of the s.s. *Philadelphia* was Alfred Menanteau, who had been chief officer when the vessel was previously at Bushire flying the French flag. The vessel possessed a provisional certificate from the Officer of the Chinese Maritime Customs at Kowloon dated September 11th, 1925, showing the owner to be one Lichi San. It is understood that the above-mentioned certificate, which has the same effect as the registration of the vessel upon the Chinese register, is issued by the Chinese Maritime Customs upon the instructions of the appropriate Chinese Minister.

E. The Norwegian owners of the s.s. *Prominent* have informed the Norwegian Foreign Office that, in reply to enquiries, they have received from the office in Hong-Kong a telegram to the following effect :

“ *Prominent* chartered for lawful trade only. Left Bushire March 12th due Macao April 5th. ”

It is also stated that the vessel had been chartered on January 15th, 1926, by the firm of Wong Kan of Hong-Kong for two months. Enquiries are being made at Hong-Kong with regard to these transactions of Wong Kan & Co.

F. The consignments on these vessels, which, being British, were subject to the King's Regulations controlling this traffic, were all covered by import certificates issued by the Japanese authorities.

Note.— A comparison between document O. C. 417 and document O. C. 417 (a) was made by M. B. Ferreira at the meeting held on May 27th. This comparison brought to light, in the opinion of the Portuguese delegate, certain contradictions in the information contained in those documents, and a certain amount of vagueness in the facts set out therein.

Appendix 7.

MEMORANDUM OF INSURANCE OF CONSIGNMENTS OF OPIUM AND DANGEROUS DRUGS.

In July 1925, it was brought to the notice of the British Government by the Government of Hong-Kong that shipments of opium to the Far East were being insured with British underwriters and that the persons concerned in the shipments were able upon the insurance policies to obtain money advances from certain banks in the Far East, by which they were enabled to finance the transactions. It is well known that many of the opium shipments to the Far East are intended, when they reach the Far East, to be diverted to the illegal traffic. Investigations also have shown that the drug traffickers were able to obtain advances from banks on the production of maritime insurance policies covering shipments of dangerous drugs. It should be stated that the underwriters would be unaware of the purpose for which the consignments actually insured by them were intended.

The British Government at once communicated with those London underwriters, informing them that a large proportion of the opium shipped to the Far East, ostensibly consigned to such places as Dalny, Vladivostock, Kobe, etc., was intended to be unloaded and diverted to the illicit traffic before the vessel reached the destination declared, and inviting their co-operation to prevent facilities being given for the insurance of consignments of opium or other dangerous drugs intended for illicit purposes. The members of Lloyd's and the members of the London Underwriters' Association, which between them comprise most, if not all, of the firms or companies in London undertaking maritime insurance, have now come to an agreement with His Majesty's Government that in all maritime insurance policies issued by them a clause shall be inserted in the following terms :

" It is understood and agreed that no claim under this policy will be paid in respect of drugs to which the International Opium Convention of 1912 applies unless :

" (1) the drugs shall be expressly declared as such in the policy, and the name of the country from which, and the name of the country to which, they are consigned shall be specifically stated in the policy ;

and

" (2) the proof of loss is accompanied either by a licence, certificate or authorisation issued by the Government of the country to which the drugs are consigned showing that the importation of the consignment into that country has been approved by that Government, or, alternatively, by a licence, certificate or authorisation issued by the Government of the country from which the drugs are consigned showing that the export of the consignment to the destination stated has been approved by that Government ;

and

" (3) the route by which the drugs were conveyed was usual and customary. "

It will be observed that the effect of the clause (which is based on the system of export authorisations and import certificates recommended by the League of Nations and now embodied in the Geneva Convention of 1925) will be that, in the event of the loss of an insured consignment of opium or drugs at sea, payment will only be made if it can be shown either that the import of the opium or drugs into the country of declared destination has been approved by the Government of that country or that the export of the opium or drugs had been approved by the Government of the country of declared origin of the consignment. In view of the fact that ships carrying cargoes of opium to the Far East have been reported as taking unusual courses for the purpose of evading observation, it is also provided that no claim will be admitted under the policy unless the route taken is usual and customary. It is hoped by this clause that the use of insurance facilities by persons engaged in illicit traffic for the purpose of raising money to finance their transactions will be checked. Action by one Government alone will not, however, put a stop to the practice. Unless similar steps are taken by other countries also, the illicit traffickers will have recourse to the insurance companies and underwriters of other countries, and a message has reached the British Government that this is already happening. Shippers of opium from Constantinople to *certain* destinations are refusing to enter into policies containing this clause.

H.M. Government believes that the other Powers will recognise the importance of taking steps to deal with the situation which has been disclosed, and they would accordingly suggest that the Council of the League should bring the matter to the notice of other Powers in whose territory is carried on the business of underwriting maritime risks, with a view to the adoption by them of arrangements similar to those made by the British Government.

Appendix 8.

CIRCULAR ISSUED BY THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF CUSTOMS IN CHINA IN REGARD TO THE USE OF THE REGISTERED LETTER POST FOR SMUGGLING DRUGS INTO CHINA.

Circular No. 3589. Second Series.

Inspectorate-General of Customs,
Pekin, January 30th, 1925.

Sir,

I append for your information, copy of correspondence with Harbin concerning abuse of registered mail by evaders of duty and smugglers of contraband to an extent which calls for vigorous counter-measures.

Postal:
Abuse of registered mail by evaders of duty and smugglers of contraband: counter-measures to be taken against: instructions.

The Postal Authorities and the public attach great importance to the inviolability of the registered mail matter, and rightly so, assuming the legitimate use of the registered post. But it is easy to see how wide is the door which this means of conveyance opens to smugglers who base their operations on the recognised immunity from examination of registered letters and on the general reluctance of those through whose hands this mail matter passes to question its contents. The vagueness of postal regulations on the subject is a measure of this reluctance. From time to time the question of duty evasion by means of the registered post has arisen, as you will see from the correspondence appended. For valuable articles of small bulk, such as jewellery, the registered post is the usual means of conveyance, and, as such articles are not in the category of those things which are absolutely prohibited by postal regulations, no very energetic co-operation may perhaps be expected from the Postal Authorities in countering this evasion. With the growth, however, in the trade in narcotics the question has assumed an importance too serious to be trifled with. I am confident that if at any port a state of affairs exists such as that disclosed by the Harbin despatches, you may depend upon receiving support and assistance from the Postal Commissioner in any measures you may adopt, which should follow generally the lines laid down by me for the guidance of the Harbin Commissioner.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,
(Signed) F. A. AGLEN,
Inspector-General.

To the Commissioner of Customs.

No. 3138.

L.G.

Harbin, January 15th, 1925.

Sir,

1. In Harbin despatch No. 3116, of November 22nd, 1924, the question was raised as to the Customs treatment to be accorded to dutiable articles forwarded by post as registered "letters" and/or "samples" in defiance of postal rules prohibiting such practice. It was then assumed that the registered letter and sample post was resorted to by the public in order to get certain goods to this market by the quickest, though not legitimate, means available rather than with any intention to defraud the Customs of their revenue. Since writing the above despatch, however, the following cases of attempted importation of contraband by Siberian mail have been detected:

November 24th, 1924.—Five packages, marked "Sample—no value", containing each 200 grammes of meconium (opium powder), addressed to Gesellschaft Druggist, Harbin; posted at Halle, Germany. Estimated value \$75.

December 9th, 1924.—17 packages, marked "Sample—no value", containing altogether 9 catties heroin, addressed to R. Lange, c/o Rintai Stores, Mukden; posted at Basle, Switzerland. Estimated value \$4,000.

14 packages, marked "Registered letters", containing altogether 18 catties heroin, addressed to the Hong-Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation for G. and K. Kapustin, Harbin. Estimated value, \$7,500.

January 9th, 1925.—One "registered letter", measuring 13 inches by 10 $\frac{1}{3}$ inches by 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches and weighing 1.4 kilo., accidentally got undone and was found to contain 10 tins of morphine hydrochloride for an approximate weight of 1 kilo. and an estimated value of \$1,000. The discovery led to an accurate external examination of no less than 118 similar "registered letters" lying at the Chinese Post

Office as unclaimed by the addressees, and it can be safely maintained that they contain an approximate weight of 75 kilos. of morphia, valued at about \$75,000. A detailed report on this discovery, drawn up by Mr. C. M. Petterson, First Assistant B, who personally made the examination, is enclosed.

2. The above cases put an entirely different complexion on the question raised in Harbin despatch No. 3116. We are evidently confronted here with a vast and well-organised system which has undoubtedly been working ever since the re-establishment of the Siberian mail route, whereby narcotics were peacefully delivered at the delinquent's door against a mere signature on a "registered mail" receipt. I venture to submit that it is incumbent upon China promptly to take drastic measures, no matter at whose initiative and by the enactment of what laws, to suppress this traffic.

3. The administrations concerned are the Customs and the Posts. The latter argue that, by their rules, letters suspected to contain dutiable articles or contraband cannot be opened except in the presence of the addressees; the addressees failing to appear within a prescribed time limit, these letters are to be returned to the office of origin for transmission to the sender unless the Customs wish to seize them, which they (the Customs) can do at their own responsibility. The Customs, on the other hand, would seem to be rather chary of tampering with letter mail, as the recognised principle is herein involved of the sanctity of correspondence. In the case under consideration, however, this principle would hardly be touched, as the letters in question are bulky packages obviously containing anything but *bona fide* correspondence. Moreover, if a Post Office is justified in opening an undeliverable ordinary letter for the purpose of finding the sender's address whereto to return it, it would in my opinion be more than justified in officially opening "registered letters" which are well-nigh certain to contain contraband and/or dutiable articles. It would, at any rate, seem out of place to return to the senders the 118 "registered letters" mentioned above on the plea that correspondence is sacred when Article 18, Section 3, of the Madrid Postal Convention of 1920, which reads :

"Packets falling under the prohibitions of the present article which have been wrongly admitted to the post must be returned to the post office of origin, except in cases where the Administration of the country of destination is authorised by its laws or by its internal regulations to dispose of them otherwise.

"Explosive, inflammable, or dangerous substances, and obscene or immoral articles, however, are not returned to the country of origin; they are destroyed on the spot under the direction of the Administration which has found them";

and Rule VI, final paragraph, of the Postal Guide :

"In all cases it lies with the sender to ascertain that the articles he is sending are permitted in the country of destination, and the Post Office will have no responsibility for loss, delay, or charges arising from the Customs or other regulations to which the contents of correspondence or parcels are subject in the country of destination"—

afford ample opportunity of seizing and destroying them.

4. Pending the receipt of instructions from Peking, the Postal Authorities have agreed to detain the above letters, which are now under the joint custody of Customs and Posts, and the Police Authorities, with whom I have had dealings in connection with the other seizures mentioned in Section 1, have undertaken to do all they can to induce the addressees to come forward to take delivery of them. Should the addressees fail to appear—which is highly probable—a definite ruling is respectfully solicited in regard to :

- (a) How to deal with the 118 "letters" detained at the local post office.
- (b) What measures should be taken if similar cases recur in future.

I venture to express the opinion that the American system of refusing to accept any article of correspondence exceeding the ordinary size of a common letter unless marked "To be opened by the Customs" might eventually do away with the abuse at present lamented.

5. A memorandum from the Deputy Commissioner, envisaging from a different angle the above question, is enclosed.

(Signed) U. MARCONI,
Acting Commissioner.

The Inspector-General to the Harbin Commissioner.

No. 3373. Comms.
Harbin. No. 101813.

Pekin, January 30th, 1925.

Sir,

I have now to acknowledge receipt of your despatch No. 3138: reporting, further, that several cases of attempted importation of opium powder, heroin and morphia by registered letter and sample post had taken place; stating that these cases put an entirely different complexion on the question raised in your despatch No. 3116 and that we are evidently confronted with a vast and well-organised system of importation of narcotics through registered mail, and that it is incumbent on China promptly to take drastic measures to suppress this traffic; and requesting instructions (a) how to deal with the 118 "letters" containing narcotics and detained at the local post office, and (b) as to what measures should be taken if similar cases occur in future;

And in reply, to say that every effort is to be made, in co-operation with the Postal Authorities, to put a stop to the nefarious trade in contraband by means of registered letters or covers said to contain samples and to penalise those who are engaged in it at this end. Registered mail packages supposed to contain contraband are to be opened in presence of the addressees, and, if contraband is found, the Post Office is to be requested to hand it over, and the contraband is to be confiscated. The addressees are to be followed up and handed over to the police if possible. When addressees cannot be found or refuse to come forward, this is to be taken as strong presumption that the contents are contraband, and the packages are to be opened; if found to contain contraband, the Post Office is to be asked to hand them over, and, if they refuse to do so, the case is to be reported to me. We cannot lay down the law for the Post Office or decide how they are to interpret their own regulations or exercise their own administrative powers (*vide* Mr. Law's memorandum enclosed in your despatch No. 3138) but, as the revenue organisation, we are prepared to take the responsibility of ; contraband found in registered mail. The packages now under suspicion and under joint custody are to be dealt with on the above lines and their contents disposed in accordance with standing instructions.

(Signed) F. A. AGLÉN,
Inspector-General.

O. C. 420.

Appendix 9.

**EXTRACT FROM MEMORANDUM ON SMUGGLING AT DAIREN,
SUBMITTED BY THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE.**

A new method of smuggling drugs has recently been brought to light at Dairen. In December 1925, a letter was received at the office of the Compradore of the Dairen Branch of the Hong-Kong and Shanghai Bank. It was addressed from Schlieren in Switzerland by one F. Danker, and stated that he was sending six parcels for a Mr. Broon, who would shortly visit Dairen. A person styling himself Mr. A. Broon called and took delivery of the parcels. Subsequent enquiries showed that Broon is an alias of one C. Kapustin, of Harbin, who was known or believed to be an importer of narcotics. Again in December another letter was received stating that four cases purporting to contain clocks were being consigned to the Bank. The consignment had been shipped on the German motor-ship *Fulda* by order of the firm of G. and K. Kapustin of Berlin and were destined for Kapustin alias Broon at Harbin. This method of sending clocks through the Bank was quite unusual. When the *Fulda* arrived at Dairen on February 19th the consignment was not on board. It seems possible, if not probable, that the man Kapustin at Harbin took alarm and arranged for the cases to be landed elsewhere. Then in February a number of packets marked "For Mr. Broon" were received at the Bank, ostensibly containing shampoo powder. They were placed by the Bank in the hands of the police, and on examination it was found that, though a few of the packets contained genuine shampoo powder, the remainder contained heroin. This consignment appears also to have emanated from Switzerland. Particulars have been sent to the Swiss and German representatives on the Advisory Committee for investigation.

Appendix 10.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF COLONEL WOODS' SUGGESTIONS.

(Full reports can be found in the minutes of the nineteenth meeting.)

1. Colonel Woods was impressed with the enormous illicit traffic in these drugs, which everyone concedes and which is strikingly asserted in the first resolution in this report. He was also impressed with the ineffectiveness of present laws and methods. He saw no hope of success in halfway or compromise measures.

2. He stated that, as the result of many years of practical experience, he believed no country could successfully protect its citizens from the ravage of these habit-forming drugs unless it nationally owned or nationally adequately controlled the factories producing them.

By control he meant that the Government should know exactly what goes into every factory and what comes out of it, and should see to it that nothing comes out except for medical or scientific purposes, and that it goes only to persons and places authorised by proper authority.

3. Colonel Woods also suggested several administrative measures to strengthen existing methods :

(a) He pointed out that, to meet this international traffic, we must have international action.

To this end he recommended that the officials in the countries represented on this Committee who are in charge of the administration of the laws regulating the traffic in these drugs be called together periodically to confer with each other.

They would confer as to the powers and other arrangements they have, and those they need, in order to enable them more fully to enforce the laws of their country for the control of the legitimate, and suppression of the illicit, traffic.

They would arrange with each other about such matters as exchange of records of law-breakers, including finger-prints, photographs, *modus operandi*, history, etc. They would make practical arrangements for direct and swift communication with each other and would generally improve and strengthen their own national and the international methods of suppressing smugglers.

(b) He suggested that good results would follow a conference of representatives of manufacturers of drugs with the Chairman of this Committee, since they could, out of their experience, give valuable information as to the best ways to regulate lawful and useful distribution and to prevent illicit traffic.

(c) He suggested that specific information be sent by each nation to all others interested as to the identity and methods of shipowners, agents, captains or others known to have deliberately connived at the illicit traffic.

(d) He commended the import and export regulations recommended by this Committee and urged their adoption and stringent co-operative enforcement by all nations.

Appendix 11.

O. C. 407.

EXTRACT FROM NOTE ON THE EGYPTIAN DECREE-LAW OF MARCH 21ST, 1925, REGULATING THE TRADE IN STUPEFYING DRUGS AND THEIR USE, FORWARDED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Hitherto the non-existence of any Egyptian law treating these offences as anything more serious than contraventions has had a serious repercussion on the attitude of consular courts towards them. Although, according to the laws of the great majority of capitory Powers, offences connected with the drug traffic are punished with severe penalties, certain consuls have always shown reluctance to try their own nationals for them while native offenders have enjoyed the comparative immunity guaranteed by the Egyptian Law. I believe that in most cases British, French and Italian Consuls have consented to try persons charged by the police with offences under their respective drug laws, but there was always a certain amount of excuse for a consul who pointed out to the police the unfairness of inflicting a heavy sentence on one of his nationals, whose Egyptian accomplice would get off with a fine of P.T. 100 at most, and therefore politely referred them to the mixed courts.

The promulgation of this law will remove any such feeling of inequality and will strengthen the hand of consuls in dealing with offenders belonging to their jurisdiction. In order that this may be properly appreciated, it will be advisable for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to notify the representatives of all Capitulatory Powers of the existence of the new law and to request them to draw the attention of their consuls and consular judges to the severe penalties which it enacts against delinquents.

A very good argument for introducing uniform legislation in matters connected with the consumption of and traffic in drugs is that, although the law of most capitulatory nations takes a serious view of offences of this kind, certain codes, *e.g.*, the Swedish, do not inflict imprisonment upon delinquents (although Swedish law lays down a maximum fine of £600), while others envisage the suppression of abuse in one form of drug, such as opium, and make little provision for the control of others.

In these circumstances, contrabandists and traders are quite likely to lay their heads together and, having discovered which of the capitulatory nations deal with this class of offence most leniently, will make a determined attempt to concentrate the traffic in the hands of subjects of those States.

Appendix 12.

O. C. 436.

COCAINE SMUGGLING IN INDIA.

Extracts from the Reports of the Excise Administrations of the Punjab, Bombay Presidency and Bengal for the Financial Year 1924-25, submitted by the Representative of India.

PUNJAB.

A certain amount of satisfaction may be obtained from the fact that the licit consumption of cocaine fell from 32,141 grains in the previous year to 30,636 grains. But this licit consumption represents principally the use of the drug for surgical or dental operations.

It was pointed out last year that the increase from 25,494 grains in 1922-23 to 32,141 grains in 1923-24 was not satisfactorily explained. But there was an unfortunate suspicion that the less reputable medical practitioners contrive to prescribe cocaine for some of their patients who are addicted to the cocaine habit. It is reported this year that one licensee is suspected to have abused his licence.

There can be little doubt that the use of cocaine is rapidly increasing in almost every district in the Province, especially in the large towns. Eighteen cases of illicit sale, possession and smuggling were detected in Lahore, the two most important seizures being one of 676 grains and another of no less than 50 ounces. As the Commissioner of Lahore points out, the cocaine habit is far more serious and more difficult to deal with than the evil consequences of liquor or opium. Captures are not effected without great trouble and sometimes danger to the preventive staff. But in spite of their efforts it is only too obvious that actual seizures represent a ridiculously small proportion of illicit imports. As in the case of charas smuggling, the illicit cocaine trade must be tackled at its source, namely : the ports of entry. Unless stringent action is taken at the ports, it is impossible to suppress this pernicious trade when once the drug has been transported inland. As has been mentioned in the paragraphs dealing with charas, the smugglers of that drug return with cocaine from Bombay and Calcutta.

BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

Cocaine cases.—Four hundred and twenty-nine cases of illicit possession of cocaine were detected in the city of Bombay during the year under report, against 364 in 1923-24. A large quantity of German and Japanese cocaine is still being smuggled into Bombay, and there is clear indication of a brisk revival of the illicit trade in cocaine. The illicit traffic is carried on principally by Italian seamen, Pathans and other Mohammedans, in spite of the vigilance of the Excise staff.

The largest seizure of cocaine by the Excise Department during the year was 42,522 $\frac{1}{3}$ grains.

BENGAL.

69. The abuse of cocaine continued to be prevalent in Calcutta, where alone 280 persons were prosecuted, against 256 in the preceding year. The 24 Parganas, Dacca, Hooghly and Burdwan followed with 17, 10, 7 and 3 prosecutions respectively. The number of persons convicted of illicit possession, sale or smuggling of cocaine increased from 257 to 270. In Calcutta the number was 249, as compared with 234 in the previous year.

The total quantity of cocaine seized in Bengal during the year was 1,432 ounces 112 grains, as compared with 1,730 ounces 231 grains in 1923-24. Only 25 ounces 8 grains were seized outside the Calcutta district, and of this quantity 23 ounces 349 grains were seized in Dacca. In Calcutta, 181 ounces 98 grains were seized by Excise officers, 1,197 ounces 270 grains by Customs officers, and 28 ounces 174 grains by police officers.

72. The prosecutions for "illicit sale or possession of cocaine" increased from 287 to 317. Calcutta alone is responsible for the increase. The illicit traffic in cocaine continued to be prevalent, in order of notoriety, in Calcutta, 24 Parganas and Dacca, where 280, 17 and 10 persons respectively were prosecuted. Hooghly joined the list with seven prosecutions. Calcutta is the principal centre for the illicit trade in cocaine, whence all the contraband imports and exports of the drug are controlled. The total quantity of cocaine confiscated in Bengal during the year under report was 1,432 ounces 112 grains, of which Calcutta alone contributed 1,407 ounces 104 grains. Three cases of special importance are noted below :

(1) The Superintendent of Excise, Detection Branch, Calcutta, on receipt of information that R. Fernandez, a Goanese, was going to dispose of a large quantity of cocaine, laid a trap for the accused, with the help of a petty officer, in the Imperial Restaurant, where the accused came with a cane box containing 100 ounces of cocaine. The petty officer, who was previously introduced to him, paid him Rs. 6,000, the price arranged, in Government currency notes (the number of which had previously been noted by the Superintendent), and the accused handed over the cane box and its key. The Excise Superintendent, who was closely watching the whole affair from a short distance, arrested the accused as he was counting the money, and about 100 ounces of cocaine were recovered from the cane box. The accused was the second butler on board the s.s. *Talma* and was regularly smuggling cocaine from Japan probably with the help of accomplices on board. He was prosecuted under the Excise Act and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year.

(2)

(3) The most important detection of the year was the arrest of one Batasia, who is alleged to have amassed considerable wealth by dealing in cocaine. As the case is still under trial, it is not permissible to enter into details in this report.

75. *Seizures of opium and cocaine on board vessels in the Port of Calcutta.* The following statement shows seizures of opium and cocaine on board vessels in the Port of Calcutta :

| Name of steamer | Company | Opium | | | Cocaine | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------|---------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | | Number of seizures | Quantity seized | | | Number of seizures | Quantity seized | |
| | | | mds. | srs. | chs. | | oz. | gr. |
| <i>Takliawa</i> | Mackinnon, Mackenzie & Co. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 222 | 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| <i>Torilla</i> | ditto. | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 116 | 120 |
| <i>Tairea</i> | ditto. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 365 |
| <i>Kut Sang</i> | Jardine, Skinner & Co. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 69 |
| <i>Talma</i> | Mackinnon, Mackenzie & Co. | 1 | 0 | 23 | 0 | — | — | — |
| <i>Ellora</i> | ditto. | 1 | 0 | 15 | 8 | — | — | — |
| <i>Chantala</i> | ditto. | 1 | 0 | 11 | 6 | — | — | — |
| <i>Ho Sang</i> | Jardine, Skinner & Co. | — | — | — | — | 1 | 24 | 120 |
| <i>Nam Sang</i> | ditto. | — | — | — | — | 1 | 809 | 238 |
| <i>Majo Maru</i> | Nippon Yusen Kaisha | — | — | — | — | 1 | 24 | 242 |
| Total | | 7 | 1 | 35 | 13 | 9 | 1,197 | 301 $\frac{1}{2}$ |

ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO THE

EIGHTH SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OPIUM TRAFFIC

| | Pages | | Pages |
|--|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Advisory Committee on Opium Traffic : | | Ceylon, statistics of drugs used in | 156, 167, 179, 196 |
| Agenda | 128-9 | Chile, statistics of drugs used in | 167, 184, 188 |
| Adopted | 7 | China : | |
| Assessors, appointment | 6, 217 | Annual report, procedure | 104-5 |
| Chairman and vice-chairman, election | 6 | British consuls in, extracts from Intelli- gence Reports | 102, 214-15 |
| Co-operation with Union catholique d'Etudes internationales | 44-5, 86 | Extra-territorial rights in | 11-12, 134 |
| Documents distributed to, procedure to be adopted. | 117, 121-2, 219 | Inspector-General of Customs in, circular issued <i>re</i> smuggling by registered letter post | 104, 231-3 |
| Meetings, arrangements <i>re</i> | 6 | Protest from Minister of Foreign Affairs against smuggling of Russian Opium into Manchuria | 87, 104, 216 |
| Members : | | Smuggling in. | 87, 102-4, 216, 231-3 |
| Absence of certain | 6 | Statistics of drugs used in | 167, 173, 196 |
| List | 5, 217 | Observations | 33 |
| Minutes, adoption of | 86-7, 91 | Traffic, position <i>re</i> | 68-71 |
| Reports : | | Chosen : | |
| to Council | 216-36 | Annual report, observations on. | 18, 148 |
| Examination | 118-22, 124-5 | Statistics of drugs used in. | 161, 175, 181, 190 |
| Progress | 129-45 | Cocaine and salts : | |
| Examination | 7-10, 10-13 | Export from Netherlands | 110 |
| Resolutions passed by | 130-3, 219-21 | Raw : | |
| Examination | 110-11, 118 | Statistical tables | 195 |
| Agreement drawn up by First Conference : | | Observations | 34 |
| Signatures, ratifications and adhesions 7, 36, 129, 218, 224 | | Statistics of export, resolution <i>re</i> trans- mission | 220 |
| Anselmino, Doctor : | | Smuggling of, in India, extract from re- ports on. | 235-6 |
| Letter <i>re</i> duplicate export certificates from | 141, 213 | Statistical tables | 187-94 |
| Vice-chairman, election as | 6 | Observations on | 33-4 |
| Argentine, statistics of drugs used in | 166, 172, 187 | Coca leaves : | |
| Australia, statistics of drugs used in | 166, 172, 179, 187 | Production in Java, report to Council <i>re</i> | 119 |
| Austria : | | Statistical tables | 184-6 |
| Annual report, observations on | 18, 147 | Observations on | 32-3 |
| Reservation to International Opium Con- vention, 1925 | 42-3, 118-19 | Statistics of export, resolution <i>re</i> | 220 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 166, 172, 179, 187 | Committee of Experts, examination of list of drugs and preparations covered by Hague Convention drawn up by. | 107-8 |
| Belgium : | | Conference : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 18, 147 | First, agreement draw up by, <i>see</i> Agree- ment draw up by First Conference, 1925 | |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 156, 166, 172, 179, 184, 187 | Second, convention draw up by, <i>see</i> Inter- national Opium Convention, 1925. | |
| Bolivia, statistics of coca leaf used in | 184 | Consumption, statistics in various countries | 156-199 |
| Bourgois, M., Election as Chairman | 6 | Council : | |
| Brasil : | | Report on work of Eighth Session to | 216-36 |
| Import certificate system in | 134 | Examination | 116-22, 124-5 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 166, 172, 179, 187 | Cuba : | |
| British North Borneo, statistics of drugs used in | 156, 196 | Export of morphine from France to | 109-110 |
| Broemson, A., of Hamburg, report by Rotterdam police on operations of | 74-7 | Extradition treaty between United States and. | 139 |
| Brunei, statistics of prepared opium | 196 | Statistics of cocaine used in | 188 |
| Burma, statistics of prepared opium | 196 | Czechoslovakia, statistics of drugs used in | 167, 173, 188 |
| Bushire, shipments of Persian opium from | 122-4, 228-9 | Dairen, position <i>re</i> Illicit Traffic in. | 71-2, 233 |
| Buxtorf & C., of Basle, report by Rot- terdam police on operations of | 74-7 | Danzig : | |
| Campbell, Sir John, statement <i>re</i> opium policy in India | 36-8 | Annual report, observations. | 18, 148 |
| Canada : | | Statistics of drugs used in | 156, 173, 188 |
| Extradition treaty between United States and, resolution. | 11, 133 | Denmark, statistics of drugs used in | 173, 188 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 166, 172, 179, 187 | | |

| | Pages |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Documents distributed to Advisory Committee, procedure . . . | 117, 121-2, 219 |
| Drafting Committee, appointment. . . | 90-1 |
| Egypt, extract from note on Decree Law of March, 21st. re control of drugs | 234-5 |
| Esthonia, statistics of drugs used in | 167, 173, 188 |
| Export : | |
| Authorisation, resolution <i>re</i> | 11, 133 |
| Certificates : | |
| Duplicate, letter from Dr. Anselmino <i>re</i> | 141, 213 |
| List of departments authorised to issue in various countries | 143-5 |
| in Free Ports, situation <i>re</i> | 117 |
| from Persian Gulf | 119-20, 218, 228-9 |
| Statistical tables | 156-99 |
| Statistics of coca leaf and crude cocaine, resolution <i>re</i> transmission | 220 |
| in Various countries 59-60, 109-10, 119-20, 156-99 | |
| Extradition Treaties between Various Countries | 11, 111, 133, 139 |
| Extra-territorial rights in China, see under China. | |
| Falkland Islands, observations on Annual Report | 18, 148 |
| Far East : | |
| Report to Council <i>re</i> position in | 218-19 |
| Examination | 121 |
| Finland, statistics of drugs used in | 167-8, 173, 180, 188 |
| Forged labels on packets containing drugs, procedure. | 91-5, 212-13 |
| Formosa : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 18-19, 148 |
| Illicit traffic in | 71 |
| Import of heroin into | 110 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 161-2, 181, 184, 191, 197, 27-8 |
| Observations on | 27-8 |
| France : | |
| Annual report from | 109-110 |
| Export and import | 109-10, 157, 173-4, 180, 189, 195 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 157, 173-4, 180, 189, 195 |
| Observations on | 27, 33-4 |
| Free ports, situation regarding export and import in | 117 |
| Germany : | |
| Correspondence : | |
| <i>re</i> Forged labels on packets containing drugs | 212-13 |
| <i>re</i> Seizures | 203-4, 204-5 |
| Import certificate system in | 134 |
| Memoranda <i>re</i> illicit traffic in | 209-10, 212-13 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 157, 174, 180, 184, 189, 195 |
| Goa, establishment of centre of illicit traffic at. | 16-17, 108-9 |
| Great Britain : | |
| Consuls in China, extracts from Intelligence Reports | 102, 214-15 |
| Manufacture of morphia, morphine content of opium used for. | 15-16 |
| Maritime Insurance in : | |
| Memorandum <i>re</i> | 230 |
| Resolution <i>re</i> adoption of system in other countries. | 106-7, 220-1 |
| Note <i>re</i> seizure of drugs at Singapore. | 205-6 |
| Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council, regulations under | 68, 200-1 |
| Statistics of drugs used in 157-8, 168, 174, 180-1, 184-5, 189, 195 | |
| Observations on | 31 |

| | Pages |
|---|------------------------|
| Greece : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 18-19, 149 |
| Law <i>re</i> narcotics, October 14th, 1925 | 139-41 |
| Morphine exported from France to | 109-10 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 158, 168 |
| Hague Convention, 1912 : | |
| Application, procedure 45-6, 47, 53-4, 119, 217-18, 220 | |
| Information to be furnished under Article 21, omission of certain governments to do so | 40-1 |
| Insurance of consignments of drugs covered by, proposal by British Government | 106-7 |
| List of drugs and preparations falling under, drawn up by Committee of Experts. | 107-8 |
| Ratifications and signatures | 45, 223 |
| Hai Tung Pharmacy, case of | 68-71 |
| Hamburg, illicit traffic in. | 77-81, 204-5 |
| Health Committee, action taken by to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 of Convention adopted by Second Conference | 105-6 |
| Heroin and Salts : | |
| Import into Formosa | 110 |
| Statistical tables. | 179-83 |
| Observations on | 32 |
| Hong-Hong : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 20-1, 149 |
| Seizure at. | 215-16 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 158, 168, 197 |
| Traffic between United States and Kwang Chow Wan, report by Superintendent of imports and exports. | 210-12 |
| Hungary, statistics of drugs used in | 169, 174, 181, 189 |
| Illicit Traffic, see Smuggling | |
| Import : | |
| Authorisation, resolution <i>re</i> | 220 |
| Certificates, procedure 13, 95-102, 134, 142-3, 227 | |
| List of departments authorised to issue, in various countries | 143-5 |
| in Free ports, situation <i>re</i> | 117 |
| Morphine content, memorandum by Secretariat <i>re</i> advisability of declaring | 13-15 |
| Statistical tables. | 156-99 |
| in Various countries | 59-60, 110, 156-99 |
| India : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 21, 149-50 |
| Opium, illicit traffic in | 85-6, 210-12 |
| Smuggling of cocaine in, extract from reports of Excise authorities | 235-6 |
| Statistics of drugs used in 159-60, 175, 189-90, 197 | |
| Observations on | 34 |
| Statement <i>re</i> opium policy in. | 36-8, 218-19 |
| Indo-China : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 22, 150 |
| Statistics of drugs used in 160, 175, 190, 197 | |
| Insurance of consignments of drugs : | |
| Memorandum | 230 |
| System adopted in Great Britain, resolution <i>re</i> adoption in other countries | 106-7, 220-1 |
| International Anti-Opium Association : | |
| Letters <i>re</i> illicit traffic from | 86, 208-9 |
| Report on certain new opium Substitutes | 111 |
| International Opium Convention, 1925 : | |
| Action taken by Health Committee to give effect to Articles 8 and 10 | 105-6 |
| Reservation by Austrian Government | 42-4, 118-19 |
| Signatures, ratifications and adhesions, procedure. | 7-10, 109, 119, 219-20 |
| List | 129-30, 224 |

| | Pages |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Italy : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 22-3, 150 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 160, 175, 181, 190 |
| Japan and Territories : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 23, 110, 151 |
| Manufacture of morphine, relations of quantities of raw opium used for, with amount produced | 110 |
| Punishment of illicit traffic, report from Ministry for Interior <i>re</i> | 72-4 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 160-1, 169, 175, 181, 190, 195 |
| Observations on | 30-1 |
| Statement <i>re</i> opium policy in | 39-40 |
| Java, production of coca leaf in | 119, 185 |
| Knaffl-Lenz, Doctor, notes on report of International Anti-Opium Association <i>re</i> certain new Opium substitutions | 111 |
| Kwang Cho-wan, Illicit traffic in | 85-6, 210-12 |
| Kwangtung Leased Territory : | |
| Annual report, observations | 23, 151 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 162, 175, 182, 191, 198 |
| Legislation : | |
| Communication, resolution <i>re</i> | 221 |
| in Egypt, extract from note on | 234-5 |
| Macao : | |
| Annual report, observations | 23-5, 152 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 162, 198 |
| Observations on | 28, 35 |
| Madagascar, statistics of medicinal opium | 169 |
| Malay States, Federated and Unfederated : | |
| Annual reports, observations on | 18, 25, 148, 154-5 |
| Statistics of prepared opium | 198 |
| Observations on | 34-5 |
| Manchuria, Protest from Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs, <i>re</i> Smuggling of Russian Opium into | 87, 104, 216 |
| Mandated Territories, procedure to be adopted <i>re</i> Opium Situation in | 105 |
| Manufacture : | |
| Morphine content of opium used for, in Great Britain | 15-16 |
| Relation of quantities of raw opium used for, with amount of morphine produced | 110 |
| Statistics for various countries | 156-99 |
| Medicinal opium : | |
| Statistics of | 166-71 |
| Observations on | 30-1 |
| Mexican Government, request for information by Netherlands Government <i>re</i> drug situation in | 40, 59 |
| Morphine and salts : | |
| Manufacture in Japan, relation of quantities of raw opium used for, with amount produced | 110 |
| Statistics of use in various countries | 109-10, 172-8 |
| Observations on | 31-2 |
| Morphine content : | |
| for Manufacture of Morphine in Great Britain, opium used for | 15-16 |
| Memorandum by Secretariat <i>re</i> advisability of declaring at time of importation for uses other than the manufacture of prepared opium | 13-15 |
| Netherlands : | |
| Annual report, observations on | 23, 115 |

| | Pages |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Netherlands (continued) : | |
| Correspondence with German Government <i>re</i> seizure of drugs at Rotterdam | 203-4 |
| Raw cocaine exported from | 110 |
| Request to Mexican Government for information <i>re</i> drug situation in | 40, 59 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 162-3, 169, 176, 182, 191-2 |
| Observations | 34 |
| Netherlands East Indies : | |
| Annual report, observations | 23, 151-2 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 163, 169-70, 176, 192, 198 |
| Statement <i>re</i> opium policy | 38-9 |
| New Zealand, statistics of drugs used in | 176, 182, 192 |
| Nicaragua, statistics of medicinal opium | 170 |
| Norway : | |
| Legislation for punishment of smuggling | 136-7 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 170, 176, 192 |
| S. S. "Oostkerk", illicit traffic by | 85 |
| Opium shops, in Peking, letter from Secretary of International Anti-Opium Association <i>re</i> | 86 |
| Palestine, observations on Annual Report | 23, 152 |
| Pekin, letter from Secretary of International Anti-Opium Association <i>re</i> alleged opium shops in | 86 |
| Persia : | |
| Regulations under Persian Coasts and Islands Order in Council of Great Britain | 68, 200-1 |
| Shipments of opium from Bushire | 122-4, 228-9 |
| Statistics of raw opium | 163 |
| Observations on | 28-9 |
| Persian Gulf : | |
| Export of opium from, procedure | 119-20, 218, 220 |
| Illicit traffic in | 11, 61-8, 131 |
| Peru, statistics of coca leaf | 185 |
| Philippine Islands : | |
| Letter from Mrs. Hamilton Wright <i>re</i> opium situation | 111-12 |
| Seizures in | 87 |
| Poland : | |
| Annual report, observations | 23, 152 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 170, 177, 182, 192 |
| Portugal : | |
| Annual report on Macao, observations | 23-5, 152 |
| Import certificate system in | 134 |
| Law No. 1.687 | 141-2 |
| Postal export, import and dispatch of drugs : | |
| List of conditions regulating | 54-5, 59 |
| by Registered letter, in China | 104, 231-3 |
| Resolution <i>re</i> necessity for prevention | 221 |
| Prepared opium : | |
| Statistics of use in various countries | 196-9 |
| Observations on | 34-6 |
| Production of Raw opium, statistics | 156-65 |
| Raw opium : | |
| Quantities used in manufacture of morphine in Japan, relations with amount produced | 110 |
| Statistics of use in various countries | 156-65 |
| Observations on | 27-9 |
| Summary, proposal <i>re</i> preparation of | 29-30 |
| Reports, Annual : | |
| Examination, report to Council <i>re</i> | 119, 217-8 |
| Preparation, method | 26-7 |
| Resolutions <i>re</i> | 11, 132-3, 220 |

| | Pages | | Pages |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| Reports, Annual (continued) : | | South America, consideration of position re application of Hague Convention in | 47 |
| <i>re</i> Seizures, procedure | 91-5, 112-13 | Spain, statistics of drugs used in | 171, 177, 182, 193 |
| Statement <i>re</i> | 137-8, 225-6 | Statistical Tables | 156-99 |
| Summary | 146-99 | Observations | 25-6, 27-36 |
| Consideration of | 16-26, 27-32, 32-6 | Straits Settlements : | |
| from Various countries | 32, 41, 104-5, 109-10 | Annual report, observations | 25, 153-4 |
| Rotterdam : | | Seizures of drugs at | 206-7 |
| Report by police on operation of firms of Buxtorf & Co., of Basle, and A. Broemson of Hamburg | 74-7 | Statistics of drugs used in | 163-4, 199 |
| Seizure of drugs, statement <i>re</i> | 201-4 | Substitutes for Opium, consideration of Report of International Anti-Opium Association | 111 |
| Roumania, statistics of drugs used in | 170, 177, 193 | Sugimura, M., statement re opium policy in Japan | 39-40 |
| Russian opium, protest from Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs re Smuggling into Manchuria | 87, 104, 216 | Swaziland, observations on Annual Report | 25, 154 |
| Sarawak : | | Sweden, statistics of drugs used in | 164, 171, 177, 182, 193 |
| Annual report, observations | 25, 152-3 | Switzerland : | |
| Statistics of prepared opium | 199 | Statistics of drugs used in | 164, 177, 183, 185, 193 |
| Secretariat : | | Observations on | 29, 31, 35-6 |
| Action to be taken <i>re</i> distribution of reports of seizures and question of forged labels | 91-5 | Swiss Narcotics Law, consideration of summary report <i>re</i> | 116-17 |
| Memorandum <i>re</i> advisability of declaring morphine content at time of importation, for uses other than the manufacture of prepared opium | 13-15 | Tat Seng Company Shanghai, Illicit Traffic by | 86 |
| Notes on annual reports by | 146-55 | Tientsin, seizure on board S. S. "Westerdijk" | 204 |
| Seizures, see under Smuggling. | | Traffic : | |
| Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, position re Export and Import of drugs | 59-60 | Control, suggestions <i>re</i> | 113-16, 119 |
| Shanghai : | | Position in China | 68-71 |
| Illicit Traffic in | 82-5, 208-10 | Treaties, Extradition, see Extradition Treaties. | |
| Tat Seng Company, prospectus | 86 | Turkey : | |
| Siam : | | Application of Hague Convention in, consideration of position | 45-6, 220 |
| Annual report, observations | 25, 153 | Statistics of raw opium | 164 |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 163, 171, 199 | Observations | 29 |
| Singapore, Seizures in | 59, 81-2, 205-6, 207 | Union catholique d'Etudes internationales, question of Co-operation with Advisory Committee on Opium | 44-5, 86 |
| Smuggling : | | United States of America : | |
| General situation, discussion | 87-90 | Annual report dispatch of | 32, 41 |
| Interchange of communication <i>re</i> , resolution | 221 | Extradition treaties with various countries | 11, 133, 139 |
| Investigations, omissions or delays on part of government to notify results | 87 | Reports <i>re</i> seizures from | 112-13 |
| in S. S. 'Oostkerk' | 85 | Smuggling in | 10, 210-12 |
| in Persian Gulf, discussion | 11, 61-8, 131 | Statement <i>re</i> measures taken to control drug traffic in | 47-53 |
| by Post, procedure for prevention of | 104, 221, 231-3 | Statistics of drugs used in | 165, 171, 178, 183, 186, 194 |
| Protest from Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs <i>re</i> | 87, 104, 216 | Observations on | 31-2 |
| Reports <i>re</i> | 72-4, 235-6 | Uruguay, statistics of cocaine used in | 194 |
| Resolutions <i>re</i> | 10-11, 219-20, 221 | van Wettum, M., statements by | 38-9, 218 |
| Seizures : | | S.S. "Westerdijk", seizure of drugs on | 204 |
| List, observations on | 55-8 | Woods, Colonel : | |
| Reports : | | Statement, <i>re</i> measures taken to control drug traffic in United States | 47-53 |
| Annual, procedure <i>re</i> | 91-5, 220 | Summary of suggestions by <i>re</i> control of illicit traffic | 234 |
| to Council | 118-19 | Wright, Mrs. Hamilton, letter re opium situation in Philippine Islands | 111-12 |
| from Various Governments | 72-4, 112-13 | | |
| Services authorised to exchange information <i>re</i> , list | 134-6 | | |
| in Various Countries | 59, 81-2, 201-7, 215-16 | | |
| Summary of suggestions by Colonel Wood <i>re</i> control | 234 | | |
| Tat Seng Company, prospectus | 86 | | |
| in Various countries | 10, 16-17, 71-2, 77-87, 102-4, 108-9, 136-7, 208-10, 210-12, 216, 233 | | |
| South Africa : | | | |
| Annual report, observations | 25, 154-5 | | |
| Statistics of drugs used in | 164, 178, 193 | | |

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

C. 557. M. 199. 1927. XI.

GENEVA, November 1927

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC IN OPIUM
AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS**

MINUTES

OF THE

TENTH (EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

Held at Geneva from September 28th to October 8th, 1927.

Publications of the League of Nations

**XI. OPIUM AND OTHER
DANGEROUS DRUGS**
1927. XI. 10.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF MEMBERS | 5 |
| FIRST MEETING (Private), September 28th, 1927, at 11 a.m. | |
| 91. Opening Speech by the Chairman | 7 |
| 92. Publicity of the Meetings of the Committee | 7 |
| 93. Adoption of the Agenda of the Session | 7 |
| SECOND MEETING (Public), September 28th, 1927, at 3 p.m. | |
| 94. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary | 10 |
| 95. Absence of M. Brenier from the Session | 13 |
| THIRD MEETING (Public), September 29th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 96. Reservation made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference | 13 |
| FOURTH MEETING (Public), September 29th, 1927, at 4.30 p.m. | |
| 97. Reservation made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference (<i>continuation</i>) | 19 |
| 98. Question of the Conveyance of Drugs by Post: Proposal to ask a Member of the Bureau of the Universal Postal Union to come before the Committee | 21 |
| 99. Respective Duties of the Advisory Committee and the Permanent Central Board: Appointment of a Sub-Committee to consider and report on the Proposal of M. Fotitch | 22 |
| 100. Examination of the Progress Report by the Secretary (<i>continuation</i>) | 22 |
| FIFTH MEETING (Public), September 30th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 101. Minutes of the Meetings and List of Publications | 24 |
| 102. Examination of the Progress Report by the Secretary (<i>continuation</i>) | 24 |
| 103. Method of entering Statistics relating to Seized Drugs in Annual Reports sent in by Governments | 26 |
| 104. Method of Circulation of Unofficial Information | 27 |
| SIXTH MEETING (Public), October 1st, 1927, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 105. Suppression of Opium Production and Traffic in South China | 29 |
| 106. Opium Conditions in the Far East: Report from the Foreign Policy Association | 29 |
| 107. Maritime Insurance in the United States of America: Letter from Mr. Pinkney Tuck | 29 |
| 108. Production of Opium in Persia: Consideration of the Report of the Committee of Enquiry in relation to the Question of Illicit Traffic | 30 |
| 109. Illicit Traffic: Carl Rubens Case: Letter from the Danish Government with regard to the Minutes of the Ninth Session of the Committee | 31 |
| 110. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic: Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni | 32 |
| SEVENTH MEETING (Public), October 1st, 1927, at 4.30 p.m. | |
| 111. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic: Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni (<i>continuation</i>) | 33 |
| EIGHTH MEETING (Public), October 3rd, 1927, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 112. Conveyance of Drugs by Post | 35 |
| 113. Survey of the Conditions in the Far East as regards Smoking Opium: Report by Mr. Herbert L. May | 36 |
| 114. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic: Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni (<i>continuation</i>) | 37 |
| NINTH MEETING (Public), October 3rd, 1927, at 3 p.m. | |
| 115. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic: Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni (<i>continuation</i>) | 41 |
| 116. Letter from M. H. Brenier regarding Certain Matters connected with the Work of the Session | 43 |
| 117. Import and Export Certificates: Situation in China | 43 |
| 118. Relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board: Report of the Sub-Committee | 43 |
| TENTH MEETING (Public), October 4th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m. | |
| 119. Relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board: Report of the Sub-Committee (<i>continuation</i>) | 46 |
| ELEVENTH MEETING (Public), October 4th, 1927, at 3 p.m. | |
| 120. Approval of the Minutes of the First, Second and Third Meetings | 50 |
| 121. Method of presenting Documents regarding Seizures | 50 |
| 122. Question of taking Legislative Measures to make possible the Punishment of Persons using the Territory of one Country to carry on the Illicit Traffic in other Countries | 51 |
| 123. Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs by Kiaochow Customs Authorities | 52 |
| 124. Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Cocaine at Copenhagen | 53 |
| 125. Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Cocaine at Hong-Kong | 53 |
| 126. Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs at Genoa | 53 |
| 127. Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Morphine at Hong-Kong | 53 |

| TWELFTH MEETING (Public), October 5th, 1927, at 10 a.m. | | Page |
|--|--|------|
| 128. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs on the <i>Fumana</i> at the Barry Dock, London. | 54 |
| 129. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures effected by the Customs Authorities at Shanghai. | 54 |
| 130. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs at Shanghai during the March Quarter, 1927. | 58 |
| 131. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs by the Estonian Police. | 58 |
| 132. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs during the September Quarter 1927. | 58 |
| 133. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Cocaine at Calcutta. | 58 |
| 134. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Cocaine at Trieste. | 58 |
| 135. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs. | 59 |
| 136. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs in the Netherlands and in the Dutch East Indies. | 59 |
| 137. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs. | 59 |
| 138. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs in the United States. | 59 |
| 139. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs at Calcutta. | 59 |
| 140. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs at Calcutta, Rangoon, Montreal and Vancouver. | 59 |
| | | |
| THIRTEENTH MEETING (Public), October 5th, 1927, at 3 p.m. | | |
| 141. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs. | 61 |
| 142. | Agreement concluded between the Chinese and Swiss Governments with regard to the Imports of Drugs from Switzerland to China: Letter from the Chinese Representative. | 61 |
| 143. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs in Italy during the First Six Months of 1926. | 61 |
| 144. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs effected at Bombay. | 62 |
| 145. | Illicit Traffic: Transactions by the Firm of Arwed Broemsen, of Hamburg. | 62 |
| 146. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs at Singapore and Penang. | 62 |
| 147. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures made in Italy during the Last Six Months of 1926. | 63 |
| 148. | Collation by the Secretariat of Cases of the Illicit Traffic. | 63 |
| 149. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs at Hong-Kong. | 63 |
| 150. | Illicit Traffic: The Schulten Case: Letter from the Austrian Government. | 64 |
| 151. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs at Havana. | 64 |
| 152. | Illicit Traffic: Seizures of Drugs in the United States during 1926 and the First Three Months of 1927. | 64 |
| 153. | Illicit Traffic: Question of the Units of Weights and Measures used in Seizure Reports. | 64 |
| 154. | Spain and the Illicit Traffic. | 64 |
| 155. | Illicit Traffic: Smuggling of Drugs into Iraq. | 65 |
| 156. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs at New York: Letter from Colonel Woods. | 65 |
| 157. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs at Shanghai sent from Vienna: Letter from Dr. Anselmino. | 65 |
| 158. | Illicit Traffic: Affair of Roche & Co. | 65 |
| 159. | Traffic in the Persian Gulf on the <i>Kumamoto Maru</i> | 66 |
| 160. | Illicit Traffic: List of Postal Packets of Narcotic Substances destroyed by the Cuban Government between November 4th, 1926, and April 22nd, 1927. | 66 |
| | | |
| FOURTEENTH MEETING (Public), October 6th, 1927, at 10 a.m. | | |
| 161. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs in the Netherlands East Indies. | 66 |
| 162. | Illicit Traffic: Information regarding a Quantity of Opium purchased by the Chinese Navy. | 66 |
| 163. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs in Berlin. | 67 |
| 164. | Question of the Nature of Strychnine and Caffeine. | 69 |
| 165. | Illicit Traffic: Shipment of Goods, believed to consist of Drugs, into the Far East from Dairen: Note by the British Representative. | 69 |
| 166. | Case of the Illicit Traffic in Hamburg: Letter from the German Representative. | 70 |
| 167. | Illicit Traffic: Seizure of Drugs in Berlin: Question of the Publication of the Document relating to this Case. | 70 |
| 168. | Illicit Traffic: Information supplied by the Netherlands Government regarding the Movements of a Quantity of Raw Persian Opium purchased by Hoornstraa. | 70 |
| 169. | Illicit Traffic: General Statement and Draft Resolution presented by Colonel Woods. | 71 |
| | | |
| FIFTEENTH MEETING (Public), October 6th, 1927, at 3 p.m. | | |
| 170. | Illicit Traffic: Statement and Draft Resolution presented by Colonel Woods (<i>continuation</i>). | 72 |
| 171. | Question of the Formation of an International Syndicate of Drug Manufacturers: Proposal by Dr. Anselmino: Insertion of this Item on the Agenda. | 75 |
| 172. | Question of the Formation of an International Syndicate of Drug Manufacturers: General Discussion on Dr. Anselmino's Proposal. | 76 |
| | | |
| SIXTEENTH MEETING (Public), October 8th, 1927, at 11 a.m. | | |
| 173. | Illicit Traffic: Case of Madame Stattniegross. | 77 |
| 174. | Examination of the Draft Report to the Council on the Work of the Tenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Committee. | 78 |
| | | |
| SEVENTEENTH MEETING (Public), October 8th, 1927, at 3 p.m. | | |
| 175. | Examination of the Draft Report to the Council (<i>continuation</i>). | 80 |
| 176. | Date of the Next Session of the Committee. | 83 |
| 177. | Close of the Session. | 83 |
| | | |
| ANNEXES | | 85 |

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

TENTH (EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

(September 28th to October 8th, 1927).

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Sir John CAMPBELL, C.S.I. (Chairman) | <i>India.</i> |
| Dr. CARRIÈRE (Vice-Chairman) | <i>Switzerland.</i> |
| Dr. ANSELMINO | <i>Germany.</i> |
| Dr. CUELLAR | <i>Bolivia.</i> |
| M. BOURGOIS | <i>France.</i> |
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, K.C.B. | <i>Great Britain.</i> |
| His Excellency M. CAVAZZONI | <i>Italy.</i> |
| His Excellency M. N. SATO | <i>Japan.</i> |
| M. W. G. VAN WETTUM | <i>Netherlands.</i> |
| His Excellency M. FERREIRA | <i>Portugal.</i> |
| M. Constantin FOTITCH | <i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.</i> |
| His Highness the Prince CHAROON | <i>Siam.</i> |
| <hr/> | |
| Mr. Pinkney TUCK | <i>United States of America.</i> |

Assessors : Mr. L. A. LYALL.
Colonel Arthur Woods.

Absent : M. CHAO-HSIN CHU.
M. BRENIER.

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

FIRST MEETING (PRIVATE).

Held on Wednesday, September 28th, 1927, at 11 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, or their substitutes, and the Assessors, with the exception of Dr. Carrière and M. Brenier.

91. Opening Speech by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN opened the session. He wished to apologise to those members whom he had been unable to consult for the fact that it had been found necessary to fix the date of the Committee's session so near to the end of the Assembly. He had done everything in his power to fix a date to suit the convenience of the majority of the members, but there was no other time available for the present extraordinary session.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Lyall, who was attending for the first time as assessor, and whose intimate knowledge of conditions in China would be of the greatest assistance to the Committee.

He also welcomed Colonel Woods, who was attending the present session as assessor after being absent from the last session, and Mr. Pinkney Tuck, who was again representing the United States of America in an unofficial capacity.

Dr. Lange, Norway, desired to follow the Committee's proceedings in order to be able to take part in the discussion with regard to the Swedish reservations to Article 6 of the 1925 Opium Convention, as Norway associated itself to a considerable extent with Sweden in that matter.

He had received a letter from M. Cavazzoni, who was indisposed and unable to attend the first meetings of the session. M. Cavazzoni requested the Committee to permit Professor Gallavresi to act as his substitute, and to postpone the discussion of his memorandum (document O.C.666) until he was himself able to be present.

The Committee agreed to the procedure suggested by M. Cavazzoni.

92. Publicity of the Meetings of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should follow its previous decisions with regard to the publicity of its meetings.

The proposal was adopted.

93. Adoption of the Agenda of the Session.

The Committee decided to discuss the agenda in private session in accordance with previous practice.

The CHAIRMAN, submitting the revised provisional agenda, said that, in addition to the items appearing in the revised agenda, there were three subjects submitted since the agenda had been drawn up, namely :

1. A discussion on the respective duties of the Advisory Committee and of the Permanent Central Board. This was proposed by M. Fotitch in a letter dated September 20th, 1927, in which he said that his proposal was made in consequence of the discussions held in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly, which had given him the impression that the relations between the two bodies were not very distinctly defined and that it would be advisable for the Committee to discuss the matter.

2. A memorandum from M. Cavazzoni (document O.C.666) concerning the method of application of the import certificate system and the national control of factories. In a letter dated September 24th, 1927, communicating this memorandum to the Secretariat, M. Cavazzoni had said that he wished to make a statement to the Committee on the object and scope of the scheme outlined in his memorandum.

3. A letter from the Danish Government concerning the Minutes of the ninth session with reference to the seizure of cocaine in the free port of Copenhagen (the Carl Ruben case).

The Chairman suggested that the Committee should consider the agenda item by item.

Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted without observation.

ITEM 5. — ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

In reply to an observation by Colonel Woods, who suggested that M. Cavazzoni's memorandum and the letter from the Danish Government might be taken in conjunction with this item, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the letter from the Danish Government,

although bearing upon the subject of the illicit traffic, was in reality a separate matter, while M. Cavazzoni's memorandum had only just been distributed and was of considerable length. It would accordingly need careful consideration and could not be taken early in the session.

Professor GALLAVRESI (Italy) pointed out that M. Cavazzoni had asked that his memorandum should be placed at the end of the agenda in order to give him an opportunity of making a statement. He suggested therefore either that it should be taken as a separate item at the end of the agenda or, if the Committee accepted Colonel Woods' proposal, that Item 5, Illicit Traffic, should be postponed so as to allow it to be taken in conjunction with M. Cavazzoni's memorandum towards the end of the session.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would be glad to take note of Professor Gallavresi's remarks. He thought it better to limit the present discussion to the admissibility of items, leaving the order in which they should be discussed for settlement later.

He suggested that the Committee should for the moment approve Item 5, it being understood that, in discussing the question of the illicit traffic, the Committee would also examine reports on seizures.

The Committee agreed.

ITEM 6. — METHOD OF ENTERING STATISTICS RELATING TO SEIZED DRUGS IN ANNUAL REPORTS SENT IN BY GOVERNMENTS.

This item was adopted.

ITEM 7. — CONSIDERATION OF THE FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL SYNDICATE OF DRUG MANUFACTURERS (PROPOSAL BY DR. ANSELMINO. DOCUMENT O.C.638).

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) reminded the Committee that the discussion at the extraordinary session was to be limited to matters coming within the scope of the Opium Conventions. It appeared from Dr. Anselmino's proposal that he desired to give the suggested international syndicate much wider powers than those which would be enjoyed by the Permanent Central Board. M. van Wettum wondered accordingly whether the Committee would be in order in discussing Dr. Anselmino's proposal at the present session.

The CHAIRMAN understood — he was not sure — that the organisation proposed by Dr. Anselmino was to be an entirely unofficial organisation whose activities would be directed towards attaining the objects contemplated by the Conventions. He suggested that the best course to follow would be to leave the item on the agenda, subject to the reservation that, when the subject came up for discussion, Dr. Anselmino would be asked to make a statement on his proposal, after which it would be open to any member to raise the question whether it was within the competence of the Committee to examine the matter at the present session.

The proposal was adopted.

ITEM 8. — METHOD OF CIRCULATION OF UNOFFICIAL INFORMATION.

This item was adopted without observation.

ITEM 9. — REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY INTO THE PRODUCTION OF OPIUM IN PERSIA.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) thought that the Persian Government should perhaps be represented during the discussion of this item.

The CHAIRMAN said this would, he thought, depend upon whether the Committee proposed to take any action in the matter. The report had been distributed, and had formed the subject of resolutions by the Fifth Committee and the Assembly. As it had also been circulated by the Council to the members of the Advisory Committee on Opium, he saw no reason why the latter should not discuss it.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that the Council had not asked the Committee for an opinion. He thought it unnecessary to discuss the report again.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if members did not wish to discuss the report, the Committee would, of course, refrain from doing so. The report had, however, been circulated to the Committee, and in his view this item should therefore remain on the agenda.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that the Committee was bound to take note of the recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry, because they had a very important bearing on the traffic in the Far East and might affect the Committee's attitude towards certain questions. The discussions in the Fifth Committee had also raised points of considerable importance to the work of the Advisory Committee. He suggested that the Minutes of the Fifth Committee should be distributed to the members of the Advisory Committee.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The situation in the Far East would be changed as a result of the discussion of the Persian Government. The Committee would also have to take into account the discussions which had taken place in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly. It should be clearly noted that the Committee did not intend to reopen a discussion which it considered as closed. For this purpose it might be possible to alter the title of Item 9 on the agenda to read as follows: "Examination of the Position created by the Declarations of the Persian Government and by the Discussions in the Assembly on this Subject".

M. SATO (Japan) agreed that it would be useful to examine the report in question, but pointed out that the present session had been called for the special purpose of discussing the question of the illicit traffic. It would be better not to increase the agenda, and he therefore proposed that the discussion of the report of the Committee of Enquiry be postponed until the ordinary session in January.

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) supported the suggestion of M. Sato.

M. SATO (Japan) believed that, at the last session but one, the Committee had decided that its ordinary sessions should take place regularly in January. It was important, in connection with the matter of submitting annual reports, that the date of the ordinary sessions should be definitely fixed. Perhaps, as Sir Malcolm Delevingne had pointed out, it was a little inconvenient for the members of the Committee to hold a new session three months after the present extraordinary session, but, for the reasons he had just given, M. Sato hoped that the next ordinary session would take place in January.

After an exchange of views, the Committee decided to maintain this item on the agenda, it being understood that the report would be examined in view of the discussion in the Fifth Committee and in the Assembly, and with reference to the question of the illicit traffic.

ITEM 10. — DISCUSSION ON THE RESPECTIVE DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE PERMANENT CENTRAL BOARD: PROPOSAL OF M. FOTITCH.

In the course of a discussion as to whether, in view of the possible early receipt of the necessary ratification to bring the 1925 Opium Convention into operation, it would be advisable to discuss this item at the present extraordinary session or whether it could be left over until the next session, M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that it was his personal opinion that failure by the Committee to discuss the matter at the present session might have an adverse effect upon the ratification of the Convention.

The Committee decided to retain the item on the agenda.

The Committee further decided to hold its next session in the latter half of January 1928, the date to be settled later in the session.

ITEM 11. — DISCUSSION MEMORANDUM BY M. CAVAZZONI OF DOCUMENT O.C. 666.

The Committee decided to postpone consideration of this item to a later stage of the session, because the memorandum by M. Cavazzoni had only just been received, and required detailed examination.

ITEM 12. — LETTER FROM THE DANISH GOVERNMENT WITH REGARD TO THE MINUTES OF THE NINTH SESSION CONCERNING THE CARL RUBEN CASE.

This item was approved without observation.

The agenda as amended was adopted (Annex 1).

With regard to the order in which the items should be taken, the CHAIRMAN said that there was no need for a general discussion on this point. He proposed that the items should be discussed in the order in which they appeared on the agenda, subject to the reservation that, if any member wished to alter the order of discussion, he could suggest that course when the different items came up for consideration.

The Committee agreed.

SECOND MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Wednesday, September 28th, 1927, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, or their substitutes, and the Assessors, with the exception of Dr. Carrière and M. Brenier.

94. Consideration of the Progress Report by the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Progress Report (Annex 2) should be discussed section by section.

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1925.

The CHAIRMAN said that this matter might be taken together with Item 3 of the agenda, which dealt with the same question. It would be noted from document O.C.668 that there were now twelve ratifications and six adhesions, without reservations or *ad referendum* clauses. The Dominican Republic, Roumania and Bolivia had adhered *ad referendum*, the latter with certain reservations to the effect that it would not undertake to restrict the cultivation or use by the native population of coca leaves. It would, however, export only through certain ports under Government supervision. Three members of the Council had ratified, out of the seven necessary for the coming into force of the Convention.

M. SATO (Japan) said that the Japanese Privy Council was at present examining the Convention. In Japan, the power to ratify belonged to the Emperor, who took the advice of the Privy Council. The matter did not come before Parliament. As soon as the Privy Council had decided in favour of ratification, about which there seemed to be no doubt, the Emperor would take the necessary decision.

Dr. LANGE (Norway) explained that the Norwegian authorities were at present preparing modifications for introduction in their internal legislation with a view to adapting that legislation to meet the requirements of the Convention. There was another question which stood in the way of ratification by Norway and Sweden, which would be discussed under Item 4 of the agenda.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thought that, in view of the change which had taken place in the composition of the Council, it would be valuable to pass a resolution similar to that which was adopted at the last session, and to instruct the Secretariat to remind States Members of the Council of their special position as regards the entry into force of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that M. Bourgois' proposal would be acceptable to the Committee.

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) said that his Government had put the question of the adhesion of Bolivia before the Parliament, which was at present in session. It was certain to obtain ratification, which would doubtless be announced at the next session.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) and Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (British Empire) asked whether the reservations on behalf of the Bolivian Government could be regarded as reservations in the strict meaning of the term.

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) explained that these were not, properly speaking, reservations. His Government had merely wished to define what would be its attitude if the Committee should raise this question.

The CHAIRMAN put to the Committee the proposal of M. Bourgois that it should pass a resolution emphasising the importance of ratification, and pointing out the special position of the Members of the Council in this matter.

The Committee decided to adopt this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as regards the first Opium Agreement and Protocol, ratifications had been received from France, Great Britain, India, the Netherlands, Portugal and Siam. Japan was the only signatory which had not yet ratified.

M. SATO (Japan) recalled the explanations which he had given at the session in January last. If Japan ratified the 1925 Convention, it would at the same time ratify the Agreement. The Privy Council was at present examining both matters.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) asked whether it would be possible to make direct representations to certain countries which had not yet ratified the Convention and which held a particularly important position. For example, Chile, Denmark, Greece, Hungary and Latvia were particularly important as regards the control of the illicit traffic and they had so far not indicated their intentions in the matter. He suggested that it might be possible for direct representation to be made by the Council.

The Committee was in favour of this proposal, and asked the Chairman to discuss the suggestion with the Secretary-General and, if such a suggestion appeared to offer no difficulty for general reasons, to decide the form in which it should be submitted to the Council.

Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic.

The CHAIRMAN emphasised the importance of this question and added that replies from fifteen countries were before the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) asked whether any members of the Committee could state if and how their Governments proposed to give effect to these recommendations.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) thought that there was some misunderstanding in the draft of the reply from Germany. It could only refer to new measures to be taken by the German Government, whose attitude in this connection was well known to the Committee. The Government exercised complete supervision over narcotics, both as regards internal use and exports. In the case of exports, it had accepted all the suggestions of the Committee, applied the system of certificates and concluded special agreements with countries which did not accept this system. His Government was entirely prepared to introduce the system of export certificates.

The CHAIRMAN said that no cocaine was manufactured in India and that the small quantity of morphine which was produced there was either consumed in India under strict control or was sent to Great Britain, where it came under the Dangerous Drugs Act.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he had drawn the special attention of the authorities to this resolution, and he would see that in future the reports were very detailed. The last part of the resolution was of fundamental importance. Licences should only be issued to persons who could clearly establish their commercial respectability. He had personally proposed the establishment of a Committee which would be solely in charge of the issue of licences, and which would be extremely strict in these matters and would only issue them to houses of good reputation and not to individuals, who frequently carried on their business in furnished premises and were difficult to catch. By considerably restricting the number of persons who received licences, they would diminish to the same extent the importance of the illicit traffic. Supervision was fairly easy in France, where there were only three factories of no great importance. A Committee instructed to deliver the authorisations provided for by the Convention of February 19th, 1925, would have more authority, more liberty and more severity than would a single official.

M. SATO (Japan) did not know why his Government had not replied to this question nor to the other resolution adopted at the last session. He would do his best to hasten this reply. He was under the impression that Japan was not without regulations or laws as to the control and the leakage of drugs after leaving the factory. His Government would merely have to enforce all these regulations with energy. According to certain information which he had received, he understood that this Government was making efforts in this direction. With this end in view, the credits had been increased for the purpose of supervision by the police. There were in Japan about 80,000 persons authorised to sell and use narcotics, and the credits which had previously been granted were insufficient to provide the necessary supervision. It was to be hoped that the results of the new methods would soon be apparent.

M. Sato then gave certain details. There was at Tokyo a manufacturing company, Koto Seiyaku, the production of which had frequently been known to be the object of illicit traffic. Its goods had been seized in India, and this had called forth observations on the part of the representatives of that country. This company had of its own accord decided to number all receptacles of drugs and to put upon them the date of manufacture. The Japanese authorities were extremely interested in this arrangement, which had been begun on July 1st. M. Sato would ask for further information on the subject. The Japanese police had for some time endeavoured to trace the drugs from the moment when they left the factory, through the various business transactions, in order to discover the exact origin and process of the illicit traffic. He might state that the Japanese authorities were doing all they could to control the manufacture, sale and distribution of narcotics. He had sent the Secretary a note on this subject, which would be circulated to his colleagues.

Professor GALLAVRESI (Italy) said that the situation in Italy had changed quite quickly. As Italy was not a producing country, the illicit traffic was only carried on by

smuggling, particularly on the Swiss frontier. He mentioned a case where the Italian authorities stopped on the frontier a suspected motor-car; its occupants immediately set fire to it, and it was subsequently discovered that it had been carrying drugs. Legislation was in process in Italy for the repression of these offences. This legislation had not only a political aim, but also tended to facilitate the application of the international Conventions. The Law of 1923, which had been communicated to the Committee, had put at the disposal of the police the means for energetic action against narcotics, particularly as regards their use in undesirable places. A new Penal Code had recently been proposed, which included extremely severe rules against the traffic in narcotics. New regulations had also been introduced in the law governing pharmacies. The supervision which had been established had begun to give results, and Professor Gallavresi thought that the strengthening of protective legislation was calculated to prevent the traffic and the introduction of narcotics into a non-producing country such as Italy.

The CHAIRMAN said that few replies had been received as regards the proposal to limit licences to desirable persons. He suggested that the matter might be postponed till the next session, when the Committee would have before it further reports and more information.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed that the results in this matter were somewhat disappointing. The Governments had not all fully understood the meaning of the resolution adopted by the Committee at its last session.

The number and amount of the seizures recently reported fully confirmed the importance of the action proposed in this resolution. When the Committee discussed the details of seizures, it would be able to consider whether this resolution could be enforced by further action.

The Committee agreed to postpone this question.

Postal Traffic.

The CHAIRMAN referred to document O.C.569(b), containing a letter from M. Dinichert on behalf of the Swiss Government.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Germany, which was a member of the Universal Postal Union, had put into force the International Postal Conventions by a law the terms of which he outlined. He had also prepared a note (document O.C.392(1)) which would serve as a guide to other countries having less knowledge of the question.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, on his return to Paris after the last session of the Committee, he had informed the French authorities of the enormous amount of contraband in postal packets which reached certain towns in China. In the two months which had followed the last session reference had been made in the newspapers of numerous seizures. This was due either to the fact that the attention of the police had been drawn to the observations of the Committee, or because the smugglers had moved to France from certain countries in Central Europe. The note prepared by Dr. Anselmino had been of great value to him, as it had probably been to other members of the Committee, and he warmly thanked his colleague.

The CHAIRMAN asked what action the Committee proposed. A technical point was involved and M. Dinichert had suggested that a letter be written to the Universal Postal Union.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) drew attention to the reply from the Netherlands Government supporting the proposal of the Swiss Government.

The CHAIRMAN read this letter, adding that he thought the Swiss Government might be waiting for a communication from the Committee.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that this matter had not been discussed at the last session of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that this letter had been received in January 1927, but that no action had yet been taken. He suggested that the Swiss Government might be requested to send the letter in question.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, though the substance of the letter was excellent, its terms were rather too general. In view of the remarkable seizures which had recently taken place in China, he thought that the letter might be reinforced by a reference to the resolution adopted at the last session of the Committee and by the inclusion of examples to show the extent to which the post was used for the illicit traffic.

An examination of the answers in Part III of the Progress Report showed that certain countries appeared to think that the difficulty only arose in the case of producing countries. The Committee had remarkable examples of smuggling, both in producing and in consuming countries.

It was possible that the Governments did not realise that the Committee had had in mind the idea that the postal authorities might devote special attention to parcels destined

for China. He would suggest that Resolution 3 should be mentioned in the letter which the Swiss Government proposed should be addressed to the various Governments.

Mr. LYALL said that he had recently spoken to the Chinese Postal Commissioner in Shanghai, who pointed out that, in many cases of seizure of parcels arriving at Shanghai, it was impossible for the country that despatched the parcel to punish the offenders because, though export was prohibited in certain countries, the Courts had no means of punishing the sender if the goods were discovered abroad.

If this information were correct, he felt that it would be a serious deficiency in legislation.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that this was an important point. He suggested that the Committee might ask for the attendance of an official of the Universal Postal Union, who would be able to tell the Committee how to obtain more precise information as to the legal points involved.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that his Government had corresponded with other Governments on the matter of the control of postal traffic, but this correspondence had not yet led to satisfactory conclusions. He thought it would be difficult for the League to approach the Universal Postal Union, as it was not a member, but he felt that the Swiss proposal to approach that body would be more satisfactory.

M. Professor GALLAVRESI (Italy) was unable to see any objection to reference to the Universal Postal Union. Article 24 of the Covenant referred to the co-ordination of the work of existing organisations with that of the League of Nations. He thought this would be a good opportunity to get into touch with the Universal Postal Union, and that an official of that body would be able to furnish useful information.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had two proposals before it. The first of these was Sir Malcolm Delevingne's. He proposed that the Swiss Government be asked to send its draft letter, somewhat intensified, to the Universal Postal Union. The second proposal arose out of the remark of Mr. Lyall that it was not a punishable offence to post a packet of narcotics to China. It was suggested that a letter might be written inviting an official of the Universal Postal Union to assist the Committee in this matter.

The Committee adopted these proposals.

95. Absence of M. Brenier from the Session.

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from M. Brenier stating that his professional duties prevented him from attending the meetings of this session of the Committee. He had, however, forwarded certain observations as regards an international syndicate for the manufacture of narcotics. He hoped that the Minutes of the Committee would be sent to him, and regretted his inability to attend.

THIRD MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Thursday, September 29th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, and the Assessors, with the exception of Professor Gallavresi, M. Fotitch and M. Brenier.

96. Reservation made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference (document C. 302. C.L. 13 (Annex). C. 269. O.C. 663).

M. Hennings and M. Friedrichs, representatives of Sweden, and Dr. Lange, representing Norway in an unofficial capacity, came to the table of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed M. Hennings and M. Friedrichs, and thanked the Swedish Government for the opportunity it had given the Committee of a frank and friendly discussion of the difficulties felt by the Swedish Government with regard to the acceptance of the 1925 Opium Convention. He earnestly hoped that it would be possible to arrive at a solution which would be satisfactory to all concerned. The part played by the Northern Governments in furtherance of the campaign against the abuse of opium and dangerous drugs made it the more desirable to arrive at a friendly agreement. He welcomed Dr. Lange, who was representing the Norwegian Government in an unofficial capacity. As had been stated during the recent session of the Assembly, Norway felt much the same difficulties

as Sweden in this matter, although he understood that Norway had made no formal reservation. This, however, did not affect the substance of the question and the Committee would, of course, be prepared to discuss the matter with the Norwegian representative in the same way as with the Swedish representatives.

M. HENNINGS (Sweden), on behalf of his Government, thanked the Committee for giving it the opportunity of sending representatives to the present extraordinary session to discuss the Swedish Government's difficulties concerning the ratification of the 1925 Convention. His Government greatly appreciated this mark of the Committee's esteem and understanding.

M. Hennings then spoke as follows :

Sweden is most anxious to take her share in the fight against the illicit traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. With this object, the Swedish Government has prepared a Bill which is to be laid before the Riksdag during its 1928 session. This Bill is permeated by the same spirit as impelled the Second Opium Conference to adopt the Convention of February 19th, 1925. It imposes long terms of imprisonment on persons engaging in the illicit traffic.

At the same time, the competent authorities in Sweden think it would be better not to introduce into the national legislation provisions which, from the point of view of the object aimed at, might be of considerable importance in certain countries but which, in their opinion, would meet no real need in Sweden and would impose serious inconveniences on the people.

For these reasons, the Swedish Government finds it difficult to accede to the Opium Convention of 1925 unless its accession is accompanied by a reservation in regard to the stipulations of Article 6 (c), which stipulations in any case do not affect any of the fundamental principles of the Convention, but are merely of secondary importance.

If we are correct in our interpretation of the text of the Convention, the observance of these clauses would make it the duty of pharmaceutical chemists either to enter in their books all sales of a large number of remedies containing opium, morphine, cocaine or diacetylmorphine on medical prescriptions, or to preserve all prescriptions for such remedies.

It will be seen from the letter of January 14th last from the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General of the League that neither of these alternatives would add anything to the almost complete safeguards already existing in Sweden against the illicit use of chemists' stocks of narcotics, and that either of them would entail such large changes in the Swedish medical organisation — which experience has shown to be suitable and efficient — as could not easily be accepted.

On this subject I shall make a few brief remarks to complete the statement given by the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs in his letter.

For many years past Swedish law has provided that toxic substances prescribed by doctors may in certain circumstances be sold by pharmaceutical chemists an indefinite number of times on a single prescription. This provision does not, it is true, apply to the free alkaloids or salts of alkaloids to which the stipulations of the Convention refer : but it does affect certain preparations containing opium. Consequently, a remedy containing opium, if prescribed by a doctor for external use, may be sold an indefinite number of times without any need for a new prescription, provided it is not prescribed that the remedy should be used for gargling or inhaling. Remedies for internal use may also, except in certain special cases, be delivered an indefinite number of times provided that the quantity of opium, or of any preparation containing opium, prescribed for use on one occasion does not exceed one-fifth of the maximum dose laid down in the Swedish Pharmacopœia.

In the case of the remedies referred to and, indeed, all other remedies delivered by Swedish pharmaceutical chemists, a copy of the doctor's prescription must appear on the label. Thus the patient can obtain the remedy anywhere in Sweden simply by presenting the prescription, or the copy of the prescription delivered by the chemist, without having either to go to the doctor again or to go back to the same chemist. Experience has shown that these arrangements are highly satisfactory, since they enable patients to obtain the necessary remedies without extra expense or loss of time. They have never given rise to any abuse of dangerous remedies injurious to public health.

In regard to all other poisons — including morphine, cocaine and the other alkaloids — Swedish law provides that a prescription may be executed, with the authority of the person who made it out, not more than four times after it was given, and thereafter, if the doctor makes a special note to that effect, not more than three more times in respect of each drug were kept by the chemist, it would be more difficult for the patient — particularly if he has no permanent residence — to obtain the remedies he requires. It is therefore obvious that the clause in Article 6 (c) to the effect that prescriptions should be preserved by the chemist would create considerable difficulties in our country. It is no less obvious that, for the purpose of control, the value of that clause is very limited in cases in which the prescription kept by the chemist bears a note from the doctor authorising the further

delivery of the drug on the same prescription. In such a case, if the bearer of the prescription does not return to the chemist as many times as the prescription allows, the clause in question would not prevent the undelivered portion being used for unlawful purposes.

The other alternative in Article 6 (c), whereby the contracting parties are to require that sales shall be entered in the books, would also involve great difficulties for chemists in our country, and would neither meet any real need nor ensure effectual control. The entering in the books of these preparations, very many of which are proprietary remedies, would increase the working expenses of chemists and thus raise the price of the remedies. Moreover, since, under Article 8, the provisions of the Convention would not apply to certain preparations, there would be no effectual control over all such dangerous drugs as might enter into the composition of those preparations.

It is natural enough that the Swedish authorities, who are constantly endeavouring to reduce the price of pharmaceutical preparations, should not look with favour upon such provisions as that contained in Article 6 (c), which, if applied in Sweden, would defeat the aims of the authorities.

As has already been pointed out in the letter from the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General of the League, the Swedish authorities consider that adequate safeguards are provided against the abuse of the drugs in question in Sweden inasmuch as "pharmacies in Sweden are administered in such a way, and the standard required from the pharmacists is so high, that it would be practically impossible for the illicit traffic to draw on their stocks for supplies of narcotics".

The Secretary-General communicated the Swedish Government's letter to the Governments of various countries, a large number of which expressed their views on the subject. Several of them stated that they had no objection to the Swedish reservation. Certain Governments preferred not to give any opinion until they had seen the report of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium. Others, again, have made observations of considerable importance. I may perhaps be allowed to dwell on some of these observations.

First, the British Government expressed the opinion that the interpretation given by the Swedish authorities to certain points in the Convention was perhaps based on a misconception, and, further, that, if the Swedish Government's reservation was accepted, it would be necessary, having regard to the provisions of Article 6, to specify that the reservation referred only to pharmaceutical chemists and only to cases in which they delivered drugs on the prescription of a doctor or other authorised person. With reference to the first point in the British reply, we should be only too glad to find that Sweden's hesitation to accede to the Convention was due to a misconception. At the same time, it must be admitted that the wording of Article 6 (c), in particular, lends itself to a variety of interpretations. While that article provides for "*la consignation sur leurs livres des quantités fabriquées, des importations, exportations, ventes et tous autres modes de cession desdites substances*" the corresponding provision in the Hague Convention (Article 10 (c)) uses the expression "*de toute autre cession*". We should perhaps be justified in interpreting the provision of the 1925 Convention as meaning that entries in the books need not be made for every separate delivery but, for example, for the annual consumption only, following the rule now applied in Sweden. It is true, however, that this interpretation cannot easily be reconciled with the provisions of Article 9.

As regards the second point in the British reply — the desirability of making certain matters in the Swedish reservation clear — I think I may say that my Government is prepared to give favourable consideration to any suggestions that the Committee may care to make on this subject.

The Italian Government stated that "the existing regulations in Italy regarding pharmacies and the exercise of the profession of chemist are no less severe than the laws in Sweden; nevertheless, the provisions of the Convention of 1925 encountered no particular difficulties when they came into force". We in Sweden are well aware of the high standard reached in the organisation of pharmacies in Italy, but the Italian argument would have no point unless the Italian legislation were identical with the Swedish, and unless Italy also had felt it necessary to amend her legislation before she could accede to the Convention.

The Government of the Union of South Africa stated that, if the Swedish Government considered the proposed reservation necessary, and if, with that reservation, it was prepared to accept all the external or international obligations of the Convention, the Government of the Union of South Africa would be prepared to support the accession of Sweden under the said conditions. In this connection I would emphasise that, in formulating its reservation, the Swedish Government had, of course, no intention of attempting to evade any of the obligations alluded to in the reply from the Government of the Union of South Africa.

From the survey which I have had the honour to put before you, the conclusion that emerges is, on the one hand, that Sweden is genuinely anxious that a satisfactory solution should be found for the problem, and, on the other hand, that at the same time she feels bound to take care that no provisions are introduced into her legislation that would not in any way improve the control of the opium traffic but would work to the prejudice of the Swedish people and of our health organisation, which, as you all know, has attained an exceedingly high level.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Hennings for his clear and interesting statement. It appeared to him that the problem ought to be soluble. All the members of the Committee realised the technical difficulties implicit in the ratification, subject to a reservation, of an international convention like the 1925 Opium Convention, which had already been ratified by many Governments. They all knew also that the Swedish Government had done everything in its power to limit the abuse of drugs. There was unquestionably good will on both sides and therefore there was every ground for hoping that an arrangement could be reached.

He hoped that those members who had practical experience of the working of the system prescribed in the Convention would place their knowledge at the disposal of the Swedish and Norwegian Governments, with a view to finding a solution of the technical difficulties which had been explained.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French Government had postponed sending in its reply when it had learned that the Advisory Committee had decided to discuss the matter.

The explanations given by the Swedish representative confirmed the French Government's opinion that the extremely detailed regulations in force in Sweden gave guarantees equivalent to those prescribed by the Convention. Moreover, all the members of the Committee know that the illicit traffic never passed through this channel, and that Sweden was not an international smuggling centre. The Committee could, moreover, consult the Legal Section of the Secretariat on the possibility of ratifying the Convention with reservations.

DR. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) reminded the Committee that the Swiss Government was one of those which had asked that the reservations of the Swedish Government should be submitted to the Committee. He therefore considered that he was obliged to comply with the request made by the Chairman to the representatives of those Governments which had already had experience in the application of the provisions of the Convention to be good enough to put this experience at the disposal of the Swedish and Norwegian representatives. Although the Swiss Government had not yet ratified the Geneva Convention (the Swiss delegate at the Assembly had declared that this ratification would soon be made), Swiss legislation regarding the traffic in drugs was based on the stipulations of the Convention, which was the same thing as saying that the regulations laid down in Article 6 (c) were, in fact, applied. The application of these regulations had not so far led to the difficulties of which the Swedish Government was apprehensive in Sweden, and this doubtless because the Swiss cantonal legislation, which controlled, generally speaking, the pharmacy business, had prescribed for a long time measures similar to those of Article 6 (c), and stipulated that the pharmacists must keep their prescriptions or include them in a register. This measure, Dr. Carrière repeated, was not difficult to apply, and it was not clear, at a glance, why a regulation which was feasible in one country would not be feasible in another.

He was convinced that the body of Swedish pharmacists gave all requisite guarantees of honesty and loyalty, and he was happy to be able to say the same of pharmacists in his country. If Swiss legislation contained, like a great many other legislations, very clear stipulations, these were not directed against pharmacists in general; if they were considered necessary, it was because pharmacy had, like all other professions, its "black sheep", against which it was necessary to take precautions. It must, nevertheless, not be forgotten, in examining the question at present before the Committee, that the illicit traffic in narcotics, at least what could be called the big traffic, did not draw its supplies from pharmacy. Therefore, if the Swedish Government, as the result of long experience, was of the opinion that the system which it adopted was sufficient to assure efficient control of the pharmacies, it was understandable that it should wish to keep to this system and not upset its legislation. Still, in view of the terms of the Convention and the fact that they referred, generally speaking, to what was strictly a secondary point and raised no question of principle, Dr. Carrière wondered if it would not be possible to find a formula which would reconcile the necessities of the application of the Convention with the wish of Sweden not to introduce too serious modifications into her legislation, and which would enable her to ratify the Convention without reservation.

M. BOURGOIS (France) called the Committee's attention to the fact that there was in Sweden no internal abuse of drugs and no international smuggling. It would be very strange if the Committee were to make difficulties for such a country. To do so would be to expose itself to criticism.

DR. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that a regulation obliging pharmacists to keep and register prescriptions had been in existence in Germany since July 1st, 1924. Experience had shown that the system gave rise to no administrative difficulties and was of the greatest value in the campaign against the abuse of drugs.

M. SATO (Japan) wished to raise a previous question. It would be useful for the Committee to learn what was the action taken by the Council in connection with the general question of reservations made by States when ratifying or acceding to international

conventions. This question had been examined by the Council and, accordingly, it might be desirable to request the Legal Section of the Secretariat to make a statement on the point. This would make it easier for the Committee to take a decision on the legal point raised by M. Bourgois. If it were assured that ratification subject to reservation was legally inadmissible, then the only remaining question would be whether the Swedish Government maintained its point of view or no.

The Japanese Government had stated in its reply to the Secretary-General that it was in favour of acceptance of the Swedish reservation. The Japanese Government fully realised the Swedish Government's difficulties and the motives for which it had made its reservation.

M. Sato entirely shared M. Bourgois' point of view. The laws and regulations concerning dangerous drugs, more particularly in regard to control, differed from country to country, so that the Swedish Government should be allowed a certain latitude as to the reservation which it considered indispensable in order to facilitate its ratification of the Convention.

M. HENNINGS (Sweden) warmly thanked those members of the Committee who had spoken for the very friendly way in which they had referred to his country's difficulties.

He had merely two things to say. He did not mean to imply that the system in force for Sweden would be suitable for all other countries. That system had behind it the force of tradition and had been found both useful and effective in Sweden. This was, of course, due to the fact that there was practically no abuse of drugs in his country. It appeared that it was not in the Swedish national character to resort to the abuse of drugs. Indeed, there was not on record a single case in which the illicit traffic had obtained supplies from stocks in pharmacies. Should it prove otherwise, the Swedish Government would not hesitate to take very severe measures, not only from the international point of view but also from the point of view of the nation's health. The Swedish Government's hesitation with regard to Article 6 (c) was solely due to the fact that the necessity for these additional regulations was not clear in Sweden. In this connection, he might instance the very severe legislation which the Swedish Government had not hesitated to enact in order to counteract the danger of alcoholism. It had not, however, ever proposed that other countries, where the danger of alcoholism was not so acute, should take the same measures. The severe measures taken in other countries to combat the abuse of drugs were unnecessary in Sweden, where no such danger existed.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. McKinnon Wood, the Director of the Legal Section of the Secretariat, would now explain to the Committee the legal position as regards the ratification of international conventions, subject to reservations.

Mr. McKinnon WOOD, said that this question had been raised by the British Government after a reservation made in respect of the Second Opium Convention. The reservation was ultimately withdrawn, but the Council decided to refer the matter to the Committee of Experts for the Codification of International Law. A Sub-Committee of the Committee of Experts, consisting of M. Fromageot, M. Diena and Mr. McNair, had met and forwarded a report on this matter to the Council. The report affirmed the established principle of international law that, where an international convention had been concluded, no State could become a party to the convention subject to reservation unless the reservation was agreed to by all the other parties to the convention.

After receipt of the report, the Council adopted the following resolution :

“ The Council :

“ Takes note of the report and directs it to be circulated to the Members of the League ;

“ Requests the Secretary-General to be guided by the principles of the report regarding the necessity for acceptance by all the contracting States when dealing in future with reservations made after the close of a conference at which a convention is concluded, subject, of course, to any special decisions taken by the conference itself . . . ”

The report itself read in part as follows :

“ If the principles of the report are acted upon, this will prevent States from attaching to their signature or accession reservations which are not accepted by the other parties to the convention. ”

In conformity with the decision of the Council, when a ratification was received by the League with a reservation on a point where there was no special provision, the Secretariat informed the Government in question that it would be necessary to consult the other parties to the convention, and it also informed the other parties of the reservation. Until a reservation was accepted by them, it was without legal effect.

Mr. McKinnon Wood then read the following passage from the report of the Committee of Experts (document C.357.M.130.1927) :

“ It no doubt frequently happens that, in the course of the negotiation of a treaty, agreement is reached between the contracting parties regarding a reservation which is put forward by one of them and accepted by the others. In such a case, the former party may naturally, when appending its signature to the act concluded, mention and maintain its reservation. The other contracting parties, when they also append their signatures, signify thereby that they have accepted the reservation and consent thereto.

“ But when the treaty declares, as we have seen above, that it permits signature by Powers which have not taken part in its negotiation, such signature can only relate to what has been agreed upon between the contracting Powers. In order that any reservation may be validly made in regard to a clause of the treaty, it is essential that this reservation should be accepted by all the contracting parties, as would have been the case if it had been put forward in the course of the negotiations. If not, the reservation, like the signature to which it is attached, is null and void. ”

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. McKinnon Wood for his clear statement of the case.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the Committee was faced with a real difficulty. It appeared that any reservation now made by a State which desired to adhere to the Convention would have to be accepted by all the parties to the Convention, and certain of the replies showed that some countries would find difficulty in accepting the Swedish reservation. The Geneva Convention was the work of a Conference which had included a large number of Powers and the Convention had, after very minute examination, been unanimously accepted. The question was to see whether the difficulties of the Swedish Government could be solved so as to avoid any reservation on the part of Sweden.

The discussion on this question had given rise to two suggestions. The first was made by M. Bourgois, that it would be impossible and absurd, in view of the conditions in Sweden, to ask Sweden to ratify unconditionally. Experience, however, had shown that no country was free either from the possibility of internal abuse in these matters or from the risk of becoming a centre for the contraband traffic.

The second suggestion was that Article 6, paragraph (c), of the Convention was not of any great importance as regards the control of the illicit traffic. The Geneva Convention, like the Hague Convention of 1912, was based on the view that national and international control could not be separated. A loose national control in any country tended to create a supply of new addicts and to increase the demand which the drug traffickers set out to supply. Experience showed that Article 6, paragraph (c), was an important provision, which had been of great value to the Governments in the administration of the laws on dangerous drugs. The information supplied to the authorities by the pharmacists' registers of sales of drugs and of prescriptions made up, which they had to keep available for inspection, helped the authorities to discover cases of abuse. It was almost the only way by which they could detect cases where, through the carelessness or deliberate action of a medical practitioner, drugs had been supplied in excessive quantities. Though there were not many cases of this kind in Great Britain, they did appear to be more numerous than had been originally expected and he doubted whether it could be said that the abuse did not exist in any particular country. It would be noted that Article 10 of the Hague Convention, which did not apply to sales on a prescription by an authorised pharmacist, was intentionally strengthened by paragraph (c) of Article 6 of the Geneva Convention.

As regards the difficulties of the Swedish Government, he would observe that England had had experience of both the provisions in Article 6 (c). The pharmacist had to register all sales on a medical prescription and he had also to retain the prescription itself. It had been suggested that the retention of the prescription by the pharmacist might raise difficulties in cases where a prescription allowed a person to obtain the drug on three or four occasions, as the patient could not then take it to another chemist for the later supplies, but no serious inconvenience had resulted in England, though it was perhaps more likely to be caused in a country like England than in Sweden.

The alternative of registration, however, was open to the Swedish Government, and it was hard to see where the difficulty lay as regards the registration of the particulars of sales by pharmacists. It had been suggested that this involved the entry of very minute details which would cause delay in the execution of the prescription and increase the cost of the drug, but Sir Malcolm Delevingne could not agree that this would be the case. The entries were simple and could be quickly made.

Sir Malcolm Delevingne wished to urge the importance of Sweden's ratification of the Convention. Unless Article 6 (c) was accepted, there would be a real danger of an improper supply to the public of dangerous drugs. The pharmacist, whatever his qualifications,

had no power to overrule the decision of a medical practitioner, and the records provided for in the article, which would show cases of over-prescription or forged prescription, were of great value in aiding the authorities to detect abuses.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, without putting forward arguments already known to the Committee, he would venture to criticise certain remarks of Sir Malcolm Delevingne. He felt that there was a contradiction. Sir Malcolm Delevingne, who had begun his speech by declaring that there was here a possible basis for the operation of the traffic, had finally added that such matters must not be exaggerated. M. Bourgois strongly agreed with this last remark; the experience of the Committee and the study of statistics and the reports of the Governments showed quite clearly that the figures of fraudulent supply of drugs by pharmacists were quite insignificant.

The aim of the Convention was to prevent smuggling. This aim had been attained in Sweden. There was no need to haggle about the means by which that result had been obtained.

DR. LANGE (Norway) thanked the Chairman and the Committee for giving the Norwegian representative an opportunity to be present at the meetings.

In Norway, as in Sweden, the druggists were strictly organised. The Norwegian Government had prepared a Bill for the 1928 session of its Parliament adapting its legislation to the terms of the 1925 Convention, and he felt that in this matter its good will had been proved. Its difficulties were not entirely the same as those of Sweden. The main point of Article 6 was to "require that such persons shall enter in their books the quantities manufactured . . ." This rule was already in force in Norway. The difficulties lay, first, in the provisions as regards the repeated deliverance of the drug on the same prescription, and, secondly, the keeping of the prescription by the chemist. He hoped, however, that they could be overcome.

Dr. Lange welcomed the remarks of the British representative as regards the first point, that of obtaining several doses of the drug on one prescription. As regards the question of keeping the prescription at the chemist's, Dr. Lange felt that the special conditions in Norway, with its great distances and sparse population, would have to be considered, as would the fact that certain elements of the population were subject to frequent seasonal movements in connection with the fishing and the lumber trades. It would be practically impossible in Norway to oblige the sick person to go to the same pharmacy for the supply of opium. The medical authorities in Norway emphasised the inconvenience and expense for small pharmacies in keeping prescriptions and in drawing up detailed statistics. He was doubtful whether by means of such control the aims of the Convention would be achieved.

The CHAIRMAN said he doubted whether a satisfactory solution could be reached in the full Committee. The difficulties were technical; the discussions showed the utmost good will and a desire on both sides to find a solution of the problem. He therefore suggested that the best plan would be for certain of the members to meet the representatives of Sweden and Norway and to discuss the matter informally with them. He proposed that DR. CARRIÈRE, DR. ANSELMINO and Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE should continue the discussion with the Swedish and Norwegian representatives and that then the matter should be taken up in the full Committee later in the afternoon.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

FOURTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Thursday, September 29th, 1927, at 4.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee, and the Assessors, with the exception of Professor Gallavresi, M. Fotitch and M. Brenier.

97. Reservations made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Covenant adopted by the Second Opium Conference (continuation).

M. Hennings and M. Friedrichs, representatives of Sweden, and Dr. Lange, representing Norway in an unofficial capacity, came to the table of the Committee.

DR. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland), speaking in the name of the members of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider with M. Hennings, M. Friedrichs and Dr. Lange the reservation made by the Swedish Government, reminded his colleagues that the Sub-Committee had found itself faced with the following question: Was it advisable to recommend the acceptance of the reservation, and, in the case of a negative reply, what possibility was there of the Swedish Government withdrawing it?

It at once appeared that any withdrawal of the Swedish reservation could not for a moment be contemplated. M. Hennings had stated, and insisted strongly on the point, that the Swedish Government had only presented that reservation after a thorough examination of the question and after having carefully weighed its import. On the other hand, after an examination of the reasons given by the Swedish Government in support of its reservation, M. Hennings had declared that he maintained them for the most part; but he was good enough to assure the Sub-Committee that he would not fail to submit to his Government the objections to which its reservation had given rise.

There remained to be examined the question of knowing whether the provisions of Article 6 (c) admitted of an interpretation which would make it possible to conciliate the Swedish reservation with the necessities of the application of this measure. The Sub-Committee had been obliged to admit that the terms of the provision in question were so clear and so precise that it was impossible to give it another interpretation than that which was manifest from the text. The Sub-Committee had been obliged to conclude from the discussion that it was not possible to recommend the acceptance of the Swedish reservation. He thought, however, that he should insist on the importance of the ratification of the Convention by Sweden, on the necessity for that ratification, and he wished, in consequence, to ask that every means should be tried to persuade the Swedish Government to withdraw its reservation.

M. HENNINGS (Sweden) wished merely to emphasise a point to which he had already drawn the attention of Dr. Carrière, Sir Malcolm Delevingne and Dr. Anselmino, namely, that the Swedish Government had not formulated its reservation without mature consideration. It was accordingly impossible for him to withdraw that reservation. He would, however, report to his Government on the arguments advanced against it, so as to give his Government an opportunity of reconsidering the matter. He could, of course, give no undertaking as to the attitude which his Government would eventually adopt.

With regard to Dr. Carrière's statement that the three members with whom the matter had been discussed were unable to recommend acceptance of the reservation, M. Hennings, of course, had no desire to try and influence in any way the Committee's decision. He would, however, beg the Committee not to take up quite so definite an attitude towards the reservation, and would venture to draw its attention to the fact that the majority of Governments which had sent in replies on the question had stated that they were in favour of acceptance. This attitude had been taken by many Governments which, if not represented on the Committee, at least had nationals on it.

DR. LANGE (Norway) reminded the Committee that, from the legal point of view, the position of Norway was different from that of Sweden, because it had as yet made no formal reservation. It, however, shared Sweden's hesitation with regard to Article 6 (c). In this connection, he would ask the Committee to give, if possible, an interpretation, which would have all the force of the Committee's authority behind it, of the terms of Article 6 (c). It had been interpreted in various ways, and it would be desirable that all Governments should know exactly its purport and scope.

There were two points of importance to the Norwegian Government. First, two different interpretations has been given to the opening paragraph of the article, in which it was said that "the Contracting Parties shall control all persons manufacturing, importing, selling, distributing or exporting the substances to which this chapter applies" In Dr. Lange's opinion, this provision certainly was intended to cover retail traders — that was to say, chemists. Others had interpreted this stipulation in its contrary sense.

Secondly, Dr. Lange would be glad to have the Committee's opinion concerning the interpretation of the words "in each case" occurring in Article 6 (c) in the passage reading: "provided in each case that the medical prescriptions are filed and preserved by the chemist". Did this provision refer to each occasion on which a prescription was presented or to each occasion on which a supply was dispensed on the basis of a prescription?

M. BOURGOIS (France) proposed that, as the interval between the present and the next session of the Committee would be short, the Committee should not, during the present session, vote on the question of the Swedish reservation, but should decide to communicate to the Swedish and Norwegian Governments the Minutes of the discussion and the report by Dr. Carrière. The Committee should not proceed to vote until the January session, after it had had an opportunity of examining the question further.

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) supported M. Bourgois' proposal.

DR. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) requested permission to reply to the questions put by the Norwegian representative with regard to the interpretation of Article 6. Dr. Lange had asked first whether the opening paragraph of the article applied to chemists? Dr. Carrière thought that there could be no doubt on this point. Chemists should quite certainly be

included among the "persons manufacturing, importing, selling, or exporting" narcotics. The second question put by Dr. Lange referred to the words "in each case" at the end of subparagraph (c) of Article 6 (" . . . provided in each case that the medical prescriptions are filed and preserved by the medical practitioner or chemist"). Dr. Lange wished to know whether this passage referred to each prescription or to each supply of a narcotic dispensed (in cases where a prescription was repeated). Dr. Carrière was of opinion that this referred to the entry of the prescription on the register, which entry need merely be made once, the chemist being only obliged to mention, on the original prescription, the date of the renewal of the supply. This, moreover, was rather an internal question, for which the States were entitled to make such regulations as they thought fit.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Committee accepted the interpretation of Article 6 given by Dr. Carrière ?

The Committee assented.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the only remaining question was the action to be taken by the Committee in reply to the Council's request. M. Bourgois had proposed and Dr. Cuellar had seconded a course which had many advantages. The Chairman would, however, call the Committee's attention to the fact that, in referring the matter to the Committee, the Council had requested it to examine the matter at its next session and to present a report. The terms of reference presented a difficulty which, however, was not, in the Chairman's view, important, if the Committee desired to adopt the course proposed by M. Bourgois.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN said that in that case the Committee would refrain from taking a final decision regarding the Swedish reservation at the present session. It would simply send a report to the Council summarising the proceedings as recorded in the Minutes, together with a recommendation that copies of the Minutes should be sent to the Swedish and Norwegian Governments for their information, and a statement that it would reconsider the subject at its next session.

M. SATO (Japan) had in general no objection to the course proposed, but suggested that, as the Committee proposed to say that it was not taking a final decision, it would also be necessary to say that there had been a divergence of views in the Committee. Otherwise, it would be impossible for the Council to understand the reasons for which the Committee had postponed taking a final decision. He pointed out that certain Governments had signified their willingness to accept the Swedish reservation.

The CHAIRMAN appreciated M. Sato's point, but urged him to withdraw his proposal, which involved certain difficulties, because it would almost certainly oblige the Committee to take a vote at the present session. It seemed obvious that most members desired to avoid taking a vote, and, indeed, it would, in the Chairman's opinion, be most undesirable to do so. Both M. Hennings and Dr. Lange had said they would be satisfied if the matter were dealt with in the way he had suggested. He did not think that either M. Hennings or Dr. Lange would wish the Committee to proceed to a vote.

M. SATO (Japan) pointed out that, from the beginning of the discussion, he had been bound by the terms of the reply sent by the Japanese Government to the Secretary-General's circular letter. This was the reason for which he had taken up so definite an attitude in favour of the reservation. He would, however, be perfectly satisfied if the Committee took note of the statement which he had made at the previous meeting, especially since M. Hennings had said that he would be satisfied with the course which it was proposed to adopt.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Sato for withdrawing his proposal, and said that the Minutes would contain a record of the attitude he had adopted, while the documents before the Committee gave a summary of the Japanese Government's reply.

The Committee decided to adopt M. Bourgois' proposal as indicated by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Swedish and Norwegian representatives for attending the meeting and for the very interesting information they had given the Committee.

M. Hennings, M. Friedrichs and Dr. Lange withdrew.

98. Question of the Conveyance of Drugs by Post : Proposal to ask a Member of the Bureau of the Universal Postal Union to come before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN announced that he had consulted Dr. Carrière as to whether he saw any objection to asking an official of the Bureau of the Universal Postal Union to come before the Committee and give information concerning the regulations with regard to the conveyance of drugs by post.

Dr. Carrière had assured him that he saw no objection to this suggestion, and accordingly the Chairman proposed to make a request to the Bureau of the Universal Postal Union in the above sense.

The Committee agreed.

99. Respective Duties of the Advisory Committee and the Permanent Central Board :
Appointment of a Sub-Committee to consider and report on the Proposal of M. Fotitch.

M. BOURGOIS (France) suggested that it would shorten the discussion on M. Fotitch's proposal if a small Sub-Committee were appointed and requested to examine the matter and report to the plenary Committee.

After some discussion, *it was decided to form a Sub-Committee*, consisting of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, M. VAN WETTUM, M. BOURGOIS and M. FOTITCH, under the Chairmanship of Sir John CAMPBELL (*ex officio*), to examine M. Fotitch's proposal and to report to the Committee.

100. Examination of the Progress Report by the Secretary (continuation).

Resolution No. IV of the Ninth Session relative to the Turkish Government's Failure to reply to the Secretary-General's Letter of October 20th, 1926, concerning the Ratification of the Hague Convention.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no reply had been received to the repeated communications sent to the Turkish Government. The Committee would probably consider no further action advisable in the matter.

The Committee agreed.

Resolution No. V regarding Annual Reports and Information from the Governments of Central and South American Countries.

DR. CUELLAR (Bolivia) said that, according to the latest information at his disposal, the reports from the Central and South American Governments should arrive in time for the January session. He reminded the Committee that it had been agreed that reports from European countries should arrive at the Secretariat in October and from the Central and South American countries in November or December. He therefore suggested that the discussion should be postponed until the next session.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that it might be desirable to authorise the Secretariat to send out in October a reminder to those Central and South American Governments which had not yet replied to the letter of April 14th, 1927, at the same time informing them that the Committee was meeting in January and would be glad to have their replies before it by that date.

DR. CUELLAR (Bolivia) supported Sir Malcolm Delevingne's suggestion. He further undertook to get into touch with the Ministers of those South American Governments which had Legations in Paris and to request them to urge their Governments to send their reports and also their replies to the letter of April 14th in time for the next session.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. Cuellar. As replies had been received only from Cuba and Salvador, he proposed that the discussion should be postponed till January.

The Committee agreed.

Resolution No. VI relative to Free Ports and Free Zones.

The SECRETARY said that the reply from the Japanese Government, not mentioned in the Progress Report, had just been received. The Japanese Government stated that there were no free ports or zones in Japanese territory.

The Committee would observe that the circular letter had been sent only to certain Members of the League. Full statements had already been received from Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Siam and Sweden in reply to earlier enquiries. The circular letter had not been sent to France or Belgium because, from information in the possession of the Transit Section, it appeared that there were no free ports in those countries. It had also not been sent to Denmark because a special communication had been sent to the Danish Government with regard to the free port of Copenhagen.

MR. LYALL said that, while it was undoubtedly true that there were no free ports or zones in Japan, it was desirable that the position existing in the Kwan-tung Peninsula should be cleared up. He had been in Kwan-tung when the Chinese Customs first began operations there and had observed that they had no control over imports into the peninsula. To the best of his knowledge, any kind of merchandise could be introduced into the peninsula without any control whatsoever. In so far as exports were concerned, the Chinese Customs controlled all exports by sea and also by rail into the interior of China, but there was no control whatever over the smuggling of goods into Manchuria across the very extensive land frontier of the peninsula. Hence the position in that area seemed a very dangerous one. As far as the Chinese Customs were concerned, they could not prevent the

importation of drugs into Kwan-tung, and, so far as Mr. Lyall was aware, the Japanese authorities took no measures to prevent such imports. It was possible that Mr. Lyall might be mistaken and he would be glad to hear from the Japanese representative that this was the case.

M. SATO (Japan) said that the importation of opium and dangerous drugs into the peninsula was governed by the special convention concluded between Japan and China in 1907, under which the Japanese authorities were obliged to give every assistance in preventing smuggling in Kwan-tung, more particularly in co-operation with the Chinese Maritime Customs at Dairen. The Convention contained regulations regarding the importation of opium and dangerous drugs and defined the procedure for exports and imports of the same. It contained a clause stipulating that all importers of opium into the leased territory must make application to the Chinese Maritime Customs for a permit. The Convention contained in all about twenty articles. At the same time, when merchandise of this kind left the leased territory for consignment to the north, *i.e.*, Mukden, it came under the control of the Chinese Customs. M. Sato accordingly thought that there should be no serious obstacle to the control of opium and dangerous drugs in the peninsula. He would, however, undertake to obtain more detailed information for the January session.

Mr. LYALL thanked M. Sato for his offer to make enquiries, but feared that he had not made himself quite clear. He did not think that there was any smuggling of opium from Kwan-tung into the interior, although most probably morphia was smuggled. His point was that goods imported into Kwan-tung for consumption in the leased territory were not controlled in any way. It was therefore possible to import morphia into the interior of Manchuria without the Chinese Customs being able to prevent the transaction in any way, especially in view of the long land frontier.

M. SATO (Japan) said that the Japanese Government had enacted regulations concerning the control of opium and dangerous drugs and of arms and ammunition imported into the territory of Kwan-tung. True, not all these goods were subject to inspection by the Chinese Maritime Customs, but they were at all events subject to Japanese control. Provided that the control of the Japanese authorities was exercised effectively, it was impossible for abuses to exist as regards importation into Kwan-tung. With regards to exports, these were effected solely by the railway and accordingly came under the jurisdiction of the Chinese Maritime Customs, which were responsible for controlling them. Isolated cases of smuggling, of course, occurred in Kwan-tung as elsewhere. M. Sato would do everything in his power to procure the suppression of smuggling.

At the Committee's last session he had made a statement concerning the control of dangerous drugs consigned to China. The Japanese Government had now enforced the import certificate system, under which a permit was only delivered to an importer if his application were accompanied by a certificate from the Japanese consular authority in China. This measure related only to small consignments of opium and drugs. In the case of big consignments, the Japanese Government had decided in future to refuse authorisation for export to China. Since the autumn of the preceding year, the regulations had been made much more severe and it was to be hoped that they would yield better results.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Sato for undertaking to examine the situation in Kwan-tung, and understood that he would make a further declaration at the next session.

M. SATO (Japan) agreed.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked that the reference in the Progress Report to the document O.C.386 might be deleted. The information contained in that document was out of date and had been replaced by the statement of the Netherlands Government reproduced in the same column.

The Committee agreed.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) drew attention to the somewhat striking document O.C.646, from the Swedish Government, giving a frank statement concerning the position of the free ports in Sweden, of which there were three. It appeared from the document in question that there was considerable uncertainty as to what the position actually was with regard to opium and dangerous drugs. This emphasised the point which he had ventured to make that morning in the discussion on the Swedish reservation that no country was free from the liability to become a centre of the illicit traffic. Indeed, it was probable that, if the illicit traffickers were to obtain a copy of the document, they might settle in one or other of the Swedish free ports as a favourable centre of operations. The anomalous position in the ports would be rectified if Sweden were to ratify the 1925 Convention, which contained adequate regulations as to the traffic in free ports. He suggested that for the moment the Committee should take note of the Swedish Government's statement and that at a later meeting, when it came to consider the question of free ports, it should consider the position very carefully and perhaps recommend the Council to make representations to the Swedish Government.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Secretariat should be authorised to ascertain officially whether, in point of fact, the Turkish Government had put into effect the reported proposal to create a free port at Stamboul, and whether the similar reports with regard to Fiume as a free port for Hungary were correct.

The Committee agreed to the Chairman's proposal.

FIFTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Friday, September 30th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Ferreira and M. Brenier.

101. Minutes of the Meetings and List of Publications.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked to speak upon two points. He hoped that the Minutes would be as brief as possible and he asked the Secretariat to be good enough to bring its list of publications touching on opium and dangerous drugs up to date in order that the members might have it before the end of the session.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Minutes would be sent to the members, who would be able to revise them. The Secretariat would endeavour to bring the list of publications up to date by the end of the session.

102. Examination of the Progress Report by the Secretary (continuation).

Statistics of Import and Export in Annual Reports, and Export Authorisations.

The Committee took note of the information received. The subject would come up again at the next session.

*Annual Reports from Certain Governments which have not hitherto sent them ;
Date of Despatch of Annual Reports.*

The Committee took note of these parts of the report.

Information from Estonia and Lithuania.

The Committee noted that this matter would come up in the annual Progress Report and asked the Secretariat to prepare and circulate a short commentary on the reply received from Estonia (document O.C.641) and to send a reminder to Lithuania.

II. REPLIES RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST SESSION TO CIRCULAR LETTERS CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH SESSION.

Inclusion of Seizure Returns in Annual Reports.

The CHAIRMAN said that this matter was covered by Article 6 of the agenda.

Traffic in the Persian Gulf.

The CHAIRMAN said that this matter had been virtually settled. Practically all the countries involved had taken satisfactory action. The Committee has still no information as to the action, if any, taken by China and Portugal.

The Committee decided to write to M. Ouang pointing out that the important questions on the agenda of the present session made the attendance of a Chinese representative desirable.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Ferreira (Portugal) had promised to make a statement this session ; he was temporarily absent.

The Secretariat had received information from the Norwegian Government that it had sent a circular to Norwegian shipowners pointing out how undesirable it was that the

Norwegian flag should be implicated in the illicit traffic in the Persian Gulf: This administrative circular had been very effective, as no Norwegian vessels had been implicated in the traffic, so far as he knew, since the circular was issued.

The Committee noted the satisfactory progress which had been made in this matter.

Maritime Insurance.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the International Federation of Maritime Insurance Associations had recommended the adoption of this maritime insurance clause to all its members, who had accepted it.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the Association of Underwriters at Amsterdam had now decided to accept the same clause, as had been suggested by the British representative.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) said that insurance companies in his country had decided to introduce the clause with reference to dangerous drugs into their contracts.

The Committee noted with satisfaction the progress which had been made.

Postal Traffic.

The CHAIRMAN said that this matter had already been partly discussed. A representative of the Universal Postal Union had been invited to attend the Committee's meeting next Monday at 10.30 a.m. The discussion would be deferred until then.

Communication between Authorities with regard to Illicit Traffic.

M. SATO (Japan) said that two years ago the Japanese Consul-General had asked the authorities of the Chinese Maritime Customs at Shanghai for information regarding a seizure by them of some drugs which were supposed to have come from Japan. The Japanese Consul-General had then asked for particulars regarding the sender, the quantity seized, etc., in order to make investigations, but the Chinese Maritime Customs had said they could not give this information without the authorisation of their Government in Peking.

M. Sato pointed out that the giving of such information by the Maritime Customs would greatly facilitate the search for the origin of the goods and the names of the offenders.

Mr. LYALL agreed that the communication of such information was extremely desirable. He did not think this case had happened when he was Commissioner of Customs at Shanghai. There would be no difficulty in obtaining the authorisation of Peking for the giving of such information. He added that he would readily write to a colleague on the Chinese Maritime Customs on this matter, unless this could be better done through the Secretariat.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) drew attention to the analogous question of the supply to the Committee of the particulars of seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs. Hitherto they had indirectly obtained the details of all important seizures from the International Anti-Opium Association, but since the last session the Government at Peking had decided no longer to give that body this information. The Government maintained that, if at all, this information should be communicated through its own Foreign Office. It was extremely important that the Committee should receive particulars of these seizures, and he hoped that it would be possible to make an arrangement with the Chinese Government.

The CHAIRMAN quoted the exact words of M. Chu in the Council at the sixth meeting, forty-fourth session, on March 11th, 1927. M. Chu had spoken as follows :

“ . . . The Chinese Maritime Customs should not give the list of seizures to this private organisation but the representative of the Chinese Government at the Advisory Committee should send the list of seizures officially to the League. At the last session of the Opium Committee, the members of the Committee had agreed that, in future, figures regarding seizures could only be regarded as official if they were submitted through the representatives of the various Governments. It was not advisable to eulogise a particular private organisation by mentioning it in the Council's report.

“ The Chinese Customs Office was an organisation under the Chinese Government and the figures of seizures should be given only to the Chinese Government and, through that Government, submitted to the Advisory Committee by its representative on the Committee . . .

“ The Chinese Maritime Customs had been informed that in future no figures of seizures should be given to private organisations ; they should only be communicated to the Chinese Government. ”

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that the Committee would agree with him that it was of the greatest importance to receive particulars of seizures of drugs in

Chinese ports. The Chinese Government had occasionally furnished such information, but without details, and the Committee and the countries concerned had not been able to take action upon it. It was necessary to know in detail the date, place, circumstances of the seizure, the name of the ship carrying the consignment, the port of origin, etc. This information had hitherto been furnished by the Chinese Maritime Customs about once a quarter. He would therefore suggest that the Committee should adopt a resolution asking the Council to request the Chinese Government to instruct the Chinese Maritime Customs authorities to furnish particulars of every seizure to the appropriate department in Peking, so that that department could forward them to the League immediately. If this procedure were adopted, the Committee would be satisfied and the Chinese Government's susceptibilities not aroused. It would, of course, be useful if the representative of China, M. Ouang, were to attend the session. Should this be impossible, the Secretary-General could be asked to discuss with M. Ouang the resolution which Sir Malcolm Delevingne proposed.

The SECRETARY said that, as M. Ouang was in Portugal, the Secretariat could get into touch with the permanent Chinese delegation at Geneva.

M. SATO (Japan) said that, in view of the formal declaration of the Chinese representative at the Council, the latter would have to take up a definite attitude. He thought that the Committee should adopt a resolution concerning the desirability of continuing to receive the information concerning seizures at the disposal of the Chinese Maritime Customs. This resolution could be endorsed by the Council and forwarded to Peking.

Not only were particulars of the seizures effected at Shanghai of interest, but also those effected in all Chinese ports. For example, very few illicit drugs coming from Japan were seized in Shanghai, but the situation was different, or might be so, in other ports, such as Dairen, Chefoo, etc. Further, if the Customs officials in Shanghai took very vigorous action, the illicit drugs would be diverted to other ports where the supervision was less strict. It was essential, therefore, to have statistics in connection with all Chinese ports, and the Council might be asked to obtain them from the Chinese Government.

The question of the collaboration of Chinese Customs officials with foreign Consuls was one which could not be regulated on the spot, but must also be forwarded to the Chinese Government.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) emphasised the fact that the resolution which he had proposed covered all ports operated by the Chinese Maritime Customs service. He, of course, agreed with M. Sato that any resolution adopted by the Committee must be endorsed by the Council, but he had suggested that it might be well for the Secretary-General to discuss the matter with M. Ouang in order to avoid any possible difficulty. Naturally, the Council must decide for itself what action to take on the resolution of the Committee.

M. SATO (Japan) thanked Sir Malcolm Delevingne for his explanations and expressed his full agreement with his suggestion.

The proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne was adopted.

The Committee requested Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. Sato to draft the resolution in question.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the exiguous nature of the replies to the circular letter of the Secretariat did not mean that no action had been taken. Information was being directly exchanged in most cases; for example, between Canada and the United States. India sent information regarding seizures direct to the country concerned; so did Great Britain and many other countries.

103. Method of entering Statistics relating to Seized Drugs in Annual Reports sent in by Governments.

The SECRETARY said that the Secretariat had experienced a certain difficulty in drawing up the summary of annual reports owing to the fact that the seizures were in some cases shown among the import figures received from Governments, and no information was given as to the manner in which the seized drugs were dealt with. She hoped that some uniform procedure could be suggested, so that all Governments could state what happened to the drugs seized. The Secretariat would appreciate a resolution to this effect or a reference in the Committee's report to the Council.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, as far as his country was concerned, his Government gave, in connection with the import figures, the figures of all seized drugs which had been subsequently used for the legitimate traffic.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary's request was due to the very great increase in seizures during the past few years. Some Governments stated exactly what they did with the seized drugs. Others did not. In view of the large amounts seized, it was desirable to know what became of the drugs. To take an example: a certain country had reported the seizure of 8,000 ounces of heroin. It was obvious that the Committee could form no just estimate of the amount of drugs consumed in that country unless it possessed information as to what had happened to that heroin.

He would suggest that a resolution should be adopted, asking all Governments to state definitely in the case of all important seizures whether the drugs seized were destroyed, or used in the legitimate trade, or exported; and, if exported, to what destinations.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) pointed out that, by Article 22 (e) of the Second Opium Convention, Governments were required to follow a uniform procedure in this respect. While having no objection to the proposal of the Chairman, he thought it undesirable for the Committee to encroach on the prerogatives of the Central Board.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the attention of the Governments should be drawn to Article 22 (e) of the Second Opium Convention, and that they should be informed that it would greatly facilitate matters if the requirements of that article could be immediately applied.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

104. Method of Circulation of Unofficial Information.

The SECRETARY explained that information was occasionally received by the Secretariat from outside sources — for example, cuttings from newspapers regarding the opium traffic, new laws, etc. The usual practice was to circulate all newspaper cuttings referring to new legislation. Information was also received from private organisations, individuals, and occasionally from members or assessors of the Committee who did not desire that their names should be attached to the information.

The Secretariat desired to know how much initiative should be allowed to it in the matter of circulating such information. Hitherto, in any doubtful case, the words "For the sole use of members and assessors of the Advisory Committee" had been placed on the document to indicate its confidential nature.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that this question had been raised several times and that no definite decision had been reached.

The CHAIRMAN disagreed. The decision of the Committee as adopted at the ninth session was quite definite as far as it went. It was to the following effect:

"(1) All documents and letters coming from a private source should be distributed immediately to the members and assessors for information only, and to no one else;

"(2) All such documents should be marked by the Secretariat 'For the sole use of members and assessors';

"(3) In cases where any such document contained attacks or allegations against a particular Government, that document should be marked 'Strictly confidential';

"(4) A copy of any communication or letter from a private source containing an accusation or an allegation against a Government should be forwarded to that Government for information, but that Government should not be requested to reply. If, however, it does so, the reply should be immediately distributed . . ."

The two points not covered by this decision were: (1) Press cuttings; (2) information supplied by a member or assessor who did not wish, for one reason or another, to attach his name to it.

With regard to Press cuttings, the Secretariat should, he thought, have complete discretion; even if newspaper articles contained allegations against a Government, it would be quite in order to circulate them, for they were in themselves already public statements.

With regard to the second case, instances of which must be very rare, he thought that the information should be regarded as coming from a private source, and should therefore fall within the scope of the decision taken at the ninth session.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) enquired whether the Secretariat would state, when circulating the latter class of information, whether it had been received from a member or assessor of the Committee who desired to remain anonymous.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thought that cases in which a member of the Committee would not desire his name to be furnished to the Secretariat would scarcely ever arise.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) felt certain that no member or assessor of the Committee would desire that his name should not be mentioned in connection with any information which he supplied. In all cases of information coming from private sources, the Secretariat should communicate with official sources in the country concerned in order to obtain confirmation, after which the information should be published as widely as possible, for publicity was of the utmost importance.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) thought that perhaps the information to which the Secretary was referring had consisted of the two translations of decrees published in the semi-official Moscow newspaper *Isvestia*, which he had sent unofficially to the Secretariat. He had sent them because he thought that the matter they contained was of interest, but he had not desired to attach his name to that information because he had not seen the actual decrees in question and had had no means of verifying the accuracy of the translation.

The CHAIRMAN explained that the Secretary had not had in mind those decrees, which had been dealt with in a similar manner to Press cuttings. He thought that, when the Secretariat received information from a source not stated, or from any private source, it should be regarded as private and dealt with in accordance with the decision adopted at the ninth session.

He would take the following case to explain the type of information to which the Secretary referred. Supposing a number of laws had been passed in a country interested in the opium traffic. A member or assessor of the Committee sent a copy of those laws to the Secretariat, but, in view of the fact that he might not be in a position to verify their accuracy, he might quite naturally request that they should be circulated without his name being attached to them.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) considered that a clear distinction should be drawn between information of a public character and information from a private source. The newspapers were not the only source of public information. Other sources were published laws, official gazettes, Government reports, etc. The rule adopted in connection with Press cuttings should be applied to all such information which had already been published. The only point in connection with it was that it should be of sufficient interest to warrant circulation to the members.

With reference to information derived from private sources, he would remind the Committee of the information supplied in previous years by the Anti-Opium Association of Peking. That information had not come from an anonymous source but from a named association, and in that case he thought that its circulation had rightly been governed by the rule adopted by the Committee at its ninth session.

Obviously no notice should be taken of purely anonymous information sent to the Secretariat on no authority.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne.

The SECRETARY said that the Secretariat would never, unless through some slip, circulate any information received anonymously, or indeed any information, without mentioning its source, except at the special request of the member or assessor supplying it.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, as regards Press cuttings and "public" information, the position was clear. The Secretariat should have full discretion to circulate such information to the members and assessors, subject only to the proviso that it was of sufficient interest.

The Committee agreed with the views of the Chairman.

With reference to information from private sources, the CHAIRMAN suggested that in all cases of doubt, that was to say, in any case in which the Secretariat did not think that the Committee's decision taken at its ninth session clearly covered the matter, the Chairman should be consulted.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed. He pointed out that this rule should apply occasionally in the case of Press cuttings. For example, no useful purpose would be served if particulars of a newspaper campaign against a particular country were circulated.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with M. van Wettum.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) would again emphasise the fact that the Committee should do its utmost on all occasions to give the greatest possible publicity to information received from trustworthy sources. A case had occurred in which an acting Chairman had thought it best to consult the Committee before authorising the circulation of a certain piece of information. While he was making no criticism regarding that particular instance, he could not agree to such a procedure being adopted as a general rule. Doubtful cases should be referred not to the Committee but to the Chairman, who should be in a position to give the final ruling.

M. BOURGOIS (France) pointed out that the case to which M. Cavazzoni had referred had been of quite an exceptional kind.

The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Chairman and with the observations of M. Cavazzoni.

SIXTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Saturday, October 1st, 1927, at 10.30 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

105. **Suppression of Opium Production and Traffic in South China.**

Mr. LYALL desired to make a statement with regard to the suppression of opium in those districts of China controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Before leaving Shanghai he had communicated with that Government, and had obtained an interview with M. Kuo Tai-Chi, the Commissioner for Foreign Affairs, who had himself received permission to lay before Mr. Lyall the views of the Nationalist Government in Nanking. The policy of the Nationalist Government was to suppress the smoking and growing of opium within three years. In order to achieve this, a Government monopoly of the movement of opium would be established. Statistics were to be collected of the amount moved, bought, sold, etc., in China at the beginning of 1928. When these statistics had been completed, the total figure would be reduced by one-third at the end of 1928 and a similar reduction made in the following year until the whole trade had been suppressed at the end of three years.

He was in possession of an extract from a Chinese newspaper in which this procedure was explained by the Opium Suppression Bureau to Chinese merchants. He would suggest that the Chinese Nationalist Government's scheme, which had been communicated to him in writing, should be circulated to the Committee.

He was also of opinion that it would be to the Committee's advantage to get into touch with the Government of South China, which controlled the most important opium-producing districts, and which had now been independent of the Central Government in Peking for fifteen years. The Committee's best chance of obtaining statistics regarding the production of opium in China would be to approach the Nationalist Government.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should take note of Mr. Lyall's statement, but should not discuss it. With regard to the proposal that the Committee should get into touch with the Chinese Nationalist Government, that was clearly a very delicate point which the Committee was not competent to settle. The members might consider the suggestion, and raise the point later on, if they thought it necessary to do so.

The proposals of the Chairman were adopted.

106. **Opium Conditions in the Far East : Report from the Foreign Policy Association.**

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a report, submitted to the Foreign Policy Association of New York by Mr. Herbert May and containing a survey of opium conditions in the Far East, should be distributed.

Mr. May was at the disposal of the Committee should any member desire to put questions to him. Any statements which M. May might make would be purely personal, unless it should appear that he was authorised to speak on behalf of the Foreign Policy Association.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) while agreeing that any member could put questions to Mr. May, said that such questions must be in order.

The CHAIRMAN agreed, but pointed out that, as a general rule, it was for the Chairman to decide such points. If the Committee disagreed with the Chairman, it could take a decision for itself, by vote.

The proposals of the Chairman were adopted.

107. **Maritime Insurance in the United States of America : Letter from Mr. Pinkney Tuck.**

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a letter from Mr. Pinkney Tuck would be distributed, containing the information that seventy-two marine insurance companies in the United States of America had signed the arrangement recommended by the Committee regarding policies covering consignments of drugs. Only four insurance companies had not yet signed, and three of these had undertaken to do so provided that the fourth would sign. This information showed that very satisfactory progress had been made.

108. Production of Opium in Persia : Consideration of the Report of the Committee of Enquiry in relation to the Question of Illicit Traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that many of the questions dealt with in the report of the Committee of Enquiry and by the Persian Government in its observations were outside the competence of the Committee. Such questions concerned the development of the material resources of Persia, and the Advisory Committee could but take note of them and at the same time pay a tribute to the Committee of Enquiry for the amount of information collected and the shrewdness and far-sightedness of its recommendations. He would also include the Secretary of the Committee in these observations, on whom a large amount of the work must have devolved.

Two aspects of the report concerned the Advisory Committee :

(1) Did the facts contained in it or in the Persian Government's observations correspond with the information in the possession of the Committee ?

(2) What prospect would the measures which the Persian Government had decided to take afford of improving the very grave situation in connection with the export of Persian opium ?

With regard to the first point, it would appear from the report that the Committee of Enquiry had not noticed the fact that the cultivation of opium in Persia had considerably increased in recent years. Such, however, appeared to be the case ; which meant that opium crops had displaced other crops. It would therefore have been of interest to know in what provinces this increase of cultivation had occurred and what crops it had displaced.

With regard to the second point, the observations made by the American Finance Commissioner attached to the Persian Government, who had represented Persia before the Council and in the Assembly, laid great stress on the fact that Persian opium was not used in the manufacture of drugs and that its production had therefore no effect on the drug traffic. The Finance Commissioner, Colonel MacCormack, had, in fact, suggested that an entirely erroneous belief prevailed in this connection.

This statement was somewhat misleading. It was true that, at the moment, Persian opium was not used for the manufacture of drugs, not, however, because it was not suitable for the purpose but because the demand for that opium for illicit use in the Far East was so great that its price had soared far above any figure which European or American manufacturers were prepared to pay. It had formerly been used for the manufacture of drugs. Although its morphine content was lower than that of Turkish or Serbian opium, it possessed the advantage that the proportion of codeine which it contained was the highest of any known opium and amounted to about 2 per cent ; this fact had caused Persian opium in the past to be used by British manufacturers, provided that it could be obtained at a reasonable price.

If Persian opium were again available on terms similar to those current before the war, it would undoubtedly again be used for the manufacture of drugs. The Committee had constantly pointed out that European and American drug markets were open to Persia whenever it liked to compete with opium coming from Turkey and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

With regard to the curtailment of the export of opium from Persia, of which so much found its way into the deplorable contraband trade, the measures which the Persian Government proposed to take were disappointing. That Government did not propose to apply the system of export authorisations or of import certificates except after an interval and very gradually. It was to be noted from its observations that no step would be taken for two or three years, and that after that period had elapsed the application of the import and export system would only be partial. The Committee could only hope, therefore, for a very small reduction in the huge amount of opium exported from Persia to the Far East, which was quite uncontrolled. On the other hand, Colonel MacCormack, in his speech to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly during its last ordinary session, had pointed out that the decision of the Indian Government to reduce the export of opium had had the effect of transferring to the Persian market the demand for raw opium from countries and overseas possessions where smoking of opium was still permitted. Colonel MacCormack had said : " I am informed by the Persian opium traders that their exports are for the most part now covered by the opium import certificates ". This was very satisfactory and was due to the action of the Indian Government.

On the other hand, there was a corresponding danger to be noted. Colonel MacCormack had pointed out that " the danger lies in the possible augmentation of the opposition of the Persian opium traders to the Government curtailment programme, in view of the lucrative new business opening up before them ". From this it would appear that Persian cultivators and traders would try to keep their hold on the old markets while at the same time attaining the new.

The Persian Government had announced its intention of taking practical measures to reduce opium production, and the Advisory Committee must express its earnest hope that

these measures would be successful. But though the Committee should hope, it should not lose sight of the fact that the exports would still be uncontrolled for a considerable time. He trusted, therefore, that the Committee would not abate its watchfulness or refrain from urging Governments to maintain an equal watchfulness.

The CHAIRMAN fully agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne. There was one point which should be specially emphasised in connection with the opium exports from Persia. Persia had not yet ratified the Hague Opium Convention of 1912, and its intentions regarding the Geneva Opium Convention of 1925 were unknown. It had signed the former Convention, but with a very important reservation to the effect that it would not undertake measures to prevent "the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry". This was a fundamental point of great importance. Until Persia assumed the obligations contained in the Hague Opium Convention of 1912, or until it ratified the Convention of 1925, the Committee would be displaying undue optimism if it thought that material progress could be made towards putting an end to the illicit traffic based on opium exports from Persia.

The Persian Government had now agreed to accept the export and import certificate system, and to put it into force not later than three years hence. The terms of its acceptance were as follows: "Acceptance of the opium import certificate system, with an annual reduction, beginning not later than the third year after the present, of 10 per cent of the quantity annually permitted to leave the country without production of opium import certificates". Broadly speaking, opium leaving Persia which was not covered by certificate was in general destined for the illicit traffic. The undertaking therefore meant that the very large Persian exports which now found their way direct into the illicit traffic would be reduced by 10 per cent three years hence. This was not very encouraging. The Committee, however, had grounds for hoping that something effective might be done, for no member would question the good intentions of the Persian Government. The steps it had agreed to take did constitute a considerable advance on the position as it had hitherto existed, and the Committee should therefore watch, with restrained optimism but with much good will, the efforts of the Persian Government to cope with a great and admitted evil.

In conclusion, he would propose that a record of the discussion on the report of the Committee of Enquiry should be included in the Minutes, but that no resolution, since none was called for, should be passed.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) proposed that a reference to the report of the Committee of Enquiry should be made in the Committee's report to the Council.

The proposals of the Chairman and of M. van Wettum were adopted.

109. Illicit Traffic : Carl Ruben Case : Letter from the Danish Government with regard to the Minutes of the Ninth Session of the Committee.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the Danish Government, in its letter dated August 10th, 1927 (document O.C. 457 (d)), referred to certain statements made by himself at the previous session concerning a smuggling transaction in the free port of Copenhagen. He had stated that a part of the contraband drugs "had been smuggled into Denmark with the assistance of a Customs official, who had been convicted and fined". The Danish Government pointed out that this statement was not correct, for the person in question had not been a Customs official. Sir Malcolm Delevingne could only express his extreme regret that the statement he had made had been incorrect. He had, however, based his observations on a communication received by the Secretariat from the Danish Legation in Berne and circulated to the Committee as document O.C. 457. The English text of that document had referred to the person as a Customs commissioner and the French text as a "commissionnaire de la douane". Sir Malcolm Delevingne had therefore somewhat naturally concluded that the person in question had been a Customs official, while, as a matter of fact, he had been merely a private forwarding agent. In view of the extreme ambiguity of the phrase, he hoped that the Danish Government would realise how the mistake had occurred.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Danish Legation, in its original communication, had made use of the phrase "commissionnaire de la douane", which had been correctly translated as Customs commissioner. It would appear that the term which should have been used was "commissionnaire en douane".

He proposed that an extract of the Minutes containing the discussion on this point should be forwarded to the Danish Government, together with a letter explaining how the mistake arose.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

110. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic : Memorandum of M. Cavazzoni (doc. O.C.666 (1)).

The Committee formally adopted this item on its agenda.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that the campaign against narcotics entrusted to the League of Nations had not reached the results which had been expected. It would therefore be well to take account of all the efforts made and the methods adopted, in order that future action might give results which would not be illusory. Since the League of Nations had been entrusted to watch over the execution of the Hague Convention, the Advisory Committee created to assist the Council with its advice had met nine times and had adopted no fewer than sixty-six resolutions concerning the problems of the traffic, while the Council and Assembly had together adopted more than one hundred resolutions.

If, after such a long period and after so many resolutions, the illicit traffic continued without diminishing and was even on the increase, the blame could not fall on the Advisory Committee for not having realised the danger, nor for any lack of energy on its part. Nor was this fact due to the Council's having in the least neglected the advice furnished it by the Committee or to the lack of collaboration between Governments. M. Cavazzoni thought it was because the methods pursued hitherto could produce no results. Governments had been allowed too long to adopt individual measures for the indirect limitation of manufacture and the supervision of the traffic. In order to appreciate the value of these measures, it was sufficient to note that the amount of drugs manufactured as well as those involved in the secret traffic was greater than ever.

A uniform method must therefore be pursued and agreement should be obtained on a plan of action which would allow the different Governments to apply with certitude the principles underlying the Hague and the Geneva Conventions. The Italian Government considered it extremely important that the struggle against narcotics should be pursued vigorously and it had already furnished an example by its great severity towards those who endeavoured to violate the new edicts issued by the Government in this matter. The Italian Government considered the principles established by the Hague Convention as of fundamental importance in the campaign against the abuse of narcotics.

According to Article 9 of the Hague Convention and Article 5 of the Geneva Convention, the contracting Governments were bound to introduce direct measures for the limitation of the manufacture of products coming under the scope of the Convention.

The measures which might be suggested for the application of this principle through the League of Nations and the Advisory Committee were justified by this Convention as well as by Article 23 of the Covenant, which should be the inspiration of their activities. M. Cavazzoni did not think that it was a question of outstepping the fundamental principles, contained in existing Conventions, but rather one of putting before each of the Governments parties to the Hague Convention the views of the Italian representative as to the means by which it would be possible for those Governments to accomplish their task and to fulfil the solemn international obligations laid down by the Convention.

The Advisory Committee was continuing the work which, since 1912, had been entrusted to the Dutch Government and which, under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, was passed on to the League of Nations. For this reason, the League had created in its Secretariat a Section entrusted with the collection of information as to the action taken by the various countries to execute the Opium Convention and to obtain information on the production, distribution and consumption of narcotics. Finally, in order to obtain the greatest measure of co-operation between the various countries in this matter, and to advise the Council in all questions which might arise, the League created the Advisory Committee.

Moreover, the principle of limitation of production had never been lost sight of by the Committee, which had made remarkable efforts. In 1923, at its fifth session, the Committee solemnly affirmed that in the future limitation of production of narcotics lay the solution of the problem of the illicit traffic, and that it was solely in view of this limitation that it had considered the question of the needs of the world in narcotics manufactured for medical and scientific uses.

This principle needed, however, to be applied directly and thoroughly by an international rationing system. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had said on March 8th, 1924, that the limitation of manufacture to quantities meeting legitimate needs was laid down as obligatory under the terms of Article 9 of the Hague Convention. The Advisory Committee had always felt that, even with the universal application of a system of import certificates, it would be impossible to suppress the illicit traffic in narcotics while they were produced in greater quantities than was necessary for the medical and scientific needs of the world. As the present manufacture of the derivatives of opium and cocaine enormously exceeded the quantity meeting this need, the most effective means of solving the problem of narcotics would be to ration production so that it could not exceed the required amount.

Instead of being able immediately to establish the system of rationing of production, an endeavour might be made to reach the same results indirectly by the system of control. It was a question of following the movements of drugs after the raw material came into the country, while it entered the factory, was transformed into a manufactured product, passed to the wholesaler and to the public, being either used in the country itself or for export. The system of control was entirely within the terms of the present Convention and responded particularly to the Hague Convention and to the principles of Article 23 of the Covenant of the League.

The regulations submitted to the Committee involved the extremely rigorous enforcement of the system of control. It also concerned the obligation to give an account of quantities formerly imported or removed from a factory before a new authorisation had been obtained. He also desired control over the introduction of raw materials into the factories by means of special registers, Government inspection, measures to prevent the forging of the above-mentioned certificates, and legislation as regards fines, imprisonment and rewards for seizures of information leading to the seizures of narcotics which were circulating without Government authorisation. If, during the discussion, other suggestions were put forward which were better calculated to provide indirect limitation of the production of narcotics, M. Cavazzoni would be glad to give them the attention they deserved.

The Committee had met in order to find out how the principles of the Conventions could be realised. If this result were not obtained, the world would consider the members of the Committee as representatives of countries which were ready to ratify Conventions the fundamental principles of which they did not know how to put into practice. Hitherto the Committee had, like the doctors, endeavoured to find a remedy for a continually increasing disease by the study of its symptoms and causes. At the present moment, an examination must be made of the means to eliminate these causes, and if the Committee did not do this it would have failed. It was hardly necessary to furnish examples of the operations in the illicit traffic or to enumerate again the symptoms to be observed in different parts of the world, to state their frequency and intensity, nor was it necessary to discuss the material proofs of the illicit traffic, of the existence of which everyone was convinced. Ought not agreement to be reached regarding the effective means for suppressing this traffic? In considering the number of remedies suggested, it seemed certain that agreement could be reached on some one of them, which would make it possible to solve the problem. As sufficient evidence was available to convince everyone both of the causes of the traffic and of the nature of the solution of the problem, the present duty of the Committee was to draw up the details of the methods which, in its unanimous view, would make this illicit traffic impossible in the future. The regulations which he had submitted to the Committee could lead to this result.

A solution must, however, be found. The world must not be allowed to conclude that during years of international conferences of the Nations had aimed at the impossible, and that these conferences had repeatedly prescribed remedies which it had been impossible to put into practice. If a common ground could not be found as to the steps to be taken to stop the illicit traffic, in accordance with the principles of the Hague Convention and the Geneva Convention, it might be asked that these measures should be established by new agreements in new conventions.

M. Cavazzoni also asked that if, during the discussions, certain parties to the Convention had said that they could not execute their international obligations, they would be good enough to give their reasons.

It was necessary that, when the Committee separated, each of its members, if it could not agree to take a share of the undivided responsibility, must at least clearly and openly accept his individual responsibility.

SEVENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Saturday, October 1st, 1927, at 4.30 p.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee, and the Assessors, with the exception of Dr. Carrière, M. Chu and M. Brenier.

111. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic: Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni (continuation).

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) said that he recognised the great value of the proposals of M. Cavazzoni if they could be put into general application. He wondered, however, whether the Committee had the power to impose such regulations on the countries which had signed

the Convention and, if so, what means should be employed for their application. He desired to ask what would be the practical result of the Committee approving this proposal.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked Dr. Cuellar for his kind words and quoted the first paragraph of his memorandum to show that there was no intention to propose a new Convention. The proposal merely consisted of new means for applying principles already laid down.

Dr. CUELLAR (Bolivia) said that he understood that this was a proposal which the Committee could, through the Council, recommend for adoption by the Governments. He wondered whether it could say that experience had shown its value, and he thought that application might be difficult unless all countries were ready to accept it.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that some of his proposals were applied in Italy with the greatest satisfaction. He could not say, however, that they were universally applied.

M. BOURGOIS (France) drew attention to the fact that many of the measures contemplated were already in force in several countries. Other States had adopted analogous measures or measures having the same effect, which appeared to give them full satisfaction. A modification of the laws and regulations was not a task which a Government would undertake without some imperative motive. Nevertheless, it might be advisable, at the time when the Convention was coming into force, to make a general examination of the methods which, based on the obligations undertaken, would be the best way of assuring the control provided for in the Convention. Those Governments which were about to modify their legislation would appreciate the drafting of a regulation such as that which was presented to them, and might profit by the discussions which would arise from the examination of it. He therefore proposed that the Committee should examine the project paragraph by paragraph, and study the recommendations which it might seem advisable to transmit to the different Governments on this subject.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the German Government would give the proposal its favourable consideration. Most of the recommendations were already in force in Germany.

The German Government had warmly co-operated in international action in these matters. Dr. Anselmino was appointed a member of the Committee in 1922, when the relations between Germany and the League were somewhat difficult. They had pursued the task with vigour in spite of difficulties, and in its legislation, exchange of information and communication of seizures, Germany had shown its good will and sincerity. Germany would wholeheartedly co-operate with the Secretariat and the members of the Committee.

The Committee should now examine the memorandum paragraph by paragraph.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that, even if he agreed in full with the suggestions, he could not propose the enforcement thereof to his Government, for the new legislation to give effect to the 1925 Convention would be shortly before the Chamber, and his Government could not now adopt a new set of measures. The new proposals would not, he thought, be a change for the better. The distinction made between import and delivery would need many officials and he felt that the scheme was much too complicated. Moreover, it put the responsibility of the refusal of exportation on the exporting country, while for this purpose under the new Convention the Board had been created. He thought, however, that the Committee might still agree to accept one or two suggestions in the proposal.

M. SATO (Japan) said that several of the recommendations were already applied in Japan. Some of them seemed rather superfluous, but he was prepared to discuss the whole scheme, without promising acceptance until his Government had examined the memorandum.

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. Carrière had hoped to take part in the discussion of this question ; he would speak on it later.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) proposed that the discussion be adjourned until Monday morning to give more time to consider the document.

The Committee agreed to adjourn the meeting.

EIGHTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Monday, October 3rd, 1927, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

112. Conveyance of Drugs by Post.

On the invitation of the Chairman, M. Rottner, Vice-Director of the Universal Postal Union, came to the table of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the thanks of the Committee to M. Rottner for coming to give them his advice on certain points. He asked Mr. Lyall to raise the first point.

Mr. LYALL explained that though, under the International Postal Regulations, it was forbidden to send drugs by post without a declaration, many nations had not introduced into their legislation measures which would enable this offence to be punished in the country concerned.

M. ROTTNER said that the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union would be glad to furnish or obtain any information which it could. He might not in some cases be able to meet the needs of the Committee, but it would not be due to any lack of good will but rather to the special character of the Bureau. He thought that it would be desirable to know the names of the countries which had not taken steps to punish the infraction of the prohibitions laid down by the Congress of Stockholm.

Mr. LYALL said that he regretted that the Postal Commissioner at Shanghai had not specified the names of the countries in question.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that document O.C.392, column 8, mentioned various countries which had not admitted or forbidden the despatch of drugs by post. Certain of them had not said whether this was legal or not, and the Stockholm Agreement merely stated that it was forbidden if not allowed in the country of destination.

M. ROTTNER said that the Universal Postal Convention and the Arrangements concerning packets of declared value and postal packets contained certain provisions as to the despatch and import of drugs. The terms of the Convention and of the Arrangements absolutely forbade the despatch of drugs through the post except those required for medical purposes. The measures regarding the despatch of letters and parcels of declared value, Article 10, paragraphs 1 and 2 (e), and of postal packets (Article 14, § 1 (b)), forbade the despatch of drugs in such letters or packets, save for those countries in which this was allowed for medical purposes. The Union had recently written to the adherents of these Arrangements; though the International Postal Convention had been signed by all, universal adhesion had not been obtained as to the question of postal packets and packages of declared value. M. Rottner quoted from the collection of replies received, showing which countries had and which had not allowed the despatch of narcotics for medical purposes.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would like to have information in regard to the existence of internal regulations in the various countries making it an offence to export drugs to a country which prohibited their import. Information was also desirable as to whether such legislation provided any sanctions.

Mr. LYALL said that the Chinese postal authorities admitted drugs in postal packets on the authorisation of the Inspector of Customs. The packets to which reference had been made were packets which had been imported without such authorisation.

M. ROTTNER drew attention to Article 41 of the Convention of 1924, which prohibited the despatch of opium, morphine, cocaine and other drugs. Moreover, Article 10 of the Arrangement of 1924 concerned packages of declared value, and Article 14 of the Arrangement regarding postal packets prohibited the insertion of these articles in letters of declared value and in postal packets. It was clearly illegal to despatch these substances in such letters. Whether the countries concerned had any domestic legislation for dealing with such offences was another question.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to a suggestion already made by M. Bourgois, proposed that the Secretariat should be asked to prepare a memorandum on the subject, dealing with the points which had been raised, and using the memorandum of Dr. Anselmino as a basis. This memorandum might then be sent to the Universal Postal Union, which might be asked to correct any errors it might contain.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) stated that Germany had put into force the International Postal Conventions by special law. Every infraction of the Conventions in question (with regard to narcotics) was punished according to Article 8 of the Opium Law. He also said that the position as regarded export was clear in respect of countries which had accepted the import certificate system and countries which prohibited all postal imports. It was also clear in respect of countries which admitted postal imports subject to definite conditions and regulations. The countries whose position was doubtful were those which were not members of the Universal Postal Union and had not stated whether they allowed or did not allow the import of drugs by post.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) approved the proposal of the Chairman that a memorandum should be prepared by the Secretariat. There remained, however, the question raised by Mr. Lyall, whether a country which had accepted the obligations of the Universal Postal Union had passed legislation enabling it to punish those who sent opium or drugs through the post to countries where such substances were not admitted or admitted under conditions which were not fulfilled. The Bureau at Berne had not got the necessary information on this point, information which could only be obtained from the Governments themselves. The matter would accordingly have to be taken up with those Governments.

Meanwhile, the authorities at Shanghai might be asked to give particulars as to the countries in respect of which difficulties had arisen, and enquiries might be made of countries from which drugs were known to have been sent through the post contrary to the terms of the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the important question was what legal powers the various countries had to deal with cases in which drugs had been despatched from them to a country which had prohibited import or allowed import only under conditions. When postal packets containing such drugs were seized, could the country seizing them confiscate the drugs, or must the packets be returned to the country of despatch ?

M. ROTTNER said that this was not a matter for the Universal Postal Union. The position was defined in paragraph 2 of Article 41 of the Stockholm Convention, in which it was stated that objects posted contrary to the provisions of the article must be sent back to the office from which they were despatched, except in cases where the administration of the country of destination was, by its legislation or internal regulations, authorised to dispose of them otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Rottner for his statement and for his offer of collaboration. The Secretariat would be asked to prepare a note which would be sent to the Universal Postal Union for verification. The Committee, on examining that note, would then consider what further action, if any, should be taken in order to ascertain from Governments whether they had passed the necessary internal legislation. He would further suggest that Mr. Lyall should communicate with the authorities at Shanghai, in order to discover the countries in respect of which the difficulties to which he had drawn attention had arisen.

M. ROTTNER thought that the suggestions of the Chairman were very practical. He was prepared to help in the preparation of the note to be addressed to the International Bureau in order to avoid the insertion in it of anything which might be useless or undesirable.

It had been suggested that the Bureau at Berne should prepare a revised list of prohibited articles showing the instructions or rules in regard to their despatch. The present list and the present rules were based on the regulations drawn up by the Stockholm Congress. It would not be easy for the Bureau to ask, of its own accord, the various administrations to modify these rules. Such action could only be taken on the motion of one of the administrations themselves. He would suggest that the question of the revision of the list should be left to the next Congress of the Union, which would meet in 1929.

M. Rottner withdrew.

113. Survey of the Conditions in the Far East as regards Smoking Opium : Report by Mr. Herbert L. May.

On the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. May came to the table of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN noted that Mr. May, according to the preface of the report, was solely responsible for the opinions expressed, and that it was not published as a report of the Foreign Policy Association.

He asked whether any members desired to ask Mr. May any questions.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had read the report with interest and admiration. It was to be valued as presenting the point of view of a person unconnected with current controversies and as the result of an individual and prolonged enquiry.

He would ask whether Mr. May had received from British authorities in the British colonial possessions all the assistance which he had required. The British Colonial Office had given instructions that he should receive all such facilities.

Mr. MAY said that every possible facility had been furnished him in the British possessions. The British authorities had shown him all the relevant figures and had described to him their methods of control.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was prepared to endorse everything contained in the report, as distinguished from the appendices, except two paragraphs. He understood that Mr. May had not visited Burmah and that he had not gone to India for the purpose of this investigation ?

Mr. MAY agreed.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether Mr. May was aware that the alleged excessive consumption of opium per head in certain areas of India, to which allusion was made on page 18 of the report, was dealt with in official statistics which had been published for thirty years at least, and probably for over sixty years.

Mr. MAY said he was aware of the statistics, but they were statistics which required an interpretation. It was not until two years ago that investigators had drawn from these statistics the conclusion that the consumption of opium was abnormally large in industrial areas and comparatively small in thinly populated areas. This discovery had disposed of the suggestion that the use of opium in thinly inhabited areas was due to the fact that doctors were not accessible in those districts.

The CHAIRMAN, alluding to the statement on page 37 of the report concerning the right of veto of the Indian Government, asked whether Mr. May was familiar with the declaration which Lord Hardinge had made recently at the Assembly of the League of Nations, and whether he was aware that this declaration had been accepted and reiterated by the Government of India.

Mr. MAY said he remembered that declaration. In calling attention to the right of veto of the Indian Government, he had merely meant to draw attention to a technical and constitutional point.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. May if he was aware that the right of veto of the Indian Government was a general power which covered all legislation, and that it had, of course, no special reference to opium legislation.

He would ask whether Mr. May considered that his statement on page 37, suggesting that a certain contention was now exploded, was a logical and sound statement.

Mr. MAY said he believed that the statement was entirely sound.

The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to a statement on page 38 to the effect that smuggling out of British India was not believed to be on a very large scale, asked whether Mr. May had found any evidence that opium produced in India had left that country through any fault of the Indian Government ?

Mr. MAY said that practically no opium left British India in that way.

The CHAIRMAN enquired whether Mr. May had come across any evidence that opium from the Indian States found its way outside the country.

Mr. MAY said he had made no exhaustive enquiry into the matter. He had, however, heard of several cases in which small amounts had left the country through the mountainous districts of the north-west and north-east. These quantities, however, were very small.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Mr. May for his report and for his kindness in appearing before the Committee.

Mr. May withdrew.

114. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic : Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni (continuation).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) desired to make certain general observations. M. Cavazzoni had raised the whole question of the control of the traffic in drugs.

The efficiency of drug control depended on four things :

- (1) Adequacy of the laws and regulations ;
- (2) Adequacy of the administrative measures and methods ;
- (3) Efficiency of the supervision and inspection (human factor) ;
- (4) Adequacy of the penalties imposed by the Courts for contraventions.

The third and fourth were to a large extent outside any power of review possessed by the Committee. Number 3 depended mainly on the good will of the State authorities and the standards of administration prevailing in the State. If the Government were determined to enforce the law, and if its agents were competent and honest, the supervision would be efficient, and *vice versa*. The Committee might form an opinion from the facts coming to its knowledge — for example, from discoveries of illicit trafficking. It could call attention to those facts, but it could not set up a fixed standard.

Number 4 was a matter within the discretion of the courts of law. In countries where the judiciary was independent of the executive, as in accordance with English ideas it ought to be, even the executive could not interfere with the action of the Courts. A healthy and strong public opinion, however, would usually be reflected in the action of the Courts.

In the case of 1 and 2, the position was different. The Advisory Committee could, and ought to, exercise its functions of examination, criticism and advice.

While Sir Malcolm Delevingne could not agree with M. Cavazzoni when, with the zeal and — if he could say so without offence — with the imperfect knowledge of a new member, he remarked that the Advisory Committee had hitherto been concerned only with theoretical principles, it was true to say that perhaps insufficient attention had so far been paid to the first two matters. The materials at the disposal of the Committee had been incomplete. The Secretariat had indeed collected the laws and regulations in force in a large number of countries (see document O.C.653), though for some not unimportant countries those were still lacking. From time to time the Committee had examined some of them. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had made a suggestion that an analysis of the laws and regulations in force in the different countries should be undertaken by the Secretariat, in order to enable the Advisory Committee to judge how far adequate provision had been made for the carrying out of the Hague Convention of 1912. The task suggested had been, however, large, and, as in most cases amendments of the laws would be necessary when the Geneva Convention of 1925 had been ratified and had come into operation, his suggestion had perhaps been premature. No doubt such an analysis would one day have to be undertaken, possibly by some kind of research foundation.

With regard to the second point, the efficiency of the control over the traffic in drugs must depend in large measure on the manner in which the administrative authority exercised the powers conferred upon it by the law. He would refer, as an example, to the important question of the granting of permits, licences or authorisations for the manufacture, sale, import, export, etc., of the drugs. Most, if not all, of the value of such a system of permits, authorisations, etc., depended on the care with which the licences were granted, the enquiries made as to the respectability of the applicant, the conditions attached to the licence and which the licensee was required to observe, the records he had to keep, and the exercise of the power to withdraw the licence when its holder was found to be engaged in dealings for illicit purposes.

The information of the Committee regarding the administrative measures and methods adopted by the various countries was far less complete than that of the laws and regulations in force. Some Governments had given particulars of their methods in the annual reports furnished to the League, but of many, perhaps of most, the Committee knew little or nothing. It had from time to time been forced to the conclusion, from the facts before it, that in the case of some countries the administrative methods were far from adequate, and M. Cavazzoni had rendered valuable service by raising the general question of the administrative methods and measures required for an adequate execution of the laws and regulations concerning the control of the drug traffic. M. Cavazzoni desired to see an efficient standard of administration reached in all countries. On this point the whole Committee would undoubtedly agree with him.

This was a very opportune moment at which to raise the question. The Geneva Convention of 1925 had already been ratified by a considerable number of States and was soon, it was hoped, to be ratified by many more. The ratifying States were considering, or would soon consider, what changes were needed, not only in their laws and regulations, but also in their administrative methods, in order to give effect to the Convention. M. Cavazzoni considered — and Sir Malcolm Delevingne agreed with him — that the Committee could render assistance to those Governments which would be of great value and importance. The Committee was, in fact, the only body which could do so, and in doing so would take a big step towards securing the effective control of the drug traffic. He would, however, utter one word of warning. No system of internal control would, by itself, be sufficient to put an end to the illicit traffic, however perfect that system might be.

He would now refer to the particular scheme of administrative measures submitted by M. Cavazzoni. On reading the scheme, he had received the strong impression that it was the production of someone who had not had much experience of actual administration, at any rate in the kind of sphere to which the scheme referred. The scheme seemed to have been framed — to use an English phrase — by the light of nature and not to have been based

on actual experience. M. Cavazzoni, in putting forward a cut-and-dried scheme, drawn up in elaborate detail, appeared to have overlooked the fact that different countries had different methods of administration, which could not be made to conform to the same pattern. Different methods might be — Sir Malcolm Delevingne would not say they all were — equally efficient, though a Government which possessed a system that worked efficiently was not going to change it lightly — it would be very foolish to do so — for anything drawn up by the Committee. In the third place, the Committee should be careful not to propose anything that would unnecessarily penalise or burden the honest trader on account of the sins of the dishonest trader, or hamper unnecessarily the honest trader in carrying on his legitimate business. Of the thousands of merchants, chemists, druggists and other persons engaged in the business of selling drugs, the great majority — at any rate in England — were anxious to observe the law. If legitimate business were made unduly difficult, the Committee would run the risk of creating opposition which might seriously prejudice the efforts of Governments to establish an efficient control over the drug traffic.

He would take one or two points of M. Cavazzoni's proposal to illustrate the nature of his criticism of them. The requirement, as a part of the system of internal control, of so called "import certificates", by which was apparently meant a licence to purchase, on the occasion of each purchase by a wholesaler from a drug factory and presumably also from another wholesaler; the requirement of a delivery certificate in the case alike of the importer, manufacturer and the wholesale merchant, in addition to the licence to import or to purchase; the obligation on the importer or purchaser to show, and on the Government to verify, on each occasion of an application to import or purchase, that all previous imports or purchases had been legitimately used or were satisfactorily accounted for — were all proposals of major importance as to the value or practicability of which Sir Malcolm Delevingne entertained the very greatest doubts.

The proposal to require sureties or guarantees was not, in his view, essential to an effective system of control. Such a proposal had been discussed at the Geneva Conference but not included in the Convention. The idea that it was possible for an individual Government, in the manner indicated in paragraph 4 of M. Cavazzoni's scheme, to form an approximate judgment as to whether excessive quantities of the drugs were being accumulated in a given country, or whether there was a risk of that country becoming a centre of illicit traffic, seemed to be a mistaken one. To form such a judgment, it was necessary to know the exports from other countries as well, and it was for this reason that the Central Board had been instituted. The proposal of a system of rewards for informers was open to grave objection. In Great Britain it had been abandoned, so far as the Government was concerned, many years previously.

Apart from these considerations, Sir Malcolm Delevingne found much that was meticulous, some matters that were obscure (what, for instance, was meant by paragraph 7 ?) and some matters that would certainly be ineffective.

There was, of course, much in the scheme with which he entirely agreed. It included many proposals which had been adopted in Great Britain and some which had already been recommended by the Committee. He especially welcomed the proposal contained in paragraph 46, which he himself had often urged both in the Committee and at the Geneva Conference. The proposal was to the effect that, in the case of exports to a country which did not apply the import certificate system, the Government of the exporting country should satisfy itself before issuing an export licence that the drugs were intended for legitimate purposes. Sir Malcolm Delevingne would add that a similar precaution was equally necessary in the case of certain import certificates.

With regard to the action to be taken by the Committee on the scheme submitted by M. Cavazzoni, he would offer a suggestion. M. Bourgois had proposed that this scheme should be examined paragraph by paragraph, but Sir Malcolm Delevingne did not think that a satisfactory result would be achieved by such a procedure. If the Committee was to produce a satisfactory body of suggestions for the consideration and assistance of Governments, it must take into account other methods as well as those proposed, especially methods adopted in countries where a system of control was working efficiently. M. Cavazzoni had already intimated his desire that other suggestions should be considered.

The Committee should also consider whether some of the proposals in the memorandum before it were based on evidence from actual experience. It could not do this in the time at its disposal during the present session and it was to be doubted whether a large Committee, not all of whose members had actual experience of the administration of a system of control, was suitable for the purpose. He suggested, therefore, that the Committee should appoint a small Sub-Committee consisting of persons having actual experience of the administration of systems of control and instruct it to make a study of the systems of control already in force, and to present a report to the Committee which would indicate the methods that had been found in practice to be satisfactory. Such a study might well prove to be of great value, for most countries had something to learn from each other.

To quote from his own experience, which had largely been gained in the administration of the laws in force in Great Britain for securing the safety and health of workers engaged in factories, mining and other industries, it was a great advantage to those engaged in such administration to learn what was being done in that sphere in other countries, to interchange information as to improvements and to compare results. The proposed Sub-Committee would not need to meet often; much of its work could be carried out by correspondence between members, with the aid of the Secretariat. The Sub-Committee might be in a position to meet at Geneva a day or two before the next session of the Advisory Committee and settle its report in time for consideration at that session. With regard to its members, some of them might be persons not members of the Advisory Committee.

This suggestion would, he thought, save the Advisory Committee a tedious and perhaps not a very profitable discussion and would lead to a more satisfactory result.

He would conclude with a word of warning. The production of a scheme by the Advisory Committee was not sufficient. Governments had to accept it and act upon it. M. Cavazzoni had made a somewhat strange observation at the previous meeting when he had said that the world must not be allowed to conclude that, during years of international conferences, the League had aimed at the impossible and that those conferences had repeatedly prescribed remedies which it had not proved possible to put into practice. Why had they not been put into practice? The reason was that Governments cared too little about the matter or were not ready to any make concessions to the views of other Governments.

In 1925, as a result of the work of the Advisory Committee, a new Convention had been produced which was an incomparably more powerful instrument than the Hague Convention for the prevention of the illicit traffic. That Convention, at the moment, remained a piece of paper only because some of the most important countries in the world had delayed for nearly three years to ratify it or had refused to ratify it altogether. What was needed was more good will on the part of Governments far more than the production of new schemes by the Advisory Committee.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) had listened with great interest to M. Cavazzoni's very sincere statement, and he wished to acknowledge, as some members of the Committee had already done, the generous intentions which had inspired his proposals. Dr. Carrière had studied these proposals very carefully and it did not seem possible to him that regulations so stringent and so detailed could be adopted without certain modifications to meet the necessities of various countries and their administrative methods. The advantage of M. Cavazzoni's proposals was that he had given the Committee the opportunity of studying the problem of the control of narcotics as a whole, and he was certain that useful suggestions would result from the indications for the administrations which were entrusted with the control of the trade in narcotics.

Dr. Carrière was glad to remark that, amongst the measures of control suggested by M. Cavazzoni, there were many, and they were not the least important, which were to be found in one form or another in the Swiss legislation. This legislation, which applied, in anticipation, the greater part of the rules codified in the Convention of Geneva, was a proof that Switzerland, contrary to certain statements and to certain accusations which had been formulated quite recently, intended to collaborate with the greatest loyalty in the fight against narcotics. Dr. Carrière was therefore ready to receive all useful suggestions, and if there were contained in M. Cavazzoni's scheme, as very probably would be the case, measures capable of completing the efficacy of the system of control adopted in Switzerland, he thought that he might say, without having received precise instructions on this point, that his Government would not fail to examine them with the greatest attention, on condition, naturally, that they remained within the limits of existing Conventions.

Dr. Carrière, however, wished particularly to state, as he had already done several times before the Committee, that, even without having recourse to the regulations advised by M. Cavazzoni, very important progress might be made if all the States would at last decide to adopt a system of import and export certificates. It was this system which was the basis of international control and it was owing to the gaps which were still encountered in its application that a large percentage of the leakages occurred which supplied the illicit traffic. All their efforts must therefore tend to a generalisation of this system. The efficacy of international control, with which M. Cavazzoni was principally preoccupied, would be notably increased.

Dr. Carrière agreed with the suggestion formulated by Sir Malcolm Delevingne and proposed to the Committee to appoint a Sub-Committee composed of persons having a real and practical experience in the control of narcotics, a Sub-Committee which would study, together with M. Cavazzoni's scheme, the systems of control now applied in different countries, and evolve from this study, in a report which would be submitted to the Committee, the methods and regulations which appeared to it the most likely to give the best results.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with the observations of Sir Malcolm Delevingne. They completed the proposal which M. Bourgeois had made at the previous meeting.

The scheme put forward by M. Cavazzoni covered the entire system of control from beginning to end, and it was impossible to study so comprehensive a question in two or three meetings, especially when it had already been examined for many years by the administrative authorities of the various countries. The Committee could only express a fragmentary view as to its value. He thought, therefore, that it would be prudent to adopt the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne, to the effect that a Sub-Committee should be appointed. The work of such a Sub-Committee would greatly facilitate the future task of the Advisory Committee, which could, at its next session, adopt definite resolutions concerning the scheme put forward by M. Cavazzoni.

As far as the composition of the Sub-Committee was concerned, however, he had noted the suggestion of Sir Malcolm Delevingne that some of its members might not necessarily be members of the Advisory Committee. M. Bourgois was very strongly opposed to such a suggestion. The Sub-Committee must be composed entirely of members of the Advisory Committee, for that Committee had to take full responsibility in the matter. Members of the Sub-Committee could, however, be assisted by any technical experts they might require, drawn from their own administrations.

The remainder of the discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

NINTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Monday, October 3rd, 1927, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

115. Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic : Memorandum of M. Cavazzoni (continuation).

Prince CHAROON (Siam) said that he had read with great interest the proposal made by M. Cavazzoni and would like to congratulate him on his work. It showed a great deal of thought and covered every stage of the traffic. The scheme he proposed was almost an ideal scheme, but it fell short of the ideal system of stopping the illicit traffic in drugs, namely, that of State monopoly.

He agreed, however, with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that, account being taken of the different conditions prevailing in each country from the point of view of administration, it did not seem possible for every State to carry out M. Cavazzoni's proposals.

The proposals were most important and it would not be possible, owing to the shortness of time available, to study them adequately during the present session. He therefore supported the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne to appoint a Sub-Committee, as modified by the proposal of M. Bourgois.

His own country was in the fortunate position of having very little need of or traffic in drugs, whether licit or illicit. He could not say how long that fortunate situation would last, but the Siamese Government had adopted the best system of control to meet any danger which might arise, namely, the system of State monopoly, both for opium and other harmful drugs.

The importation of drugs was made by the Government only. An estimate of the requirements of the whole country for the ensuing year was made and published in the *Official Gazette*. The drugs, when imported, were kept in a Government depot and issued only to those holding licences to sell drugs within the limits that had been assigned to each retailer for the whole year. Only certain persons or institutions could receive a licence to retail drugs. These were pharmacists, physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, hospitals, charitable institutions and scientific laboratories. The production, manufacture, export and import of drugs were prohibited except by the Government. The highest penalty for infringement of the law was either a fine of three times the value of the drugs seized or two years' imprisonment.

Such were the main features of the Siamese law, which appeared to cover most of the points raised in the proposal of M. Cavazzoni.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that all the members of the Committee had been greatly impressed by the proposals of M. Cavazzoni and by the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne. There were two points to which he would like to draw attention.

The first related to the international aspect of the proposals made by M. Cavazzoni. The international regulation of the drug traffic would depend on the successful application of the Second Opium Convention of 1925, and, before considering further measures of international control, it might be advisable to await the results of that Convention. Further enquiries would perhaps be more successfully made when it was perceived how the Opium Convention worked in practice.

The proposals of M. Cavazzoni in regard to the internal regulation of the traffic by individual countries were interesting and minute. He would ask, however, by what measures it was proposed to apply the system described. Internal control could only be imposed as the result of internal legislation. Reference had been made during the discussion to the work of the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament, but he would submit that the reference to the Disarmament Commission was not altogether favourable to the proposals of M. Cavazzoni. The Preparatory Commission on Disarmament had worked with a view to the preparation of a Conference and a Convention. The League of Nations could not impose legislation on Governments, but could only get Governments to accept the obligation to introduce such legislation by means of a Convention. Was it proposed that the suggestions of M. Cavazzoni should be studied with a view to a further Opium Conference and the elaborating of a further Opium Convention? It would certainly be possible for the Sub-Committee to work with a view to framing recommendations which the Fifth Committee of the Assembly might be asked to urge upon the Governments concerned?

He would emphasise that internal control of the traffic by the Governments themselves would shortly be regulated by the terms of the Opium Convention of 1925. Was it not possible that the new proposals might overlap with these provisions?

M. BOURGOIS (France) draw attention to the considerable interest attached to the observations of M. Fotitch. Ought the Sub-Committee, in studying the proposals of M. Cavazzoni to contemplate a new Convention or content itself with drawing up the plan of new recommendations to be submitted to the Fifth Committee of the Assembly?

The CHAIRMAN said he understood that the Sub-Committee would not be working with a view to preparing for any further Conference or Convention.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked his colleagues for the way in which they had received his proposals. He would reply at once to the observations of M. Fotitch and M. Bourgois. It was quite understood that there was no question of framing a new Convention. He would not dream of submitting to the Committee anything in the nature of a draft Convention, particularly as he had not sufficient administrative experience for such a task. He had merely intended to put forward certain proposals with a view to a further consideration of possible measures of control for the regulation of the traffic. The framing of Conventions required much time and he would be glad if some speedier method could be devised of making the existing regulations more effective.

In view of the proposal that the whole question should be studied by a Sub-Committee, he did not wish to carry the general debate any further at that moment. He understood that, in the Sub-Committee, his proposals would be examined in the light of the experience of those who had been personally concerned with the administrative problems involved.

His object in submitting his memorandum was sufficiently explained in Part 2. Other views could doubtless be expressed in the Sub-Committee, but his own conviction of the gravity of the evil was shared by all, and he had no doubt that the work of the Sub-Committee would result in the finding of a solution.

It had been said that his scheme was presented rather in the light of nature than in the light of experience, but there were occasions when even nature might add something to the wisdom of experience.

The proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne was extremely opportune. All serious proposals required thorough consideration and he would be the last to refuse the assistance of experts in such a matter or to under-estimate the value of experience. The proposal made by Sir Malcolm Delevingne would enable his suggestions to be studied in the light of practical considerations and of the measures which had been tried in other countries. He understood that the Sub-Committee would work with a view to presenting practical conclusions at the next session of the Committee and that there was no question of evading the issue. He accepted the proposal in that spirit.

The CHAIRMAN said he thought the Committee accepted the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne; if so, it only remained to choose the members of the Sub-Committee. The original suggestion of Sir Malcolm Delevingne had been that M. Cavazzoni's proposals should be referred to a Sub-Committee chosen by the Advisory Committee, and that the Sub-Committee should have the power to add to its numbers, if that seemed desirable, certain experts. M. Bourgois had objected to the second part of that proposal

on the ground that the Advisory Committee should not divest itself of its responsibility, and he had urged that the Sub-Committee should consist exclusively of members of the Advisory Committee. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had accepted that modification of his original proposal. The Sub-Committee would examine the memorandum of M. Cavazzoni, bringing to bear upon it the expert knowledge which had been acquired in certain countries in the control of the drug traffic. He presumed that the Sub-Committee would meet a few days in advance of the next session of the Committee, and that it would present its report to that session.

M. BOURGOIS (France) summed up as follows the position of the question : (1) the Sub-Committee would be composed of members of the Committee, who would bring with them their own experts ; (2) it would meet before the end of the present session of the Committee in order to decide on its programme of work ; and (3) the members would be appointed at the conclusion of the present discussion, and chosen so as to represent the principal views expressed.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that it would be the duty of the Sub-Committee to frame suggestions based on the practice of any countries which had already introduced an efficient system of control.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the three points raised by M. Bourgois, said that the first was, of course, agreed. The second point was, he thought, a matter for the Sub-Committee when it had been appointed. He was not quite clear what the third point meant, but he considered that the general discussion of the subject had now been concluded, and that it only remained to appoint the Sub-Committee.

He would, on his own responsibility, suggest that the Sub-Committee should be composed of the following members : M. CAVAZZONI, Dr. CARRIÈRE, Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE, Dr. ANSELMINO, M. BOURGOIS and M. VAN WETTUM.

The Committee agreed.

116. Letter from M. Henri Brenier regarding Certain Matters connected with the Work of the Session.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Brenier had addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Committee, which had been distributed to the members (Annex 3). M. Brenier had asked that this letter should be included as an Annex to the Minutes of the session.

The Committee agreed.

117. Import and Export Certificates : Situation in China.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked that the Secretariat should clearly define the situation of China with regard to the system of import certificates. This system, as it had been defined by the recommendations of the Committee and by Chapter VI of the Geneva Convention, was apparently not applied, but it appeared that similar measures of control had been taken by the Chinese Government. It was indispensable that the Committee should know exactly what these measures were. The importance of the seizures operated by the Chinese Post Office or the Customs showed the importance of the question. He suggested that the Secretariat be asked to prepare a memorandum defining the situation.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had asked Mr. Lyall to explain the situation and, in response to that request, Mr. Lyall had written a letter which had been sent to the Secretary of the Committee and distributed to the members. He would suggest that, if any doubt still existed as to the position in China, Mr. Lyall should be asked to help the Secretariat to prepare the proposed memorandum.

The Committee agreed.

118. Relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board : Report of the Sub-Committee.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that, in examining the report of the Sub-Committee (document O.C.669), he had wondered whether the duty of the Committee was to advise the Council on matters concerning narcotics or whether it was almost an international legislative body. The report said that the Central Board was not an independent organisation but was the child and at the same time an organ of the League of Nations. M. Cavazzoni was unable to understand such a view.

After careful examination of the legal documents on which any decision must be based, M. Cavazzoni felt that discussion of this matter would be premature, since the proposed body did not exist and the Convention had not yet come into force. When the Convention was signed, it would merely represent the agreement of States to certain principles which might later become international obligations but were not at present such. The Convention had therefore at present no legal binding force and until ratified it could not be the source of international law.

The Committee claimed to settle in advance differences which might arise if the Committee and the Central Board found themselves working in the same field. This would mean that they would dictate to States ratifying the Convention terms to which they would have to conform. Would it not, however, be rather against the spirit of the Convention of Geneva to endeavour to make the present state of uncertainty a legally binding reality ?

Article 32 of the Convention laid down that, for the peaceful settlement of disputes between contracting parties as to the execution or interpretation of the Convention, all such disputes should be submitted to the technical body to be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. If the question of the relations between the Central Board and the Committee arose after the entry into force of the Convention, it would surely be decided by a technical committee appointed by the Council or, in the last resort, by the Permanent Court of International Justice. The Council could certainly not have given the Committee the duties of a technical committee, since no legal principle would allow a dispute between two parties to be entrusted for solution to one of them.

But, even assuming that it was possible to make legally binding arrangements, it would be sufficient to examine Chapter VI, which referred to the Permanent Central Board, to see that the functions of this body had not been very well established and that it might exercise powers in a way which might cause real danger to the League of Nations.

M. Cavazzoni insisted that this Board was not an organ of the League. It had its separate existence and it was not sufficient to say that the Convention had been drawn up under the auspices of the League. According to constitutional law, an organ must be entrusted by a general and higher organisation to carry out the wishes of that organisation. But the Central Board did not do work coming into the sphere of the League. Just as local authorities were part of and subordinate to the State, which represented the general legal organisation, such an organ as the one in question must be subordinate to the general organisation of which it was a part.

The Central Board, however, would in certain cases, according to the report of the Sub-Committee, exercise functions which had been termed judicial. This expression could hardly be accepted as defining the powers entrusted to the Central Board by Article 24 of the Geneva Convention. The power of supervision of the markets and the right of asking for explanations from countries accumulating an undue amount of certain products would at least constitute a voluntary jurisdiction.

M. Cavazzoni wondered what would be the situation of a country Member of the League which received orders from the Central Board to give certain explanations as to its store of certain products which came under the Convention. He thought that this would be the complete reversal of constitutional law. The situation was still more serious in the case of States which had not ratified the Convention and were Members of the Council, which might be obliged to take orders from the Central Board.

The new organisation, though its members might be appointed by the Council, was not part of the life of the League of Nations, which was under the sovereign power of the Assembly in every case. The Central Board was in no way subordinate to the Assembly according to the terms of the Convention. Its activity was completely independent and its decisions were not subject to control. Even the fact, omitted in the Convention, that the Fourth Committee dealt with its budget would not be a sufficient constitutional connection to make it fall under the powers of the Assembly.

This body, therefore, existed outside the League of Nations and was based upon a Convention which was adhered to by certain States other than those which signed the Covenant, and its powers were determined according to other principles than those guiding the other Committees of the League of Nations. The relations between the Central Board and the League were probably due to an error of drafting. M. Cavazzoni felt that, while fully appreciating the good will of its authors, it should be freely admitted that the Geneva Convention was to some extent imperfect and that it could not be legally applied without consequences which would be unacceptable.

M. Cavazzoni urged the Advisory Committee not to adopt dangerous conclusions which, after submission to the Council, would have to be ratified by the Assembly in September. Ratification of such conclusions might involve an amendment of the Covenant, and he felt that the Committee should not bow to the attitude of a limited number of States which had adhered to the Convention. The conclusions of the Sub-Committee were therefore unacceptable, though they contained principles which might be useful in the work before the Committee. There existed the Hague Convention, which afforded every means of combating the danger of narcotic drugs. There were the Assembly, the Council and the Advisory Committee to accomplish the work arising from this very Convention. The means was therefore at hand but the method which had been followed hitherto had not always been correct and M. Cavazzoni urged his colleagues to apply themselves to the work at hand without establishing new bodies and creating new difficulties.

In conclusion, M. Cavazzoni referred to certain remarks in the report of the Sub-Committee and to Articles 24 and 25 of the Hague Convention. The principles embodied therein might be applied in the present stage of the development of international law. If a small Committee were desirable to watch over the movement of the international market, to collect necessary explanations, to draw the attention of the Council of the League to the attitude of States which did not properly meet the obligations of Article 23 of the Covenant, such a Committee might well be appointed. A certain number of members might be entrusted with these duties, and the appointment of this small Committee could be approved by the Council and Assembly without any alteration to the Covenant of the League. M. Cavazzoni's conclusions on the report of the Sub-Committee were not entirely negative. He felt that, in view of the spirit of sincere co-operation existing in the Committee, it would be able to work to ensure the application of the ideas all the members had at heart.

M. BOURGOIS (France) drew attention to the fact that M. Cavazzoni's remarks were connected with the legality of the existence of the Permanent Central Board and the compatibility of its creation with Article 23 of the Covenant, and with the relations of the new organisation with the League of Nations. He was of the opinion that this question had already been settled by the resolution adopted by the Assembly when it decided to include the expenses of the Central Board in the budget of the League. The Committee need no longer consider this point, which had already been settled by the Assembly. He could only accept the situation which existed since the recent decision of the Assembly. The role of the Committee must be limited to the examination of the respective functions of the Central Board and of the Advisory Committee and to the determination of the relations which should exist between those two organisations.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that he agreed the Geneva Convention was imperfect, particularly as regards the Permanent Central Board. He thought, however, that Article 32 of the Convention referred to differences between signatories in which the Advisory Committee could not be a party. The Sub-Committee had had the practical task of examining the relations between the Advisory Committee and the Permanent Central Board. Perhaps it was a little too early to undertake this work, but the Convention would probably come into force quite soon.

M. BOURGOIS (France) was of opinion that the argument brought forward by M. Cavazzoni should not have been presented now to the Advisory Committee but to the Council and the Assembly when the question had been under discussion. The matter was now settled, and it was not for the Committee to raise it again.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) agreed with M. Bourgois and added that M. Cavazzoni had placed his views before the Fourth Committee of the Assembly, on which occasion they had not been accepted. He wished to refer to certain points in M. Cavazzoni's speech.

He felt that it was not premature to discuss the relations between the Advisory Committee and the Permanent Central Board, as questions had been asked, for example, in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly, as to what these relations would be, and it was surely desirable to remove any possible misapprehensions on the subject.

Article 32 of the Convention only referred to the interpretation of the Convention, a task which the Sub-Committee had not attempted. As the duties of the Permanent Central Board were definitely laid down in the Convention, the Sub-Committee could only define the position of the Advisory Committee when the Central Board came into existence, and its explanations would not have any binding force.

M. Cavazzoni had referred to the orders which would be issued by the Board to the Governments, but it must be remembered that the Board could only issue recommendations, which the Governments could accept or refuse as they chose.

M. Cavazzoni advocated the total abandonment of Chapter IV of the Convention and the substitution of a new organ to do the work. Neither the Advisory Committee nor the Council nor the Assembly agreed to this, but, if such abandonment were desired, it could only be achieved by the calling of another conference.

In conclusion, Sir Malcolm Delevingne pointed out that the report had been unanimously adopted by the members of the Sub-Committee.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that the main objection appeared to be that the Advisory Committee was not the place for the speech which he had made. He had, however, made observations in the Fourth and Fifth Committees of the Assembly. In the Fifth Committee he had asked what would be the relations between the Permanent Central Board and the Advisory Committee, and no one had been able to tell him. His proposal that the new body should not be included in the budget of the League had first been rejected by the Fourth Committee, but, when the question of voting the funds came up, it had decided to reject the amount requested, at any rate for 1928. He had then said that there must be a clear idea of the activity of the Board, and the matter would now come up for discussion in the Assembly of 1928, and he hoped that time would work reconciliation between the conflicting views.

M. Cavazzoni hoped that the Council would discuss the question whether the charges of a convention could be placed upon the budget of the League, and he felt that this matter could be discussed in the Advisory Committee. Had he been present when the question of the relations between the two bodies had been put on the agenda, he would have raised objections. The Council could ask for an opinion on this matter, but it was not for the Advisory Committee to give it unasked.

It was not likely that, in order to settle the question of the relations between the new body and the Advisory Committee, the Council would decide to entrust that duty to one of the interested parties.

M. Cavazzoni said that the Italian delegation had already made definite declarations in opposition to the Permanent Central Board. In the Assembly it had said that there should be no such Board without rationing, and it now said "No Central Board without strict control". He was unable to accept the suggestions of the Sub-Committee regarding the substance of the question, and, as a matter of procedure, he doubted whether it was desirable to study the relations between the Permanent Central Board and the Advisory Committee. This question seemed to be within competence of the Council and not of the Committee.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, in the report of the Fourth Committee to the Assembly, that Committee approved the recommendations of the Supervisory Commission and decided that the expenses of the Permanent Central Board should be included in the budget of the League. The Assembly had approved their report, and the question of principle had therefore been decided.

The discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.

TENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Tuesday, October 4th, 1927, at 10.30 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Commission, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

119. Relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board: Report of the Sub-Committee (continuation).

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) referred to the observations made on the previous day by M. Cavazzoni. He thought that the position of the question relating to the Central Board was clear, and unanimous agreement on the subject had been reached in the Sub-Committee. The Committee was not concerned with the question of the existence of a Central Board but had merely to consider its relations with the Advisory Committee. The Committee had to determine the respective duties of the two bodies.

The CHAIRMAN said that he agreed generally with M. Bourgois, M. Fotitch and Sir Malcolm Delevingne. There were one or two points, however, which should perhaps be emphasised. M. Cavazzoni had argued that the Advisory Committee had no right to discuss the question of the Central Board because the new Opium Convention was not yet in force; in M. Cavazzoni's view, it was "contrary to the Convention" for the Advisory Committee to discuss the matter at all. He would ask M. Cavazzoni to consider the effect of this argument. If it were accepted, the first result would be to reverse the decision which had been taken on the previous day, to the effect that the scheme which M. Cavazzoni had himself presented to the Committee should be considered! M. Cavazzoni's scheme was admittedly based on the import and export certificate system and that system in its turn found its only explicit legal base in the Geneva Convention. If the Committee could not discuss a matter arising out of the Convention because that Convention was not yet in force, it would be impossible for it to proceed with the consideration of the proposals which M. Cavazzoni had himself presented.

M. Cavazzoni had argued that the Geneva Convention was inconsistent with the Covenant of the League in view of the fact that the League Assembly, as such, found no place in the Convention, and that the Council was set up as the ultimate authority. M. Cavazzoni has argued in favour of maintaining the sovereign authority of the Assembly. That, however, was not a question for the Advisory Committee; and the Sub-Committee had not discussed it. Since, however, M. Cavazzoni had raised the question, he would ask him to remember that the Assembly was rightly jealous of its powers and privileges, and was particularly sensitive as to its sovereignty. The Assembly had, nevertheless, on the only three occasions when an opportunity presented itself, warmly approved of the Convention, and pressed strongly for its ratification. M. Cavazzoni, in his zeal for the prerogatives of the Assembly, was "plus royaliste que le roi".

The views of M. Cavazzoni in this matter had been placed before the competent Committee of the recent Assembly and the question had been pressed to a vote. The Assembly, being then aware of the arguments on both sides, so far from showing any hostility to the

Convention, had unanimously decided that the expenses of the Central Board, to be set up under the Convention, should be charged to the League's budget. M. Cavazzoni had argued that this budget vote was not a sufficiently strong indication of the attitude of the Assembly. Suppose, however, the vote had been in the contrary sense! In that case, it would have been impossible to establish the Central Board until all the signatory Powers had agreed to finance the scheme. The decision of the Assembly showed in the clearest and most emphatic way, that it did not share the doubts and fears of M. Cavazzoni on the subject, and did not regard the Convention as an attack on its sovereignty.

M. Cavazzoni was not without administrative experience; and he would realise, on reflection, that the provision of the Convention under which an appeal lay to the Council, and not to the Assembly, was necessary from an administrative point of view. In view of the urgency of the matters they dealt with, it was impossible for the Central Board to wait, perhaps for twelve months, for the Assembly to approve its decisions, or for an appeal to be decided by that body. Rapidity of action was essential, and it was therefore necessary to have a body such as the Council, which could act quickly.

Did M. Cavazzoni really contemplate the League Assembly as even a possible court of appeal here?

M. Cavazzoni had referred to the unfairness and undesirability of the Advisory Committee giving an opinion to the Council in respect of a dispute between itself and the Central Board. That, however, was hardly a fair presentment of the case. The Central Board did not yet exist; and there was certainly no dispute. He could, indeed, see only one reason why any dispute should ever arise. The Advisory Committee was not taking any unfair advantage in sending to the Council a statement of its views regarding the relations which should exist between itself and the new body which would come into existence under the Convention. The Advisory Committee could not decide the powers and functions of the Central Board, nor could the Council. The powers and functions of the Central Board were determined by the Convention, which itself provided the machinery for settling any doubtful point. No action which the Advisory Committee might now take could in any way prejudice the powers or the position of the Central Board.

M. SATO (Japan) thanked the Chairman for his clear statement. When the question of the Central Board had been discussed in the Fourth Committee, he had voted with the majority against the thesis of M. Cavazzoni. The question of principle had been in effect decided by that vote, and the Assembly had thereby resolved that the expenses of the Central Board should be borne by the League. Next year, the Fourth Committee would discuss the budget of the Central Board and would then have to decide whether the credits allotted were reasonable or not. He desired to thank the Sub-Committee for its excellent work, and he accepted its report.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) regretted that the majority of the Committee was at variance on this question with the representative of a country whose interests were identical and whose collaboration was of great value. The dissension which had arisen was likely to do no small amount of damage to the cause which the Committee had at heart. The efforts of the Committee were impeded by that dissension and the Committee was presenting to critics of the League a spectacle which was likely to afford them much matter for ridicule. Too many good causes were ruined or crippled by dissension among their advocates, and nothing should be left unsaid which might possibly help to remove the existing disagreement.

He had vainly tried to discover any adequate reason for the strong opposition of M. Cavazzoni and the Italian Government to the proposals for a Central Board contained in the Convention. He recognised the sincerity of M. Cavazzoni and his desire to put an end to the present deplorable position in regard to the drug problem. M. Cavazzoni disliked the Central Board as a defective instrument and was a strong champion of rationing as the real solution. Personally, he sympathised with M. Cavazzoni in that position. He had himself urged that solution upon the Committee and the Geneva Conference in 1923, 1924 and 1925, but had on those occasions been supported only by the representatives of India and the United States. The attempt to get the principle of rationing embodied in the Convention had failed and the utmost that could be obtained was supervision by a Central Board. He had tried to make the Central Board a more perfect instrument. He did not think the scheme went far enough. It was, however, the best solution that could be obtained, and it seemed foolish to abandon it, after the progress which had been made, because there were possible defects in the instrument at present available and because there was a possibility that at some future date something better might be obtained. The present duty of the Committee was to make the utmost use of the powers with which the various nations would entrust the Central Board for the control of the traffic under the new Convention.

The Chairman had already dealt with the alleged inconsistency between the Convention and the Covenant of the League. The position of the League and its organs was clear from Article 23 of the Covenant. It was there laid down that the Members of the League should entrust it with the general supervision over the traffic in opium "subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon". The duties of the League were accordingly to be exercised not only in

accordance with the old Hague Convention but also in accordance with the Geneva Convention or any other conventions which might in future be concluded.

The Central Board would be an experiment. It might succeed or it might fail in securing the objects for which it was appointed. It should be given a fair trial, and in any case the experiment could do no harm. Its duties did not in any way infringe the sovereignty of nations and its activities could not possibly make matters worse. He could not accordingly understand the opposition of Italy to its constitution. Forty countries, including Italy herself, had agreed to try the experiment when they had approved the Geneva Convention. The attitude adopted by the Italian representative on the Committee was to him the greatest disappointment which the Committee had yet encountered in its work. He did not think the Committee would wish to close the present discussion without expressing its regret that Italy, a country which had the same objects and the same desires as every other country with representatives on that Committee, could not see its way to collaborate with the Committee in this particular matter.

M. BOURGOIS (France) recalled that M. Cavazzoni had said, in the Fifth Committee of the recent session of the Assembly, that he would have accepted the Central Board with a system of quotas. Now, the objections of M. Cavazzoni to the Board were purely of a legal and constitutional character. It appeared that these objections would not be in any way affected by the adoption of a system of rationing.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, before he asked M. Cavazzoni to reply to the observations which had been made, the Committee should decide that the discussion would then be regarded as closed, and that a vote should be taken on the acceptance of the report of the Sub-Committee immediately following the speech of M. Cavazzoni.

The Committee agreed.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) regretted that on the previous day he had apparently somewhat discouraged the Committee. He might say, however, that the Committee had during that meeting somewhat discouraged him. He still thought, however, that the discussion to which these observations had given rise had served a useful purpose. Each of the members of the Committee had defined his attitude and if he remained alone in his opinion, the rest of the members of the Committee at least had the satisfaction of themselves being in almost universal agreement. He did not think that disagreement was always necessarily injurious. Perfect unanimity sometimes resulted in listlessness, and opposition, such as that in which he had himself ventured to indulge, gave his colleagues an opportunity of reconsidering their views.

He considered that the Central Board was not an effective instrument, and it had been his duty to say so. He felt, moreover, that it was right to raise the question in the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee, however, could hardly discuss the constitution of the Board, but only its powers in relation to those of the Committee itself.

He could not agree with the Chairman that his objections to discussing the constitution of the Board were equally valid as regarded the proposals he had himself submitted to the Committee. His own proposals were along the lines which the Committee would have to follow, and certainly came within the limits of the Committee's work as laid down by the Council and the Covenant of the League. The constitution of the Central Board, on the other hand, was a matter which fell exclusively within the limits of the Convention, and that Convention had as yet only been ratified by a few countries. The Italian Government was not alone in delaying its ratification of the Convention. The Committee must face the fact that in many quarters there was not only delay but reluctance in ratifying the Convention. There was obviously a feeling that it was an imperfect instrument, and he could not justly be reproached for calling attention to that fact.

One of his objections to the Convention was that the Central Board was not an organ of the League of Nations, and for that reason he was unable to vote for the conclusions of the Sub-Committee. In almost all the articles of the Convention there would be found something which appeared to be expressly designed to protect the independence of the Central Board. Article 20 laid special emphasis on the full technical independence of the Board in carrying out its duties, and under Article 24, paragraph 5, the Central Board had the right to publish a report to the Council, which must be forwarded to all Governments, on the failure of the Government of any importing country to act upon its recommendations. The independence of the Board was safeguarded to such an extent that it ceased to be a subordinate organ of the League of Nations, and for that reason he maintained that its constitution was contrary to the Covenant of the League.

The conclusions of the Sub-Committee were, in effect, a modification of the Convention, and he had already argued that the Sub-Committee had no power to issue conclusions having that effect. In that sense, he might be described as a champion of the Convention.

He would recall the circumstances in which the provisions in regard to the Central Board had been inserted in the Convention. Special prominence had been given by the United States and other countries to the system of rationing. It had finally been decided, however, that there should be no system of rationing, and the Central Board had thereby from the start appeared as a body which, in the views of certain critics, could only be regarded as hybrid and ineffective. He was prepared to accept the Central Board supplemented with a

system of rationing, and he did not think that his attitude was in that respect inconsistent, as M. Bourgois had suggested. The Central Board, supplemented with a system of rationing, would be something quite different from the Central Board as constituted under the present Convention, and, to permit of the necessary changes being made, the Convention would have to be amended. In that case, it could be brought more into conformity with the Covenant, and the Central Board might take its place as a subordinate organ of the League.

He would observe, in reply to M. Sato, that the vote taken in the Fourth Committee could not be regarded as disposing of the question of principle. The Fourth Committee had not gone into the substance of the question at issue; the question of principle had not, indeed, been discussed at all. He himself had presented certain observations, and there had been a certain reaction against those observations, but even in the Fifth Committee there had been no thorough discussion of the matter. No one had been able to say in that Committee precisely what would be the duties of the Central Board. It was true that his own proposal had been rejected in that Committee by seventeen votes to two, and that the Assembly had ratified that decision. He would point out, however, that most members abstained from voting, a circumstance which did not indicate any very great enthusiasm on behalf of the Central Board. The question would undoubtedly be brought again before the Committee of the Assembly when the Assembly came to consider the expenditure to be incurred under the Convention, and he was sure that on the next occasion the discussion would be thorough and extensive.

If during the recent session of the Assembly a different decision had been taken, the result would not necessarily have been disastrous. The parties concerned would have come together and discussed the possibility of a general agreement which all might accept and agree to carry into effect. Such a discussion might have resulted in the duties of the Central Board being transferred to another body working within the League and dependent on it. Many States were prepared to discuss the matter; they could see wherein the Convention was defective and were prepared to amend it in those particulars. It was possible for the duties of the Central Board to be performed by the Advisory Committee itself through an executive body chosen by the Committee, or at any rate through a body constitutionally within the League. Real unanimity might be achieved along those lines.

He had said enough to show why he could not vote for the conclusions of the Sub-Committee. He was prepared to do all that was possible to secure ultimate agreement, and he would, of course, continue to collaborate wholeheartedly with the Committee in its work.

M. SATO (Japan) asked whether it was necessary to take a vote as the Chairman had proposed. The adoption of the report of the Sub-Committee was not an urgent matter. He agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that dissension in the Committee was bad for its work. The Committee needed the collaboration of Italy. Was it advisable in the circumstances to take a vote on a report which was not really urgent, thus emphasising the disagreement which had occurred? M. Cavazzoni had alluded to the possibility of ultimate agreement. Was it possible to advance in that direction? He would tentatively suggest that the Sub-Committee might be asked to continue its work with the collaboration of M. Cavazzoni, in order to ascertain whether it was not possible to remove the existing divergencies. M. Cavazzoni had said that he would accept the Central Board supplemented by a system of rationing.

The question of quotas, however, had been dropped long ago, and there was no need to return to it. But perhaps it would be possible to re-examine the question of the Central Board so as to make the Board more easily acceptable to Italy.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked M. Sato for his suggestion, which appeared, however, to go rather far. It would, in fact, involve a modification of the Convention, and that was a task beyond the powers of the Sub-Committee. It was not possible to take up questions such as that of rationing, which would involve an amendment of the Convention, without instructions from the Council, or until one of the Governments which had ratified the Convention submitted a request to that effect.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked whether it would not be possible to eliminate from the report of the Sub-Committee all the theoretical and legal considerations which had given rise to M. Cavazzoni's criticism, and confine this report to the two paragraphs which stated the respective duties of the Advisory Committee and the Central Board under the terms of the Convention and of the Covenant. The report, thus simplified, would then be a mere statement of facts, and could hardly give rise to any more objections on the part of M. Cavazzoni.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had unanimously decided to close the discussion and to proceed to a vote on the report of the Sub-Committee. He did not think it would be useful to continue the discussion on another issue. The proposal of M. Bourgois virtually involved presenting no report at all. M. Bourgois had suggested that the report should state the duties of the Advisory Committee and of the Central Board under the terms of the Convention. The Convention, however, contained no reference to the Advisory Committee, and the report contemplated by M. Bourgois would therefore merely reproduce the provisions of the Convention relating to the Central Board.

He would again propose that the Committee should proceed to a vote on the report of the Sub-Committee.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he was not proposing to reopen the discussion, but was merely suggesting that the report of the Sub-Committee should be confined to the paragraphs which it already contained and which were connected with the powers of the Advisory Committee and the Central Board. M. Cavazzoni had not made any criticism of those particular paragraphs.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) supported the proposal of M. Bourgois.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had already decided, unanimously, to vote without further discussion on the report of the Sub-Committee. M. Sato had then presented a suggestion, but that suggestion had presumably fallen to the ground, since M. Cavazzoni, to whom it was addressed, had not accepted it.

M. Bourgois had then proposed that the report should be amended ; it would be referred back to the Sub-Committee, and would again be discussed after reconsideration by the Sub-Committee.

M. SATO (Japan) enquired whether M. Cavazzoni would sit on the Sub-Committee for the purpose of amending the report.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that he presumed that the Sub-Committee would be instructed to eliminate from the report everything except the paragraphs which described the relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board under the Convention. He would, of course, be willing to sit on the Sub-Committee in these circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Sub-Committee, if the report were referred back to it, must not be bound by any observations made by individual members of the Advisory Committee. M. Cavazzoni had only agreed to sit on the Sub-Committee on condition that the report was amended in the sense indicated by M. Bourgois. That condition, however, could not be imposed.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that every member of the Sub-Committee would, of course, be entirely free. The decision just taken showed the position adopted. His own attitude on the Sub-Committee would be that which he had already defined. He would endeavour to reach an agreement by eliminating from the report everything except a simple statement of the respective position of the Central Board and the Committee as they stood under the terms of the Convention and of Article 23 of the Covenant.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that, in the circumstances, he was willing to sit on the Sub-Committee.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) urged that a vote should be taken on the proposal of M. Bourgois.

The CHAIRMAN put the proposal of M. Bourgois to the vote.

Five members voted in favour of the proposal, three members voted against it, two members abstained and three members were absent.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), explaining his abstention, said that Germany had been obliged to make a reservation as to the composition of the Central Board, and had therefore not ratified the Convention. He accordingly preferred to take no part in the vote.

ELEVENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Tuesday, October 4th, 1927, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

120. Approval of the Minutes of the First, Second and Third Meetings.

The Committee adopted the Minutes of the First to Third Meetings, subject to minor amendments, which were handed in to the Secretariat.

121. Method of presenting Documents regarding Seizures.

The SECRETARY asked the Committee to advise the Secretariat as to the system of circulation of seizure documents. In the past, each seizure report was quickly distributed to the members, and a system of serial numbering had been adopted which enabled subsequent reports on the same case to be connected up. The Drafting Committee of the General

Secretariat had suggested that new methods might be adopted. The Secretary read the letters to and from the Drafting Committee and Administrative Officer on this subject.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that there were two advantages in the present system. In the first place, all Governments received information about particular seizures and not only those immediately concerned. The illicit traffic was largely in the hands of groups and the report often indicated that persons were implicated who were already known to some other Government in other connections. All Governments, therefore, should receive the reports of seizures as soon as possible, but the proposal of a monthly bulletin would mean that only the Governments particularly interested would be immediately informed. The other advantage was that all documents on the same seizure received the same numbering and could be connected with the original report. A certain proportion of these reports were always of first importance, and Sir Malcolm Delevingne doubted whether a monthly bulletin would be as useful as the present system of separate communication.

He would therefore be sorry to abandon the present system, though it did give the members a large pile of documents which they were disinclined to bring to the meetings. Perhaps only the more important reports might be printed, and at the same time some method devised to connect up the correspondence.

The Committee decided in favour of the maintenance of the present system of dealing with seizure reports.

122. Question of taking Legislative Measures to make possible the Punishment of Persons using the Territory of one Country to carry on the Illicit Traffic in other Countries.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) wished to refer to the case of a man, Lederer, who had carried on the illicit traffic from Bulgarian territory. The concluding sentence of the Bulgarian Government's reply to the Secretariat stated that, "as Lederer did not import narcotic drugs into the Kingdom of Bulgaria or trade in them, he was not prosecuted". This situation indicated the need for provisions in the national legislations which would enable the punishment of persons who used the territory of one country to carry on the illicit traffic in other countries.

This principle had been approved by the Advisory Committee and an effort was made to include a provision on the subject in the Geneva Agreement and Convention. Article 29 of the Convention and the corresponding article in the Agreement laid down that "the Contracting Parties will examine in the most favourable spirit the possibility of taking legislative measures to render punishable acts committed within their jurisdiction, for the purpose of procuring or assisting the commission in any place outside their jurisdiction of any act which constitutes an offence against the laws of that place relating to the matters dealt with in the present Convention". He would be glad if members would say what steps their Governments had taken to give effect to this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in India, he believed the matter was now being considered by the Legislature; there was reason to think that it would probably be possible to introduce such provisions.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, if the silence of the members indicated that nothing was being done, it would be impossible to deal with a person who used countries having this gap in their law as a base where he could direct his operations with impunity. The Committee should make a strong recommendation that this gap should be filled as soon as possible, and he would be prepared to draft a resolution if desired.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Article 4, paragraph 3, of the German Penal Code laid down that a German could be punished for an offence committed in a foreign country if the offence was punishable in Germany as well as in the foreign country in question. A foreigner could only be punished, however, for an offence committed in Germany.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he had referred rather to acts in Germany, either by a German or an alien, which would form part of a series of operations to be completed outside Germany. The Lederer case had shown that the illicit traffickers knew the laws and were frequently able to evade them.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) read the following statement: "I would refer to the legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States providing for the control of production and traffic in the dangerous drugs mentioned in the Hague Convention in the territory under its jurisdiction as well as the participation in the international traffic in such drugs by United States citizens or those within its jurisdiction.

"The participation by American citizens and others within the jurisdiction of the United States in the international traffic in narcotic drugs is controlled under an Act of January 17th, 1914, and by the Act of May 26th, 1927, amendatory thereof, known as the Narcotic Drugs Imports and Exports Act."

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he thought that this covered his point.

M. BOURGOIS (France) reminded the Committee that the French Law of July 12th, 1916, for narcotics covered the recommendations formulated in Article 29 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925. The second paragraph of Article 2 of this law stipulated in effect that "those who have facilitated the use of these substances by other people, either by procuring a place of trade or by any other means, shall suffer the same penalty". The words "by any other means" enabled the tribunals to punish the infringement in question.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that the Italian Penal Code allowed the pursuit of a crime committed either in Italy or abroad. The most recent provisions were extremely severe and the Italian law laid down that the State could punish a crime committed abroad when the foreign State in question did not prosecute. This was governed by the Law of February 18th, 1903, and M. Cavazzoni thought that it would apply even to a foreigner in Italy.

The Committee approved of the suggestion of Sir Malcolm Delevingne and expressed the wish that he would draft a resolution to be considered at the same time as the Committee's report to the Council.

123. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs by Kiaochow Customs Authorities.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) drew the attention of the Japanese representative to the fact that this document (O.C.501 (b)) stated that, in six cases where Japanese subjects had been convicted of smuggling drugs into China, the sentences varied from fifteen to twenty-five days' detention, in some cases with deportation. He felt that these penalties were extraordinarily light compared with the profits to be derived from the traffic.

M. SATO (Japan) said that he agreed that the penalties were light. But the present regulations for the Japanese Consular Tribunals in China only allowed detention up to thirty days. Before the Consular Tribunals lighter sentences were usual than in the country itself. The Japanese Government was already giving its attention to the question. M. Sato would be glad if his colleagues could say what punishment the other Consular Tribunals in China could give.

He pointed out that a consul frequently found it much more difficult than a professional judge to satisfy his conscience that his judgment was just, and for this reason he felt that punishment by Consular Tribunals could not be so severe as in Japan. He would, however, communicate with his Government, and would give the Committee further information.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that this point was one of general interest. The King's Regulations for British subjects in China laid down that British Tribunals in China could impose a fine not exceeding £50, or imprisonment with hard labour for a term not exceeding six months, or both these penalties.

It appeared that members found difficulty in discussing the seizure reports owing to the fact that they had not brought their reports with them.

The SECRETARY said that further copies of these reports could be distributed whenever desired.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that he had understood that it was only proposed to discuss the general principles of the illicit traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, if the examination of the detailed reports were postponed to January, there would be harder work, and less result.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) pointed out that he had no objection to discussing the details, but merely said that he could not rely on his recollection of the documents.

Colonel WOODS said that, from a professional point of view, he agreed that it was important to examine these matters as early as possible after the offence was committed, as every month decreased the chance of punishing the offender.

This session had been called for the specific consideration of the illicit traffic and the means to circumvent it. The only objection appeared to be that there were not enough documents. There appeared to be weighty reasons for, and no reasons for not, considering the reports.

M. BOURGOIS (France) was in agreement with Colonel Woods and Sir Malcolm Delevingne. The documents in question should be discussed. The Committee should not limit its study of the illicit traffic to a discussion of principle ; it should examine the facts. The members had examined the documents on seizures ; they should be examined during this session whilst they were still clear in their minds.

He proposed that the documents should be examined one by one in the same order as that in which they had been classed by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to deal with the cases in order.

124. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Cocaine at Copenhagen.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands), referring to document O.C.457, said that the investigations on this matter were not yet at an end.

125. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Cocaine at Hong-Kong.

In reply to Sir Malcolm Delevingne, M. SATO (Japan) said that he had no further information to add to the document (O.C.493).

126. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Genoa.

In connection with document O.C.521, Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) referred to the letter from Dr. Carrière dated October 26th, 1926, with reference to this consignment of drugs as aluminium goods. It appeared that Messrs. Jacky, Mäder & Co., with whom the cases had been deposited in the first instance, knew of the actual contents. Did this firm explain by whom and in what circumstances the cases were despatched to it ? The origin of the transaction appeared at present to be wrapped in mystery and it was desirable to clear it up.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) stated that investigation had established the fact that the perpetrators of the infringement were a certain Zimmerli and his employee. Zimmerli, who had been authorised to trade in narcotics, had been able, thanks to this authorisation, to procure a certain quantity of heroin and morphine, and it was this which he had had sent to Genoa as coming from a house of the name of Peters in Berlin, under the declaration "aluminium goods". Investigation had shown that Peters had never existed and that the letters which were attributed to that house were forgeries by Zimmerli. As a result of this investigation, Zimmerli was prosecuted, but, unfortunately, he escaped before his arrest. As regards his accomplice, named Hatze, he had been sentenced to imprisonment and a fine. It was needless to add that the authorisation to trade in narcotics had been withdrawn from Zimmerli and that if he returned to Switzerland he would be immediately arrested. As regards the house of Jacky, Mäder & Co., who had been entrusted with the expedition of the consignment, the firm had been able to prove its complete innocence. It was ignorant of the contents of the consignment. For the rest, Dr. Carrière referred the Committee to the explanations he had given it at the meeting held on January 27th, 1927 (Ninth Session).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he felt his question was fully justified by the reply from Dr. Carrière, which cleared the matter up.

127. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Morphine at Hong-Kong.

With regard to document O.C.526, M. SATO (Japan) said that two Japanese had been involved in the case. One, Tanaka, was arrested and imprisoned. The other, Harada, had apparently obtained a permit to import a considerable quantity of morphine. The Japanese authorities had investigated the matter but had found that no certificate was issued in December. Perhaps the Hong-Kong authorities had been mistaken regarding the date. At any rate, the Japanese authorities were now verifying the issue of a certificate to Harada.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the case raised a question of principle. He had consulted the Hong-Kong authorities, who told him that the import certificates had been returned immediately to Harada. It was printed in English, and they presumed it was a copy, as they supposed that the original would be in Japanese. It purported to be from the Japanese authorities in Tokio. Harada evidently valued it, and produced it immediately, adding that he had no need to smuggle while possessing this certificate. The Hong-Kong official had suggested that, in order to overcome the difficulty which had arisen in connection with this certificate, all such certificates should be certified by the Consul-General of the receiving country. This was, the official believed, the practice of the United States authorities.

He mentioned the case in order that it might be considered with any proposals the Sub-Committee might care to make.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) referred to the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, adding that importations were, by this law, restricted to crude opium and coca leaves, and were limited to such quantities as were considered necessary, by the

Federal Authorities Control Board, for legitimate and medical use only. Individual import licences for specific quantities within such limits were issued by the Board to manufacturers properly qualified under the Internal Revenue Law, having apparatus or equipment in use in the manufacture of the derivatives of opium and coca leaves. The American Consul at the port of exportation would not certify the invoice covering such shipments until duly informed of the issue of such a permit. All narcotic drugs arriving in the United States without due authority were subject to seizure and confiscation.

M. SATO (Japan) said that the import certificate in use in his country was always in English. Since January 1926, the Japanese Government had adopted special wording and materials for these documents. He would be able to furnish specimens of the prescribed forms at the January session.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that this information would be extremely valuable, and that it would be desirable that all officials inspecting such documents should have a copy of the form in use by the various Governments.

TWELFTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

Held on Wednesday, October 5th, 1927, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

128. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs on the *Fumana* at the Barry Dock, London.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the curious nature of this case (document O.C.546).

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that three years had been spent in tracing the consignment. The case illustrated the various ways in which drugs were able to escape control and emphasised the difficulty of such enquiries.

129. Illicit Traffic : Seizures effected by the Customs Authorities at Shanghai.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) observed that these seizures included two consignments of drugs manufactured in Great Britain (document O.C.569). The British authorities had made the necessary enquiries, from which it appeared that the drugs had formed part of consignments which had been exported from Great Britain to Czechoslovakia on the authority of import certificates issued by the Czechoslovak Government. The exports, therefore, were quite regular so far as the British Government was concerned. The Czechoslovak Government had made enquiries into the circumstances. The firm which had imported the drugs in question was Noris Zahn, of Prague, a firm to which reference had also been made in a letter from Dr. Anselmino of February 28th, which had been distributed to the Committee.

The consignment had reached the illicit traffic through a pharmacist living in another town of Czechoslovakia to whom Noris Zahn had sold 100 kilogrammes of diacetylmorphine. It was surprising that the wholesale firm which had imported the drug should have sold to the pharmacist a quantity so largely in excess of ordinary business requirements. The demand for such a large quantity should have aroused suspicion in the firm which was asked to supply it.

The particulars would be found in a letter from the Czechoslovak Government to the Secretary-General dated June 8th, 1927 (document O.C.569(a)). So long as the sale of such a large quantity to a pharmacist was regarded by the authorities as a legitimate transaction, the efforts of the League to supervise the illicit traffic would obviously be futile.

The Czechoslovak Government had since authorised the same firm to import a further consignment of drugs from Great Britain. In reply to an enquiry from the British Government, the Czechoslovak Government had stated that this authorisation had been granted to the firm subsequent to the enquiries which had been made into the seizure at Shanghai. The Czechoslovak Government accordingly did not appear to see anything blameworthy in the behaviour of Noris Zahn & Co.

M. BOURGOIS (France) reminded the Committee that the import certificate system did not exist in Czechoslovakia.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) replied that the suspicions of the firm in question should certainly have been aroused and that it was morally responsible as a firm which was authorised to trade in dangerous drugs.

The CHAIRMAN said that an effective system of supervision necessitated a periodical inspection of the books of wholesale dealers. Such inspection would have shown that 100 kilogrammes of morphine had been sold to a pharmacist. He thought the Committee would agree that the case indicated a grave defect in the system of control existing in the country concerned.

Colonel WOODS said it was obvious that the Czechoslovak Government had no complete system of supervision. Had this case arisen owing to the fact that the wholesale dealers were not required to keep any record of their transactions with retail firms? It would be interesting to know exactly at what point the defect in the system of control occurred.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said the question at issue was extremely important. If the Committee could succeed in making a useful recommendation to deal with such cases, nine-tenths of the illicit traffic could be suppressed. Delay in the inspection of the sales books was a very grave cause of fraud. When books were inspected a fortnight after the transaction, the drugs would already have escaped and the dealer as well, if he were working in "furnished rooms".

The CHAIRMAN said the the Committee had no detailed information regarding the system of control in Czechoslovakia. Sir Malcolm Delevingne had rightly emphasised that any wholesale dealer asked to supply so large a quantity of morphine to a pharmacist must know that he was being asked to become a party to what was obviously an illicit transaction. The question arose why the Czechoslovak Government had allowed a firm responsible for such a transaction to continue in business and why it should regard its activities as in no way reprehensible. Such an attitude appeared to show a complete misapprehension of the realities of the situation. There was another point. Any system of control, to be effective, must be based on a system of inspection, and any efficient system of inspection would have revealed this amazing transaction. He would have thought that the authorities would, in such a case, have immediately removed the firm in question from its list of authorised dealers.

Colonel WOODS asked whether it could not be assumed that, if the Czechoslovak Government had put into force and efficiently administered a system of control such as had often been recommended by the Committee, such cases could not possibly occur.

The CHAIRMAN said that undoubtedly such an assumption was correct.

Mr. LYALL said that the justice of the decision to confiscate the drugs seized by the Customs authorities at Shanghai had been questioned. It was evident that, if a firm imported heroin into Shanghai and openly declared it as heroin, confiscation was a somewhat strong measure. If, however, regard was had to the size of the consignments described in the document under consideration, the action of the authorities could not fail to be considered as justified. In all these cases the firms concerned had apparently fulfilled their legal obligations, but firms which were granted the right to manufacture dangerous drugs had also a moral responsibility. It was only necessary to compare the quantities seized with the amount of heroin legally consumed in Germany in 1926 (50 kilogrammes) to realise that the quantities described in the document were excessive. The present state of China and the prevalence of smuggling in that country were facts known to the exporting firms, or facts which could easily be ascertained from the consular officers of the countries concerned.

In order to import drugs into Shanghai it was necessary to obtain a permit from the consul-general of the exporting country. No consul-general would endorse a permit to import such large quantities as those which had been seized, even if the consignments were addressed to a large druggist, and they would be even less likely to endorse such a permit for consignments to an unknown individual. The importer acted accordingly. Since he knew that he would not be able to obtain a permit from the consul-general, and since reputable manufacturers could not undertake the responsibility of sending drugs through the post under a false or obscure declaration, the importer must himself take the risk of getting the packets through the Customs. It was impossible for the Customs authorities to examine all postal packets in detail. The documents accompanying them were therefore examined by a senior officer of the Customs, who decided which of them should be specially investigated. That official was above suspicion, but it was probably possible to find a junior officer in the service who would be prepared to get the packets through the Customs without the knowledge of the senior officer. Such probably was the plan adopted by the individuals importing the goods. It was significant that the seizures had suddenly begun to be effected in the December quarter of 1926. Probably these illicit

imports had been going on for some time, and they had begun to be detected owing to some change in the Customs staff or in the procedure of examining postal packets.

It would be interesting if the books of Frey & Co., of Basle, and of F. Wecker-Frey & Co., of Zurich, could be examined. It could then be ascertained whether they had in the past been in the habit of consigning large quantities of heroin to Shanghai through the post and it might thus be possible to trace the individual importers.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the enquiries made in Czechoslovakia had shown that it was possible to trace the passage of drugs despatched from Germany. The labels indicated both the purchasers and the dates. That circumstance appeared to meet the views of M. Cavazzoni on a question which was dealt with in his memorandum.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said there were other points which arose in regard to the document before the Committee. There had been seizures of postal packets despatched from Switzerland, France and the Netherlands. He would like to know whether the representatives of these countries had any observations to make.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) stated that the Frey case at Basle constituted a perfectly clear case of illicit traffic. In fact, there was no firm in Basle of that name. It was therefore a case of a consignment made under a false name, and the investigations opened by the postal administration had, up to now, not resulted in the establishment of the identity of the consignor. That being the case, it had not been possible to discover the origin of the drugs, but the search was still being continued. Dr. Carrière added that the ratification, in the near future, of the Geneva Convention would result in a revision of the Swiss legislation regarding narcotics. The Government would doubtless take this occasion to examine the possibility of making more stringent the regulations applicable to the sending of narcotics by post. But it would nevertheless still be difficult to stop completely the despatch of undeclared drugs through this channel.

As regards the consignments of F. Wecker-Frey & Co., of Zurich, and Hefti, of Altstetten, which had been mentioned, they were made under perfectly legal conditions from the point of view of Swiss legislation. They were, in fact, accompanied by export permits delivered by the Swiss authorities, which had been seized at Shanghai at the same time as the consignment. China not having accepted the system of export and import certificates, the Swiss authorities had up till quite lately delivered, without any other formality, the export permits for that country, but at the exporter's risk. The Swiss authorities had therefore considered that seizures such as those now in question, and which Mr. Lyall had himself recognised as of real gravity, did not concern them, and were the sole business of the importer and exporter.

Nevertheless, the Swiss authorities, wishing to avoid incidents of this nature, had entered into negotiations with the Chinese Legation at Berne. From these negotiations, an arrangement had been evolved whereby export permits would no longer be granted except on the presentation of an import permit delivered by the Chinese Naval Customs, and countersigned, if possible, by a consul. Furthermore, the Swiss authorities reserve the right to limit the quantities exported, and to reduce them in case of need to five kilogrammes.

Dr. Carrière gathered that Mr. Lyall had stated the case to the Swiss Consul-General at Shanghai. He must draw attention to the fact that, as the importers were not of Swiss nationality, the Consul-General was not called upon to interfere. On the other hand, Dr. Carrière had recently had occasion to discuss the question with the Swiss Consul-General at Shanghai, and had asked him to be so good as to inform him of and point out to him all suspicious cases which came to his knowledge, and to suggest to him any measures which he considered useful.

Dr. Carrière was of the opinion that his Government had taken all possible steps to avoid a repetition of such incidents as those in question.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he noted in the document under discussion four cases of shipments from Marseilles involving, it was true, only small quantities. He did not know whether the French authorities had been advised in regard to those consignments. If application had been made to the French authorities, they would very probably have allowed these consignments to go forward as the quantities were small, there being no valid or legal reason for refusing such applications in view of the fact that the system of import and export certificates had not been adopted in China. He drew attention to the fact that in this connection he had asked the Secretariat to prepare a note concerning the conditions of control which existed in China. He would ask that there should be added to this note information concerning the measures which had been taken by the Governments of Germany, Great Britain, Japan and Switzerland to regulate the despatch of drugs to China. He was quite prepared to recommend the French authorities to adopt similar measures.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he could not give any information in regard to the consignments from the Netherlands beyond the particulars contained in his letter to the Secretary of the Advisory Committee dated August 19th. The Netherlands Government had written to the Netherlands Consul-General at Shanghai, asking for further particulars. He would support the request which had been made by M. Bourgois concerning the note to be prepared by the Secretariat. He would like to recommend his Government to take measures similar to those which had already been taken by the Governments of Germany, Great Britain, Japan and Switzerland.

Mr. LYALL, referring to the observations of Dr. Carrière, said he had not intended, in his reference to the consular officers at Shanghai, to make any criticism of their conduct. He had merely expressed his conviction that no consul-general would have issued a permit for the import of such large quantities of drugs as those to which he had referred, and to say that, if Swiss nationals desired to obtain information in regard to the conditions prevailing in China, they could certainly obtain that information from their Consul-General at Shanghai.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) thanked Mr. Lyall for his assurances.

M. SATO (Japan) referred to the consignment from Messrs. F. Wecker-Frey & Co., of Zurich, to Araki Yoko, who was apparently a Japanese subject. There was no question here of drugs exported from Japan. All Japanese subjects in China who imported drugs from Japan were subject to the new regulations, which he had described at a previous meeting of the Committee. It was necessary for a Japanese subject who desired to import drugs from abroad to conform with the provisions of No. 693 of the Chinese Maritime Customs Regulations, which had been recognised by the Japanese Government. These regulations required a Japanese importer desiring permission to import dangerous drugs to apply to a Japanese consul at the port concerned, and the application must be signed by the applicant in the presence of the consul. The application must then be presented to the Chinese Maritime Customs, which granted a legal permit to import the goods. He inferred that, in the present case, the necessary document had apparently not accompanied the goods. The quantity imported was unusually large, and he would make enquiries of the Japanese Consul-General at Shanghai. He was unaware whether any such person as Araki Yoko actually existed.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland), replying to M. Bourgois, who had suggested that certain Governments should be asked to give information regarding the measures taken to regulate the export of narcotics to China, wished to complete the information he had given a few moments ago by adding that, if the countries in question had not adopted the certificate system, the Swiss authorities would send to the Government of the importing country a copy of the export licence delivered by it; this applied to every consignment, however small. The authorities of the importing countries would thus be fully warned.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said he would like further details in regard to one or two points. He referred in particular to the despatches from Marseilles. The quantities involved were very considerable, and one of these consignments had been exported to order. Moreover, all the consignments had been described wrongly. One was described as cocoa, another as cotton tissue and another as cotton tissue and perfumery. He would like to know the result of the enquiries made by the French Government into the action of the firms which had exported the drugs. More particularly, how had those firms explained their misdescription of the goods? Were the firms recognised by the authorities in any way as entitled to deal in drugs, and what proceedings were being taken against them?

He would also like to know whether any definite action had been taken by the Japanese authorities to investigate the case of the consignment from F. Wecker-Frey & Co., of Zurich, to Araki Yoko.

M. SATO (Japan) said that particulars of the seizures contained in document O.C.569 had been sent to the Japanese Government, but he had not yet received any information in regard to them. As the question was important, he would write and ask the Japanese Consul-General at Shanghai to go into the matter.

M. BOURGOIS (France) referred to the letter which he had addressed to the Secretary-General on the subject of the consignments from Marseilles.

Mr. LYALL said that the system of certificates issued by the Consul-General for the import of drugs had hitherto worked quite successfully. He need not say that under no circumstances had a consul-general ever issued a certificate for excessive quantities of drugs.

The CHAIRMAN said that a number of interesting points had been raised. The cases before the Committee might be regarded as concrete examples, illustrating the inevitable result of defects in the system of control exercised by certain Governments. There were three main points. First, it was clear that where the system of export and import certificates had not been introduced, or where that system was imperfectly worked or insufficiently known, there was a clear opportunity for those who engaged in the illicit traffic. Secondly, it was obvious that in all countries where the internal control over the distribution of the drugs was not sufficiently strict, or where inspection was inadequate, drugs escaped into the illicit channels. Thirdly, it was clear that in all such cases there was usually very serious delay in getting the facts examined and placed before the Committee.

All these defects would, he thought, be remedied by the effective application of the Geneva Convention. The application of that Convention implied the introduction of the import and export certificate system, with all the details necessary for its effective working.

The Convention further provided for a supervisory body, which would have before it more recent statistics than were available for this Committee, and a more expeditious machinery for following up illicit operations.

130. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs at Shanghai during the March Quarter 1927.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the seizure referred to on page 3 of document O.C.608 was part of a large shipment of medicines for the administration of the Eastern Chinese Railways. This shipment had included 150 boxes of medicaments. The very small quantity of cocaine had been certified as being for the proper use of the railways, and Dr. Anselmino therefore thought that this did not come under the illicit traffic, and was outside the scope of the Committee's discussions.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) drew the attention of M. Bourgois to the fact that in this document there were the names of two other persons at Marseilles who had been sending by post to China consignments of drugs declared as cotton tissue. There was also a name which had appeared in a previous list, one Luigi, working at Chiasso.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) explained, with regard to the case under discussion, that the legal authorities of the Canton of Tessin had been informed, and had started investigations. It was necessary to prevent Chiasso, a town in Tessin, near the Italian frontier, from becoming a smuggling centre for drugs between Switzerland and Italy, and the Federal authorities had asked the Tessin authorities to exercise a careful supervision with regard to this matter. Dr. Carrière would communicate to the Committee any additional information which he might receive.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, after the receipt of a letter from the Secretariat on July 12th, he had referred the Marseilles question to the French authorities, and he proposed to emphasise in that quarter the importance of the matter. In reply to a question by the Chairman, M. Bourgois said that he had already received a letter dated June 3rd regarding this matter.

M. SATO (Japan) pointed out that the information given on page 4 of the document under consideration, regarding the three cases of drugs sent by post, was very incomplete, no names even being given.

The Committee decided that, in view of Dr. Anselmino's remarks, page 3 of this document should be deleted.

131. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs by the Estonian Police.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain), said that document O.C.570 seemed at least to show that certain Eastern European countries were countries of transit for the traffic. The Estonian authorities appeared to be active, and he here recalled the decision of the Committee to ask the Lithuanian and Estonian Governments for information as to their methods of control.

132. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs during the September Quarter 1927.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the reports furnished by the Chinese Government of seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs (document O.C.571) did not give any particulars : if the exporting countries were to investigate seizures, it was essential that they should have something much more informative than such documents. The Secretary-General had been asked to take the matter up with the Chinese Government, and in doing so he might quote such documents as O.C.571 or 624 as examples.

133. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Cocaine at Calcutta.

The CHAIRMAN explained the nature of this case (document O.C.574). Drugs had arrived at Calcutta from the Far East.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) noted that this traffic with forged labels originated in the Far East. By the use of forged German labels, the traffickers endeavoured to sell a poor quality cocaine as coming from reputable German firms.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was another instance of the enormous amount of cocaine smuggling into India.

134. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Cocaine at Trieste.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), referring to document O.C.575, said that the man Katzmaser was not a German national, nor was the village of Glanfort referred to in Germany.

135. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs.

The CHAIRMAN said that this document (O.C.576), dealing with seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs, largely concerned drugs found on the persons of Japanese subjects.

M. SATO (Japan) said that his Government was investigating a number of cases and would give results in due course.

136. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs in the Netherlands and in the Dutch East Indies.

The CHAIRMAN said that documents O.C.577 and 578 showed the quantities of drugs involved and the ingenuity used in exporting from China to the Dutch East Indies.

137. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs by Chinese Maritime Customs.

The CHAIRMAN said he was sorry that there was no Chinese representative present. He would have liked to ask for details as to this seizure (document O.C.579) and as to the way in which the opium was alleged to be identified as Indian opium.

138. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs in the United States.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) asked whether the figure of 21,576 ounces, stated on page 3 of document O.C.580 as having been found at Chicago, was correct.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) regretted that he was unable to give further particulars. He would, however, be glad to obtain any information the Committee desired.

The CHAIRMAN noted the large figures for seizures on the Pacific coast.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that such information would be infinitely more valuable if it could reach the Advisory Committee earlier.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said that he had the assurance of the United States Government that it would in future send reports of seizures as soon as possible.

Mr. LYALL noted that there was no information whatever as to the factory or country from which the drugs came.

Colonel WOODS asked whether a report had yet been received from the United States for 1927.

The SECRETARY replied that no communications had been received since the report of 1926, save Colonel Woods's own letter of July 28th in connection with punishments.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) in reply to Sir Malcolm Delevingne's earlier question, said that the amount of opium found in Chicago and mentioned in the document under discussion was 290 packages, or 21.76 ounces of heroin.

139. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Calcutta.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that this was one of several cases in which the drugs of Koto Seiyaku, Ltd., of Japan, were concerned (document O.C.581). He thought that all these cases might be considered together with special reference to the application of Resolution 2 adopted at the last session of the Committee.

140. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Calcutta, Rangoon, Montreal and Vancouver.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) explained that these three cases (documents O.C.581, 612 and 649) concerned drugs made by Koto Seiyaku, Ltd., and two cases involved a considerable amount. Document O.C.581 referred to 100 ounces of cocaine seized at Calcutta and document O.C.612 to 400 ounces seized at Rangoon. The authorities gave particulars of the packing, labels and marks. Document O.C. 649 referred to a series of cases in which a large gang was involved.

At his request, M. Sato had drawn the attention of the Japanese Government to this matter, and he had thought that the method of discovering the sources of supply of the traffic suggested in the second resolution adopted by the Committee at its January session might be here applied. M. Sato had given him particulars explaining that the preliminary investigations showed that the drugs made by Koto Seiyaku, Ltd., were handled by two agencies and eleven companies, and that, so far, no irregularities had been found in their

dealings. These, however, were not cases which could be accounted for by small leakages through the retail pharmacies. The drugs probably found their way into the illicit traffic at a point higher up, either at the factory or the wholesaler. Sir Malcolm Delevingne did not wish to make any imputations as regards this company, but he felt fairly sure that these quantities had leaked out in a way which could be discovered if the measures were taken as recommended in their second resolution of January last.

M. SATO (Japan) said that, as regards document O. C. 581 concerning the seizures of cocaine at Calcutta, the Japanese Government had been directly informed by the Indian Government and had replied in August to the British ambassador at Tokio: A copy of this reply had not been sent to the Secretariat. The reply had not yet been received from his Government concerning the question raised in document O.C.649. As regards the seizure operated at Rangoon, M. Sato had recently given Sir Malcolm Delevingne information on this point.

It was regrettable that the cocaine of Koto Seiyaku, Ltd., should be the object of the illicit traffic. He had personally concerned himself with the matter and his Government was making investigations.

Koto Seiyaku, Ltd., were extremely annoyed at the contraband traffic in their goods. They had themselves adopted the system of numbering the receptacles containing their drugs and of putting upon them the date of manufacture. This experiment was watched with great interest by the Japanese authorities, who thought it would be of great use to know the destination of the drugs of this company. M. Sato hoped that this method would give more satisfactory results, as the question of leakage was an important one for Japan, though particularly hard to control in producing countries.

M. Sato wished to add that his position was, to some extent, less favourable than that of the other members of the Committee, as he had no direct administrative power, and was separated by a great distance from his country.

Colonel Woods said that there were two or three points he would like to raise as regards document O.C.649. It showed, in the first place, the excellent results to be obtained by the close co-operation between two countries. It also showed the enormous amount of smuggling into Canada. It referred to boxes holding 50,000 ounces, seizures amounting to 1,400 ounces, and records of deliveries showing 2,200 ounces delivered between June and December.

From page 3 of document O. C. 649 it appeared that the drugs had come from Whiffen, sometimes through an agent in Switzerland. Some shipments were as high as a ton and a-half. This man Whiffen had had his licence withdrawn in England, and Colonel Woods would like to know how such amounts could get out of the country. He would be glad of any further information as regards the alleged agent in Switzerland.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) welcomed this opportunity to make a statement on the matter. On receiving the report in London, he had been struck by its contents and had written to the Canadian authorities, pointing out that Whiffen had lost his licence in April 1923 for dealings in the illicit traffic. Since then, he had had no authority to make or sell any drug coming under the Dangerous Drugs Act, and, so far as was known, he had not done so. It was presumed that Vaughan Harrison had bought from Whiffen before the end of 1923. The Canadian Government was asked to find out from the documents seized what was the latest date on which Vaughan Harrison obtained drugs from Whiffen. The answer was received that none of the documents to hand showed the dates when Vaughan Harrison obtained the drugs from Whiffen, that Farley's activities were confined to the distribution of the drugs imported by Vaughan Harrison and Astroff, and that the Canadian authorities had no knowledge of the last date of import, but hoped to have some information when they had caught Astroff. The statement that large quantities of drugs were bought from Whiffen was not based on any documentary evidence, but solely on statements made to the Canadian Government. Doubtless Whiffen and the smugglers did business before 1923.

THIRTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Wednesday, October 5th, 1927, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

141. **Illicit Traffic : Seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs.**

The CHAIRMAN, referring to documents O.C.582 and 583, observed that no details were given as to the seizures, but only the quantities intercepted. There was therefore no point in discussing the document.

142. **Agreement concluded between the Chinese and Swiss Governments with regard to the Import of Drugs from Switzerland to China : Letter from the Chinese Representative.**

Mr. LYALL, referring to document O.C.586, thought that the form of import certificate appended by the Chinese representative threw an unfair responsibility on the Commissioner of Customs. The Commissioner was not an expert in drugs, and could have no accurate knowledge as to the requirements of druggists in Shanghai, and still less of druggists in the interior of China. It was impossible, therefore, for him to state whether a consignment imported was required solely for medicinal or scientific purposes or not.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that two officials were concerned, the Superintendent of Customs and the Commissioner of Customs. Would the Superintendent be likely to have the knowledge necessary for him to assume responsibility ?

Mr. LYALL explained that the Superintendent was a Chinese official appointed solely for the management and control of the Customs. He was not a specialist in drug questions, though he was in a better position to obtain information from Chinese sources in regard to Chinese requirements than was the Commissioner of Customs.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Lyall thought any useful action could be taken by the Committee in the matter.

Mr. LYALL did not think so.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said it was incumbent on countries exporting drugs to China to satisfy themselves that the quantities despatched were sent to a reputable firm or to an individual who required the drugs for professional purposes, and that the quantities exported were not excessive.

The CHAIRMAN agreed. That, however, was a rather different question, which had already been dealt with by the Committee in previous resolutions.

M. BOURGOIS (France) represented that it was difficult for the authorities of a particular country to judge whether a specific consignment of drugs was excessive or not, in view of the fact that they did not know what other consignments were being sent to the country concerned.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) observed that certain consignments were quite obviously excessive, irrespective of any other consignments which might be going forward.

M. BOURGOIS (France) presumed that Sir Malcolm Delevingne was referring to the 80 kilogrammes of morphine despatched to China from a firm in Marseilles, to which reference had been made at the morning meeting. If he had been asked to license that consignment for export, he would have found it extremely difficult to refuse. He considered it necessary to draw attention to the fact that it was important to avoid making to Governments recommendations which could not be carried out in practice.

The CHAIRMAN said that no recommendation was being suggested. He was glad to note the observations of M. Bourgois, which were strong arguments in favour of the establishment of the Central Board.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed.

143. **Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs in Italy during the first Six Months of 1926.**

The CHAIRMAN noted, as regards document O.C.587, that, except for two consignments which had already been discussed, the quantities of drugs seized were small, and concerned only the internal traffic.

144. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs effected at Bombay.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said, as regards document O.C.588, that M. Sato had sent him a copy of a report by the Governor of the prefecture in which Kobé was situated regarding the investigations made by the authorities into this case.

145. Illicit Traffic : Transactions by the Firm of Arwed Broensen, of Hamburg.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) asked whether Dr. Carrière could give the Committee any information in regard to the firm of Buxtorf & Co., of Basle. This firm had been mentioned in a previous case, which would be found in document O.C.360(a).

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) replied that this house was merely a forwarding agent. He also remarked that the seizure referred to in document O.C.595 had been made before the application of the Swiss legislation on dangerous drugs.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) enquired what was the present position in regard to a firm of forwarding agents. Would they need a licence in order to take delivery of a consignment of drugs for storage ? In the present case the packing of the drugs had apparently been carried out in Basle on the premises of Messrs. Buxtorf & Co. Would that firm, under the present regulations, be required to obtain a licence in order to have possession of the drugs ?

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) declared that the Swiss legislation forbade the storage of narcotics, except of raw opium, which could be stored in the Customs depots but not in private ones. The opium stored under these conditions was placed under the control of the authorities, in the same way as that which the manufacturers held. It could not be re-exported without an export certificate made out in due form.

M. SATO (Japan) said that Dr. Anselmino had supplied him with the dates of the departure of the vessels referred to in the memorandum, and that enquiries were being made by the Japanese authorities.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) thought that the report was interesting as showing the value of international co-operation. The British Government had forwarded information to the German Government which had enabled the vessels concerned to be identified and a whole series of illicit transactions to be traced. He would ask whether anything was known to the French authorities concerning S. A. Goldberg, of Paris, under whose direction the despatch of the goods was carried out.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that as yet he had no information on the subject.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the report had been distributed in April, so that the French authorities might have made enquiries concerning Goldberg, who was implicated in a number of smuggling transactions.

146. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Singapore and Penang.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that document O.C.597 related to a further seizure of cocaine of the familiar brand of Fujitsuru. Could M. Sato give the Committee any information in regard to the matter ? The wrapper of the consignment had been sent to M. Sato as a clue to the identity of the firm. The brand did not appear at all in the legitimate trade. He would refer, in this connection, to document O.C.679, which described a seizure at Calcutta of the same brand of cocaine, and he had since had two further reports from the Government of India relating to seizures of cocaine bearing the same mark. Thus within a short period 150 ounces of cocaine had been seized at Singapore (document O.C.597); 625 ounces had been seized at Calcutta (document O.C.679); and, according to the further reports which he had received, another 150 ounces had been seized at Calcutta and 251 ounces at Rangoon. All these drugs were of the same brand and they amounted to a total of some 28 kilogrammes.

M. SATO (Japan) said that he had, on several occasions, written to his Government, which was endeavouring to trace the brand in question, but no results had so far been reached. He had begun to doubt whether the brand was really the product of a Japanese firm. The combination of the two names was unusual, and the printing of the wrapper doubtful. M. Sato added that he was only expressing a personal doubt, which did not imply any minimising of the importance of the responsibility with regard to investigation.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was a most important question for India. It was probable that the illicit imports of cocaine into India were about forty times the amount which India legitimately imported. The Committee had seen that, in six cases, the illicit traffic accounted for 1,621 ounces of cocaine, which was a larger quantity than the whole of the legitimate consumption of India for one year. It was most important to ascertain the source of this traffic as quickly as possible, and to stop it.

147. Illicit Traffic : Seizures made in Italy during the last Six Months of 1926.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to document O.C.599, observed that all these seizures were concerned with trifling amounts, and that all but one of them related to the internal traffic.

148. Collation by the Secretariat of Cases of the Illicit Traffic.

Colonel WOODS asked whether it would not be useful for the Secretariat, when cases were noted in which the same individuals or some particular brand of drug or some distinctive circumstance recurred, to prepare a note collating these cases and drawing attention to their similarity or to any point that indicated a possible connection between them.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in the annual report of seizures, a series of cross-references was given which enabled similar cases or recurring names to be collated. The Secretariat would have no difficulty in preparing such a note as Colonel Woods had suggested, and it would certainly be useful to the Committee to have the facts brought together in a convenient form.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) supported the proposal of Colonel Woods. He thought that the facts in relation to the Fujitsuru brand afforded a good instance of the value of such a comparative note or table.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) also approved the suggestion. He did not think, however, that it would be necessary to lay any stress on the fact that certain steamers on certain routes recurred in connection with the illicit traffic. All steamers running between China and other Far Eastern ports were necessarily implicated.

The CHAIRMAN said it would be a difficult, and perhaps a delicate, task for the Secretariat to compile notes of this description, and he would suggest that the form and content of the notes should be left to its discretion. The point raised by M. van Wettum in regard to vessels was sound. On almost every ship trading with the Far East seizures were regularly effected. He thought it might safely be left to the Secretariat to draft the note proposed. Subsequent editions could then be based on any further suggestions which the Committee might wish to make in regard to it.

M. SATO (Japan) enquired whether the proposed note would deal with the Fujitsuru question alone. He thought that in that case it might perhaps give rise to a wrong impression. He was quite prepared to accept the proposal of Colonel Woods if it applied generally to cases in which coincidences or similarities were noted in respect of the seizures effected.

The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal of Colonel Woods was, as he understood it, entirely general in character. The Secretariat, in going through the lists of seizures, came upon certain names or facts which recurred. It would be useful if a note could be prepared on such cases for the information of the Committee. Such a note could hardly fail to help the Committee in dealing with the various reports on seizures. There was no suggestion of preparing a note in any way directed against any particular Government. The case of the Fujitsuru brand had merely been chosen as an illustration.

M. SATO (Japan) said that, in those circumstances, he entirely approved the suggestion.

The proposal of Colonel Woods was adopted.

149. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Hong-Kong.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that document O.C.611 referred to a British seizure of drugs which appeared to have been sent from Switzerland. The investigations of the Swiss authorities had thrown light on the details of the matter, which had been transmitted to the German authorities, who had made their own enquiries.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, on September 26th, Helena Statnigross was arrested. She denied any complicity and the police authorities has asked for copies of the statements made against her to be forwarded.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said that, in reference to the Naples case (document O.C.609), one Antonio Puig had been described as an American. He asked the Italian representative whether this referred to the United States or to South America.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) pointed out that, on page 6 of the document, it was stated that Puig was born at Havana, in Cuba.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that Georges Statnigross appeared to be one of the most important traffickers in the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN added that the facts of this case had been brought to the notice of the Swiss, German and French authorities.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) declared that the search made by the Swiss Police indicated that this person seemed to have stayed in Switzerland, but they had been unable to ascertain what he was doing there. His description had been given to all the Swiss Police authorities.

150. Illicit Traffic : The Schulten Case : Letter from the Austrian Government.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that document O.C.613 did not show whether Dr. Schulten had been prosecuted by the Austrian authorities. He appeared not only to have sold drugs to persons not authorised to receive them but to have sent them out of the country without an export authorisation.

151. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs at Havana.

The Committee considered two reports from the Cuban Government regarding seizures of drugs at Havana during February and March 1927 (documents O.C.614 and 628).

The CHAIRMAN, referring to document O.C.614, observed that some of the products seized by the Cuban Government did not come under the scope of the Hague Convention.

With reference to the seizures recorded for the month of March, Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said he could not give information as regards postal packets from Germany, but he would endeavour to give detailed information later on receipt of the reply from the Cuban Government. The firm of Merck said it had no relations with Dr. Murillo.

152. Illicit Traffic : Seizures of Drugs in the United States during 1926 and the first Three Months of 1927.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) drew attention to a large seizure on page 2 of document O.C.618. He wondered if the New York Police could not furnish information as to the itinerary and the source of the quantities of drugs coming into the United States.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) said he would be glad to obtain such information.

Colonel WOODS referred to a newspaper clipping of July 15th which mentioned \$250,000 worth of drugs found off a water-front house. It said that this had been flung off ships and floated in. A practice of throwing water-tight packages off ships had been discovered.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said it would be interesting to know from what port the vessel came in order to establish the route followed by these drugs.

Colonel WOODS said that these reports from the United States were very incomplete. He wondered if everything was reproduced from the original by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN said that this was a summary given by the United States Government ; it was not altered by the Secretariat.

153. Illicit Traffic : Question of the Units of Weights and Measures used in Seizure Reports.

M. BOURGOIS (France) drew attention to the choice of units of weights and measures which were used in the reports. Every reader had to transform them himself and he suggested that this might be done once and for all by the Secretariat into the metric system.

The SECRETARY suggested that the Secretariat might draw up a general comparative table without making the transformation in each individual case.

She added that the original idea had been to keep to the wording of the Government documents. In Secretariat documents such as the summary of annual reports conversions were made.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Secretariat should be asked to consider the matter. It would do its best to meet the wishes of the members.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

154. Spain and the Illicit Traffic.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) drew attention to the first paragraph of the letter contained in document O.C.619, which read as follows : "The

frequent arrests of traffickers in narcotic drugs and the almost daily notices in the Press of cases of this kind prove that the use of these drugs is becoming prevalent in Spain." He believed that the relations of the Committee with the Spanish authorities as regards information concerning seizures were almost non-existent, and suggested that the Secretariat might open up communications with the Spanish authorities in this matter, as Spain must be seriously suffering from the illicit traffic and might be glad to receive the help of the Committee. Moreover, the information from the Spanish authorities might be very useful to the Committee in its work.

The SECRETARY replied that the Secretariat received no reports from the Spanish Government regarding the drug traffic. There seemed no reason to believe that the Spanish Government would refuse to co-operate, as reports were received from Spain in matters connected with child welfare.

Perhaps the Secretary-General might be asked to go into the matter and make either official or unofficial arrangements.

155. Illicit Traffic : Smuggling of Drugs into Iraq.

M. BOURGOIS (France) thanked Sir Malcolm Delevingne for his note (document O.C.622). He pointed out a slight contradiction in the second paragraph, of which the first sentence said: "There is no precise fact to prove that cocaine has been smuggled into Iraq through the desert", and which concludes in its last sentence, very unexpectedly: "Everything points to the substance having been imported by the desert routes."

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) explained that, though there was no definite evidence on this matter, the circumstances seemed to point to the smuggled drugs having come from Syria.

156. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at New York : Letter from Colonel Woods.

Colonel WOODS, referring to his letter (document O.C.625), said that it had been found difficult to pursue the enquiries, not through a deliberate refusal to co-operate, but through a misunderstanding and a difference of method.

The CHAIRMAN noted the large amount of morphine involved, and remarked that some of the sentences delivered appeared to be very heavy.

157. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs at Shanghai sent from Vienna : Letter from Dr. Anselmino.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), referring to his letter (document O.C.627), explained that this matter had not been of direct interest to Germany, but the German authorities had taken it up because the forwarding house was a branch of one at Mulhouse. It was claimed that this was merely transit traffic, but the German Government had not agreed, there being no through way-bill. He hoped that investigations would be made in France, the country of manufacture, and in Austria, the country of destination.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that the French authorities were dealing with the matter, and he would give Dr. Anselmino certain private information. He would inform the Committee of any further results.

158. Illicit Traffic : Affair of Roche and Co.

Mr. LVALL, referring to document O.C.679, said that the name of Hoffman-La Roche & Co. had frequently appeared on the Committee's records. They might sometimes, however, have been innocent, as the firm's labels appeared to have been forged.

The CHAIRMAN said that the firm involved appeared to have been incorporated for the express purpose of selling certain products of Hoffman-La Roche & Co.; it appeared to have imported these drugs without permit and to have sold them without keeping any record.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) stated that the concern of Roche, of Tokyo, was distinct from the house of Hoffman-La Roche & Co., of Basle, although it had been founded to sell in Japan the products of the latter house. He did not think that, in the case in point, the house of Hoffman-La Roche & Co. could be directly incriminated. Nevertheless, the Swiss authorities would not fail to try and clear up the case.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of how the drugs came from Basle, without an import permit, to Japan seemed to constitute the only possible legal connection between the fraudulent action of the Tokyo firm and the house at Basle.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) added that the Swiss authorities would make more investigations. In order to leave Switzerland, the goods would need an import certificate.

159. Traffic in the Persian Gulf on the *Kumamoto Maru*.

M. SATO (Japan), referring to documents O.C. 631 and 655, said that this was the first Japanese boat to leave Bushire with opium after the application of the new measures taken by the Japanese Government. The boat had arrived at Macao, where, with the approval of the Portuguese authorities, its whole cargo of 173 cases of opium was landed. M. Ferreira had communicated a telegram to him from the Portuguese authorities at Macao stating that all was in order.

The same boat had carried Persian opium to Bushire in March last before measures had been taken by the Japanese authorities. The question of the irregular conduct of the master had been taken up by the authorities, and he had been prosecuted.

M. Sato would ask the Secretary whether there was any further information as regards the names of boats, dates of clearance, etc., connected with the traffic in the Persian Gulf.

The SECRETARY said that no further information had come to hand.

160. Illicit Traffic : List of Postal Packets of Narcotic Substances destroyed by the Cuban Government between November 4th, 1926, and April 22nd, 1927.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that page 3 of document O.C. 633 referred to three registered consignments coming from Darmstadt containing narcotic substances. These substances had not, in fact, been narcotics and he asked the Secretariat not to retain this statement in the seizure records nor to include it in the annual list of seizures.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with Dr. Anselmino, and added that it might perhaps be desirable to inform the Cuban representatives that Cuba was seizing a number of drugs which in no way came under the scope of the Convention.

The SECRETARY said that this might be done through the South American liaison officer on the Secretariat.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that the Secretariat, when communicating with Cuba, Spain and the United States, might ask for full particulars as regards postal packets. If further details could be given, the reports would be of infinitely greater value.

FOURTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Thursday, October 6th, 1927, at 10 a.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

161. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs in the Netherlands East Indies.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to documents O. C. 634 and 635, said that the lists of seizures given in the latter document were interesting as they appeared to indicate operations conducted on an extensive and organised scale. He noted a consignment of 500 small square copper boxes marked with two shrimps and the words "Hok Sing & Co.". There were a number of such consignments which appeared to be definitely intended to meet the demands of a large retail trade.

162. Illicit Traffic : Information regarding a Quantity of Opium purchased by the Chinese Navy.

M. SATO (Japan), referring to document O. C. 637, said he had no information as to this case. He had written to his Government on the subject, but would point out that the case went back to the period just after the war, that is to say, at about the time of the ratification of the Hague Convention by the Japanese Government. Any information he received was likely to be brief, as the case was still pending before the Osaka Court of Appeal.

163. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs in Berlin.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany), referring to document O. C. 639, regretted that he could not for the moment give any further details in regard to this seizure as the case was still pending before the Courts.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to an important statement in the paragraph of the report dealing with sources of supply. It was there stated that "fictitious orders were sent from countries with no certificate system; export licences were then applied for and the goods despatched apparently in order". This was a most striking instance of the fact that, unless the import certificate system were universal, it would always be possible for illicit traffickers to find a base for their operations. He would draw attention to the fact that among the firms supplying the drugs were Hoffmann-La Roche & Co., of Basle, and Wecker-Frey, of Zurich.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) emphasised the importance of the share of Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. in the transaction. In 1926, 760 kilogrammes of drugs had been delivered in France by the Paris branch of Hoffmann-La Roche & Co., through the firm of Gallix, Dubois, Müller & Co. Those drugs were to have been bought originally from Hoffmann-La Roche & Co., of Basle. The person giving the order, however, had been referred to the French firm because at that time no export licence was required in France. It thus appeared that Hoffmann-La Roche & Co., being unable, owing to the efficiency of the Swiss laws and their administration, to supply the drugs from Basle, had referred their customer to their branch in Paris. This procedure threw a lurid light on the character of the firm and seemed to him to be the most significant piece of information yet received by the Committee. He would ask whether M. Bourgois and Dr. Carrière had anything to say in regard to the case and whether the French Government had enquired into the part played in the transaction by Gallix, Dubois, Müller & Co.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) observed that Switzerland has no responsibility in this illicit transaction. The narcotics had been exported to France entirely in accordance with the regulations. They left the country under an export licence and a certificate of origin, and had entered France in excise bond. He therefore considered that it was for the importing country to control the utilisation of the merchandise imported, and that, if there were illicit traffic, it was that country which should be responsible. Dr. Carrière added that he had already had occasion to point out to the French representatives the dealings of Gallix, Dubois, Müller & Co.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he was prepared at a private meeting to give his colleagues certain information in regard to the case. For the moment, he would merely remind them that, from January 1st next, the import certificate system would be put into force in France.

The CHAIRMAN said he could hardly accept the statement of Dr. Carrière that the Swiss Government had no responsibility in the matter. At a very early stage in the discussion of the general question of the illicit traffic, there had been a lively exchange of views between M. Dinichert, at that time the representative of Switzerland on the Committee, and himself. He had on that occasion contended that such cases as the one now under consideration would inevitably occur and recur, unless the Swiss Government exercised the greatest possible care in choosing the firms to which licences were issued to deal in dangerous drugs. He had contended that, unless a Government was thoroughly satisfied as to the reputation and honesty of the firms which were permitted to engage in the drug traffic, that country would inevitably, sooner or later, be deeply implicated through its nationals in illicit transactions. That had, he thought, always been the view of the Committee; and it was incontestably sound.

Many cases had occurred, covering a very wide field, in which drugs that had entered the illicit traffic had been traced to Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. Personally, he had no doubt whatever that Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. was not a firm to which a licence to deal in drugs should be given. No amount of official control could prevent illicit traffic unless the primary conditions were satisfactory. Everyone admired the efforts which were being made by the Swiss Government to deal with the illicit traffic; but he must emphasise that the primary conditions of success were lacking so long as firms whose reputations were unsatisfactory were licensed to trade in drugs.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) was extremely surprised at the turn taken by the discussion. He could not admit that his country should be expected to take the responsibility for illicit acts which had been committed in other countries, and he protested strongly against such an interpretation of the facts. It was certainly regrettable that the name of a Swiss house should be mentioned so often in connection with the illicit traffic, but investigation had always shown that the merchandise which had been the object of this traffic had left Switzerland in accordance with the regulations, and that the starting-point of the illicit acts should be sought in the importing country. It was there, apparently, that control had

been defective. As a matter of fact, the house in question had not been guilty of any infringement of the Swiss laws and regulations. If there had been any infringement, the Swiss authorities would not have failed to intervene, as they had already done on other occasions. As there was no infringement, this intervention was not possible, but the firm had been duly warned.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that no one had any idea of placing any responsibility on the Swiss Government for the illicit transaction. The point to which he had drawn attention was the light thrown by the transaction on the character of the firm concerned. The transaction described in the report clearly indicated that the firm was unworthy of having a licence to deal in drugs. Hoffmann-La Roche & Co., being aware that they could not carry out on Swiss territory a transaction which was designed to supply the illicit traffic, deliberately arranged for that transaction to be carried out in another country. It was true that the firm had not committed any breach of the Swiss law and that the Swiss Government could not therefore prosecute it. That, however, was not the point. The situation in regard to the firm was similar to the situation of the British Government in dealing with Whiffen, who, in 1923, had sent drugs to France which had subsequently reached the illicit traffic. Whiffen had not broken any of the laws of France or Great Britain. The British Government, however, as soon as it was proved that Whiffen had knowingly supplied drugs for the illicit traffic, had withdrawn his licence to manufacture or to deal in drugs. The possibility that a licence might be withdrawn was the most powerful weapon in the hands of a Government for the suppression of the illicit traffic. If a firm knew that, on being discovered in transactions with an illicit object, it would be deprived of its licence, it would certainly not engage in such transactions. It was only because firms knew that nothing would be done so long as they kept within the limits of the law that the illicit traffic was at present flourishing.

The question raised by the present case was whether Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. were fit persons to deal in drugs. It was not suggested that the Swiss Government should prosecute the firm for past action, but merely that it should ensure that the firm was not in a position to repeat such transactions in future.

M. BOURGOIS (France) regretted that the import certificate system was not yet applied in France, and again assured the Committee that the system would be introduced at latest on January 1st of the coming year.

Meanwhile, he thought it was extremely desirable that the Swiss Government should, in the circumstances, exercise a very strict supervision over the export of drugs to France. It was easier for the Swiss Government to prevent such exports than for France at the present moment to prevent their import, since, pending the new French regulations, there was no legal basis on which the French authorities could act. They could, in fact, only act at present in a purely arbitrary manner.

A strict supervision over the despatch of drugs from the manufacturing countries would always be essential, as there would always be countries where the import certificate system had not yet been introduced. If export were allowed to such countries, it would always be possible for the drugs to pass into the illicit traffic. Countries which had introduced the import certificate system should very strictly supervise the export of drugs to countries without such a system, as that was the only way to prevent the drugs escaping into illicit channels.

He would suggest that the Committee should pass a resolution in that sense, pointing out that, so long as a single country remained outside the import certificate system, it would always be possible for drugs to escape into the illicit traffic unless the countries of export maintained a strict control over their despatch and were prepared, if necessary, to refuse a licence. It might be stated in the resolution that, unless the exporting countries took measures of that kind, the work of the Committee was fruitless.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) wished particularly to record the fact that he himself had emphasised on several occasions, and yet again during the present session, the necessity of generalising the system of import and export certificates. For a country which, like Switzerland, manufactured narcotics, and consequently found itself in a particularly difficult position, this question was specially important. He was therefore ready to support the suggestion made by M. Bourgois, who had asked that the Committee should adopt an imperative resolution on the lines indicated.

If the Swiss authorities had not as yet prohibited the exportation of narcotics into France, it was because they had thought they could take it for granted that merchandise arriving in France with an importation permit in due form and in excise bond was the object of a control which would be sufficiently effective to prevent this merchandise from passing into the illicit trade, and that the re-export of the products in particular was not free. Since this was not the case, and since the French representative had just stated that, so long as his Government had not put in force the system of import and export authorisations, he saw no reason why Switzerland should not place restrictions on the export of narcotics

to France, Dr. Carrière noted this declaration, and considered that he was authorised in acting upon it when he considered that need arose.

Though he had quite grasped the meaning of Sir John Campbell's and Sir Malcolm Delevingne's observations, Dr. Carrière could only repeat what he had already said, namely, that Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. had not been guilty of an infringement of the Swiss laws. For the present, Swiss law did not give the authorities the power to prosecute a firm for acts committed by other firms abroad, even though there was reason to believe that it had in one way or another facilitated those acts. When Switzerland revised its legislation with regard to narcotics (a revision which would become necessary in the near future, as had already been said, as a result of the ratification of the Geneva Convention), his Government would probably consider the possibility of introducing into the law measures which would enable it to act in such cases. At present, such action on the part of the authorities was not possible. But Dr. Carrière repeated once again, in closing the discussion so far as he was concerned, that, since Switzerland had promulgated legislation with regard to dangerous drugs, the Swiss authorities has constantly sought to apply it in the most loyal spirit, and that they would continue to do so without having to be reminded that this law should be observed.

The CHAIRMAN said it was unfortunate, perhaps, that the Committee has not embarked on a general discussion instead of confining its attention to a particular case. He would prefer to consider the matter from an entirely general point of view. Everyone recognised the efficiency and devotion of the Swiss authorities and of the existing Swiss system of control; he need hardly say that they all highly appreciated the work of Dr. Carrière himself in that connection.

He would put the matter quite generally, and, for that purpose, would take an imaginary case which had often served the turn of the Committee. Suppose Patagonia was a signatory of the Hague Convention. Suppose it were found that large quantities of drugs found their way into the illicit traffic from a factory in Patagonia. What would be the duty of the Patagonian Government under the Hague Convention? Under Article 9 of that Convention, the contracting Powers had undertaken to enact pharmacy laws or regulations to limit exclusively to medical and legitimate purposes the manufacture, sale and use of narcotic drugs, and they had further undertaken to co-operate with one another to prevent the use of these drugs for any other purpose. That obligation was, in his opinion, the pivot of the whole matter. The parties to the Convention had definitely promised to co-operate to prevent any misuse of narcotics. How was that co-operation to be effected. The answer to that question was found partly in the following article, which laid down that all persons engaged in the manufacture, traffic or distribution of drugs should in general have a licence from their Government, and partly in the fact that most Governments did in practice insist on such people being licensed. Here was the nexus between the obligation of Article 9 and its effective execution. It was the duty of all Governments which had signed the Convention, if they found that their licencees were constantly parties to transactions which resulted in drugs escaping into the illicit traffic, to enquire into the matter and, if necessary, to deprive the licencee of his licence. Only in that way was it possible for the Governments to co-operate as the Hague Convention required them to do. In his view, the obligation of the Governments to supervise the operations of their licencees was not merely a moral but a legal obligation.

M. BOURGOIS (France), replying to Dr. Carrière, explained that the French *acquit à caution* applied exclusively to importation with a view to the control of internal trade, and had no relation whatever to the French export trade.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a resolution in the sense indicated by M. Bourgois should be drafted, and that the present discussion should be continued on the basis of that resolution when it came to be submitted to the Committee.

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

164. Question of the Nature of Strychnine and Caffeine.

Mr. LYALL, referring to document O.C.644, asked whether strychnine and caffeine were habit-forming drugs.

The CHAIRMAN said that this question had been previously examined and that the British Government had furnished a memorandum on the subject. Neither of these drugs was habit-forming. Strychnine was a tonic when taken in small quantities, and caffeine had a stimulative effect.

M. BOURGOIS (France) suggested that these drugs were mixed with narcotics in order to mitigate the state of depression which followed on the use of the latter.

165. Illicit Traffic: Shipment of Goods, believed to consist of Drugs, into the Far East from Dairen: Note by the British Representative.

Mr. LYALL drew attention to the facts stated on page 2 of document O.C.645, which appeared to show the unsatisfactory situation arising from the existing dual control by

the Japanese authorities and the Chinese Customs Service. In order to encourage commerce in this territory, the Japanese authorities had allowed free import. M. Sato had promised, however, to make enquiries as to the system in force at Dairen.

M. SATO (Japan) asked Mr. Lyall for an explanation. These goods were addressed to a man of the name of Shichman, at Harbin, with a way-bill marked "to order". The goods should therefore have passed through the Chinese Maritime Customs and not through Japanese control, for, as their destination was Harbin, they would have been cleared through the Chinese Customs at Dairen.

Mr. LYALL said that, if the goods were shipped from Japan to Dairen on a through bill of lading for Harbin, they would be subject to examination by the Chinese Customs at Dairen. If, however, when they were landed at Dairen the importer declared that they were for consumption in the Leased Territory, they might escape examination, and it would be possible to send them on by another route.

M. SATO (Japan) observed that the case was interesting as explaining the difficulties of co-operation between the Japanese and Chinese authorities in the Leased Territory. He would obtain detailed information as soon as possible.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) asked M. Bourgois whether he had any information as regards the last paragraph of this document.

M. BOURGOIS (France) replied that he had not yet received an answer from the French authorities, to whom he had referred Sir Malcolm Delevingne's letter.

166. Case of the Illicit Traffic in Hamburg : Letter from the German Representative.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain), referring to document O.C.658, recalled that MESSRS. Friederici & Co. were also mentioned in document O.C.403 (April 1926). He asked Dr. Carrière whether he had any knowledge as to the firm of Boehringer & Co., of Basle.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) said that the Swiss authorities had opened a penal enquiry on this question. It appeared that the goods had been authorised to leave Switzerland for a particular destination but had then been diverted.

167. Illicit Traffic : Seizure of Drugs in Berlin : Question of the Publication of the Document relating to this Case.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Press was anxious to obtain the document (O.C.639) which the Committee had had before it when discussing the Hoffmann-La Roche question. He understood that, when documents were discussed at a public meeting, the Press and the public were allowed to receive copies, but in this case he felt doubtful whether publication of the details might not hamper future investigations.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he had always understood that such documents were only distributed to the members and that many of them were marked "Strictly confidential". He was against the publication of such information.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that a formal resolution of the Committee at its sixth session contemplated the widest possible publicity for the documents of the Committee, subject to its obtaining the consent of the Governments concerned. This document was not confidential, but had been sent openly by the German Government. He would ask the German, Swiss and French representatives for their views.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that, as the matter was only the result of the action of a Court of Enquiry with which the Press had already been concerned this year, he had no objection to its publication.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) said that, generally speaking, he would have preferred not to communicate such a document, but, since all the facts had already been discussed before the Press, there was no real point in keeping it confidential.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said he had no objection to publication.

The Committee agreed that document O.C.639 should be communicated to the Press.

168. Illicit Traffic : Information supplied by the Netherlands Government regarding the Movements of a Quantity of Raw Persian Opium purchased by Hoornstra.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) observed that in this document (O.C.660) the firm which had supplied the opium was "under the impression that Hoornstra was still in possession of a permit". He concluded that the Netherlands law did not compel the buyer to produce his permit to the seller, otherwise the factory would have seen that

Hoorstra had lost his licence. According to the British regulations, any licensed purchaser had to produce his licence to the seller and to get it endorsed with the facts of the sale.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he regretted that he did not know the existing practice, but would send further information to the Secretariat.

169. Illicit Traffic : General Statement and Draft Resolution presented by Colonel Woods.

Colonel Woods said that he wished to give his impressions of the discussions which had taken place in the Committee. He appreciated the heartening attitude of Italy and the excellent expression of its views by M. Cavazzoni.

This extraordinary session of the Advisory Committee had been called after serious thought to meet an emergency, and the Council of the League and the public were entitled to know what this emergency was.

After a number of conferences and meetings, the Committee had accomplished excellent work, and had established the import and export certificate system in thirty-four countries. It had secured annual reports from Governments, distributed particulars of seizures and, finally, made possible the conclusion of the Geneva Convention which appeared to be in a fair way of being ratified.

The early ratification of this Convention was extremely important and, pending this, the Committee should take all possible action which tended to improve conditions and which did not conflict with the provisions of the Hague and Geneva Conventions. The illicit traffic appeared to continue, probably even to increase, and the remarks of the members of the Committee bore convincing testimony to this fact. The representative of the British Government had, at a previous meeting, referred to the alarming situation in India, Russia, Egypt and other parts of the world. The representatives of the Netherlands, India, France and Italy had all added their witness to the increasing danger of the traffic.

These, perhaps, were only individual statements, but the Committee itself had come to similar conclusions which had been accepted by the Assembly of the League. The report of the second session of the Committee referred to the enormous scale on which morphine had been illicitly introduced into China and the large illicit traffic carried on in the countries of Western Europe and America. That of the seventh session referred to the financial resources and the worldwide connections of the persons engaged. The report of the eighth session had shown that there was no doubt that the drugs were manufactured on a scale vastly in excess of the world's medical and scientific requirements; and, finally, the last report had characterised the illicit traffic as enormous and stated that drugs were smuggled into the Far East and elsewhere in huge quantities. This was the emergency against which the Committee had to lead the fight for an early victory. The root of the trouble was the over-production of the poppy and coca plant. If this could be restricted to the legitimate needs of the world, their troubles would be over, but with such overwhelming overproduction, and in view of the extreme value of the drugs, it would be impossible to obtain great success by regulative measures. The seizures already made only pointed to what was not being seized, and the American authorities said that the price of smuggled drugs in the illicit traffic was little more than that of the legitimate market.

Colonel Woods was convinced that the only way to stop the traffic was to stop the drug at its source. There were only some forty factories, which were all included in some eight countries, and were all known. Many were wholly reputable and in some countries were so controlled that they could not sell to the illicit trade. At The Hague, fifteen years ago, the principle was recognised that manufacture must be limited to the legitimate needs of the world. Every ounce of drug in the illicit traffic came from one of those forty factories and from one of those eight countries, which were bound, as signatories of the Hague Convention, to limit manufacture. The supply could be restricted absolutely to the lawful needs of humanity if these eight countries made up their minds to restrict it.

This limitation could be done in a way not to interfere with honest production. It had been agreed upon by Conferences, supported by the Geneva Convention, and urged by the Committee. The only opposition was that of the huge financial interests involved in the traffic, but he felt that an enlightened public opinion would prove stronger than these, and it was the privilege of this Committee to hold the light before the public.

Colonel Woods therefore proposed the following resolution, which embodied the suggestion he had made at the eighth session of the Committee:

"Whereas the illicit traffic continues 'on an enormous scale', 'backed by huge financial resources', 'drugs being smuggled in huge quantities';

“ And whereas it does not seem possible at the present time to restrict the growth of the poppy and the coca plant to that small quantity necessary to supply the medical needs of the world ;

“ And whereas experience shows that the smuggling of drugs cannot be prevented by police activity or by regulative measures that fall short of complete control, owing to the great financial profit that attends the smuggling of even very small quantities ;

“ And whereas it is indubitable that, if all drug factories were adequately controlled by their Governments, there would be no more ‘drug problem’ ;

“ Therefore it be resolved that all factories manufacturing dangerous drugs should be owned or adequately controlled by their Governments. Under either system, the Governments would at least :

“ (1) Regulate and require an accurate accounting of all internal traffic, including purchase of raw materials, manufacture, sales, distribution, storage, etc ;

“ (2) Adopt and rigidly enforce the import and export certificate system ;

“ (3) Absolutely control the export of dangerous drugs to any country not having the import and export certificate system. In the absence of this system, the Government of the selling country must satisfy itself beyond a reasonable doubt that the demand is for legitimate purposes only. This precaution is particularly important since the readiest route now to the illicit traffic is through those countries which have not adopted or do not strictly enforce the import and export certificate system. ”

The CHAIRMAN suggested that copies of the speech and resolution of Colonel Woods should be circulated, in English and French, as soon as possible.

Agreed.

FIFTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Thursday, October 6th, 1927, at 3 p. m.

Present : All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

170. Illicit Traffic : Statement and Draft Resolution presented by Colonel Woods.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether any members of the Committee had any observations to make on the statement submitted by Colonel Woods, and more particularly on the resolution at the end of the statement.

The resolution was as follows :

“ Whereas the illicit traffic continues ‘on an enormous scale’, ‘backed by huge financial resources’, ‘drugs being smuggled in huge quantities’ ;

“ And whereas it does not seem possible at the present time to restrict the growth of the poppy and the coca plant to that small quantity necessary to supply the medical needs of the world ;

“ And whereas experience shows that the smuggling of drugs cannot be prevented by police activity or by regulative measures that fall short of complete control, owing to the great financial profit that attends the smuggling of even very small quantities ;

“ And whereas it is indubitable that, if all drug factories were adequately controlled by their Governments, there would be no more ‘drug problem’ ;

“ Therefore be it resolved that all factories manufacturing dangerous drugs should be owned or adequately controlled by their Governments. Under either system, the Governments would at least :

"(1) Regulate and require an accurate accounting of all internal traffic, including purchase of raw materials, manufacture, sales, distribution, storage, etc. ;

"(2) Adopt and rigidly enforce the import and export certificate system ;

"(3) Absolutely control the export of dangerous drugs to any country not having the import and export system. In the absence of this system, the Government of the selling country must satisfy itself beyond a reasonable doubt that the demand is for legitimate purposes only. This precaution is particularly important since the readiest route now to the illicit traffic is through those countries which have not adopted or do not enforce the import and export certificate system."

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said he would first like to congratulate Colonel Woods on the speech which he had made at the previous meeting.

Referring to the draft resolution, he would suggest that in the fourth paragraph it would be necessary to make some reference to wholesale dealers in drugs ; the wholesale dealers would also have to be adequately controlled.

With reference to the concluding paragraph of the draft resolution, he would observe that a very similar proposal had been adopted by the Advisory Committee during its eighth session. On that occasion he had felt obliged to make a reservation, and his Government had made similar reservations at the Assembly. He felt it would be very difficult for each individual country to control the export of drugs to countries which had not adopted the import and export certificate system. No one country could know what consignments were being sent by other countries. It could not ascertain whether the consignments for which licences were requested were intended to meet the legitimate requirements of the country of import or whether the importer was a trustworthy person. Article 26 of the Geneva Convention had been expressly designed to meet that difficulty. Under that Convention, a Central Board had been created which would be in a position to control the export of drugs to countries which had not adopted the system of import certificates.

He would like to know what measures had been taken by the various countries to give effect to the resolution adopted by the Advisory Committee during its eighth session to which he had referred. M. Bourgois had said, at a previous meeting, that it was difficult in practice to carry out such measures and the Chairman had argued that, for their successful application, the Central Board was indispensable.

M. BOURGOIS (France) associated himself with the congratulations addressed by M. van Wettum to Colonel Woods on his statement at the morning meeting.

He was prepared to accept the draft resolution of Colonel Woods subject to certain minor modifications. He agreed with the observations of M. van Wettum in regard to the last paragraph. All persons with administrative experience knew the difficulties which the authorities of a country encountered in trying to determine if an application for export corresponded with a demand for drugs to be used for legitimate purposes only. The only concrete measure so far proposed which would enable the authorities to decide as to the reasonableness or legitimacy of a particular application was the institution of a Central Board, as provided in the Geneva Convention. He therefore thought it was essential to introduce into the final paragraph of the draft resolution a specific reference to the Central Board.

He also agreed with M. van Wettum that, in the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution, a reference to wholesale dealers should be inserted. He would also suggest that the statement made in this paragraph should be toned down. It did not follow that, if all drug factories were adequately controlled, there would be no more drug problem. It would only be "solved to a great extent".

"He would also like to" soften the wording of the third paragraph, which stated that the smuggling of drugs "could not be prevented by police activity". Such a statement might seem to be a criticism of police action which would be quite unjustified. Police measures were certainly useful and even very effective for purposes of internal control. The efficiency of the internal control of the police might in fact be very fairly measured by the difference between the price charged for dangerous drugs in legitimate commerce and in the illicit traffic. He pointed out the enormous difference which existed between the two prices in France, the second being thirty and a-half or even a hundred times higher than the first. He particularly desired, in drawing the attention of the Committee to this point, to attribute the honour of the result to the Direction de la Sureté générale in Paris and to recognise its activity in the repression of smuggling, and the efficacy of its action. He would suggest that the paragraph in question should state that smuggling cannot be prevented by police measures "alone".

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America), in answer to M. van Wettum, said that the measures taken by the United States for the control of the export of drugs were contained in the Act of January 17th, 1914, and the amending Act of May 26th, 1922, known as the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act. The regulations were as follows :

“ Exportations of narcotic drugs are by that law restricted to shipments only to a country which has ratified and become a party to the International Opium Convention of 1912, and then only if: (1) such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with that Convention, a system of permits or licences for the control of imports of such narcotic drugs which the Federal Narcotics Control Board, consisting of the Secretaries of State, the Treasury and Commerce, deems adequate; (2) the narcotic drug is consigned to an authorised permittee; and (3) there is furnished to the Federal Narcotics Control Board proof deemed adequate by it that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and legitimate uses within the country to which to which exported, that it will not be re-exported from such country, and that there is an actual shortage of and a demand for the narcotic drug for medical and legitimate uses within such country.”

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that, when measures were taken to prevent smuggling, the authorities must always ask themselves what steps the smugglers were likely to take in order to evade them. The mere refusal of the authorities of a country to permit the export of large quantities of drugs to a given destination was not likely to be an effective measure, because the smugglers could easily reply to splitting up their orders and distributing them amongst various factories. This demonstrated once again the necessity for a Central Board.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked Colonel Woods for the references in his statement to the views and policy of Italy. He had said, on a previous occasion, that he was prepared to take into consideration any proposals put forward by his colleagues other than those which he had himself presented, and he was happy to accept and to support the draft resolution of Colonel Woods. He would suggest that the draft resolution should be studied by the Sub-Committee which had been appointed to consider his own memorandum, particularly as it took for granted that a system of control already existed and that it was the intention of the Council to complete that system.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) could accept the draft resolution presented by Colonel Woods, particularly with regard to the measures referred to under numbers 1 and 2 of this draft, which were already applied in Switzerland. With regard to number 3, he thought he should insist upon the fact that it was very difficult for a Government, when asked for a permit to export dangerous drugs to countries which did not apply the certificate system, to ascertain if these narcotics were intended for illicit use, as the exporting country could not know the real needs of the importing country. Consequently, the draft resolution imposed a heavy responsibility on the Government with regard to this point. Nevertheless, Dr. Carrière did not think this sufficient reason to oppose Colonel Woods's proposal, but he nevertheless thought that it could not be practically applied so long as a Central Board had not been set up.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (British Empire) agreed with other members of the Committee that there was no difficulty in accepting the draft resolution, which contained nothing to which the Advisory Committee had not already assented at previous sessions. His only criticism was that the resolution did not perhaps go far enough. M. van Wettum had pointed out that the control exercised by the Governments must cover the operations of wholesale dealers as well as of the manufacturers. It was also important to include a reference to the manner in which the system of licensing under the Convention should be carried out.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) also accepted the resolution. It was essential, however, that control should be exercised over the wholesale dealers as well as over the manufacturers, and a reference to the Central Board was equally essential.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the draft resolution contained a somewhat revolutionary proposal, namely, that all drug factories should be owned by the State. Personally, he thought that probably all Governments would, sooner or later, be driven to the monopoly system; but, for the moment, the only Government which had adopted that system was the Government of India.

The alternative was a system of control, and in that part of the resolution there was, he thought, nothing to which the Advisory Committee had not already assented. He agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that the resolution did not perhaps go far enough in some respects. He also agreed that some reference to the Central Board was essential, and that there could be no adequate control of the traffic in drugs throughout the world without a Central Board.

He felt that the resolution was one which could well be adopted in principle by the Committee, subject to certain amendments. He would therefore propose that a small Drafting Committee should be appointed to amend the resolution in the light of the observations which had been made by the various members.

M. BOURGOIS (France) asked if there existed an official document indicating the conditions in which the monopoly worked in India and the relations which existed between the Government of India and the manufacturers. Such a document would undoubtedly be useful to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Indian factory belonged to the Government. It was controlled by the Government, and was operated by Government servants. Particulars

concerning the factory were contained in the reports of the Government Opium Department, which had been published for a very long series of years. The disposal of the produce of the factory was also controlled by the Government.

Colonel Woods said he had listened with great interest to the observations made by the members of the Committee. He had no doubt that a Drafting Committee would succeed in producing a text which would be unanimously adopted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Drafting Committee should consist of Colonel Woods, M. VAN WETTUM, M. BOURGOIS, Dr. CARRIÈRE and Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE.

The Committee agreed.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that, before leaving the subject, he would refer to the question which M. van Wettum had put to those countries which had accepted the resolution adopted during the eighth session of the Advisory Committee. M. van Wettum had asked what practical measures had been taken by the various Governments to establish the kind of control described in the resolution. That was a very fair question and he would suggest that it might be desirable for the Committee to collect information as to the various methods of control which had been adopted by the Governments. The experience acquired by those Governments could not fail to be of value, and an exchange of information would be mutually helpful to the countries concerned.

He did not propose at that moment to give a complete account of the system in operation in Great Britain, but he might say briefly that the British authorities, on receiving an application for permission to export drugs to a country which did not apply the system of certificates, would usually communicate, by telegram if necessary, with the British representatives in that country, requesting particulars in regard to the importer, or they would sometimes communicate with the Government concerned and ask its advice. All the circumstances would be considered.

He would formally propose that the Secretariat should collect information from the countries which were attempting to apply a system of control, and that a report should be prepared on the subject which might be distributed to the members of the Committee, and eventually sent to the Governments for their guidance.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) thanked Sir Malcolm Delevingne for his proposal, which entirely met the needs of the case.

**171. Question of the Formation of an International Syndicate of Drug Manufacturers :
Proposal by Dr. Anselmino : Insertion of this Item on the Agenda.**

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Dr. Anselmino should make a preliminary statement regarding his proposal (document O.C. 638) and that the Committee should then formally decide whether to put it on the agenda.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) explained that his proposal and statements were purely personal in character. He did not claim that his was the only remedy or that it was a panacea, but he did think that an international syndicate was a possible remedy which would be inexpensive and efficacious. If the Committee had any other ideas to suggest as a remedy, he would not insist on the preferential treatment of his proposal.

His proposal did not provide for a new Convention, nor was it outside the scope of the Geneva Convention. It was not a new official organisation, but it derived its force from the Convention, and involved the setting up of the Permanent Central Board as soon as possible and the establishment of an international cartel for its assistance.

Had Dr. Anselmino believed that the objections in the letter from M. Brenier (Annex 3) really existed, he would never have made his proposals. He felt that a cartel operating under the eyes of the whole world could never act in the direction which had been feared. If the Committee felt that his idea was too imaginative, he would not insist upon it; if it supported his proposal, he would then ask that manufacturers be encouraged to meet and to move towards a system of rationing.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) asked whether Dr. Anselmino had in mind that there should be a link between the syndicate and the Permanent Central Board, and that the syndicate would have power to stop export to certain countries if it thought there was a danger that they might become a centre of the illicit traffic.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that this was his intention.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) understood that Dr. Anselmino wished to give the syndicate even greater powers than the Board itself, for the latter was only able to make recommendations to Governments.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) pointed out that, though the syndicate could refuse to export to a certain country, there was no question of imposing anything upon the Governments.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that at the Geneva Conference it had been discussed whether the Board should be given power to prohibit export to a country which might become a centre of the illicit traffic. The Conference had refused to give the Board this power.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) explained that the power of the syndicate would be no more than that of any individual manufacturer, who could never be forced to sell. The difference was merely that between the system of rationing by Governments and that of rationing by private manufacturers.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) understood that the syndicate would be working for profit, and that it would be able to make these export refusals for purposes of profit.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the body of manufacturers as a whole would surely have the same right as any isolated manufacturer.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed with Dr. Anselmino that there should be no question of giving the syndicate these powers, for they were natural to it. He thought that the relations between the Permanent Central Board and the syndicate would be dangerously delicate, as their decisions might be in opposition to each other.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Committee had not yet formally decided to put this matter on the agenda.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that he had no objection to the matter being discussed, but merely wished to have it explained that the proposal went further than the Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. Anselmino maintained that it would not involve any alteration in the Convention. He felt that a discussion would probably clear up doubtful points.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) said that the statement in paragraph 1 on page 7 of the proposal meant that, if the syndicate decided not to export to a certain country, it would be a decision going further than a recommendation of the Board. Moreover, a refusal by the syndicate to export to a certain country would merely be a question of profit, but a refusal by the Central Board would be for the benefit of the world.

The Committee decided to place Dr. Anselmino's proposal on its agenda.

172. Question of the Formation of an International Syndicate of Drug Manufacturers : General Discussion on Dr. Anselmino's Proposal.

M. BOURGOIS (France), referring to Dr. Anselmino's statement, foresaw grave drawbacks and even dangers in a co-operation between the Advisory Committee and its syndicate.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) fully agreed as to the advantages of the syndicate for the manufacturers, as was pointed out on page 8 of the proposal. It would be a great advantage for them to have prices stable, and, from the point of view of their standing and good name, they had every interest that the illegal trade in drugs should disappear. He would like to ask, however, what practical advantage would be obtained in the control of the trade in dangerous drugs through the creation of a syndicate.

M. BOURGOIS (France) noted, in the memorandum of Dr. Anselmino, the passage in which it was stated that "the manufacturers, thanks to their profound knowledge of the market and to the reports of their agents, are profoundly well informed on the degree of confidence which these 'middlemen' deserve".

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was glad that the Committee had decided to consider Dr. Anselmino's proposal, for, under the present conditions of over-production and bad distribution, any proposal should be considered which might lead to better results. The object of the proposal was to limit production and to ensure more care in the distribution of manufactured products, but Dr. Anselmino had not explained how the creation of the syndicate would limit the production of the drugs, apart from the suggestion that a syndicate would be more likely to be careful of its good name than would an individual manufacturer. Sir Malcolm Delevingne understood from conversation with Dr. Anselmino, that it would be an essential part of the scheme that the syndicate, when settling the amount of drugs to be manufactured by its members, should act on the advice of the organs of the League. If the syndicate accepted the advice of the League as to the amount to be produced, they would clearly be reaching in one bound the end which they had sought by other means. He would ask Dr. Anselmino to explain his precise intentions on this matter, and to state whether he thought it probable that the syndicate of manufacturers would accept the advice of the League.

Various opinions had been put forward as regards the question of distribution. M. van Wettum feared that the syndicate would act in a manner which had not been contemplated even for the Permanent Central Board, and that there would be a clash between the two bodies. But if the syndicate must act on the advice of the League in regard to the production of drugs and doubtful cases of distribution, this difficulty would largely disappear. The question arose as to whether such relations between the syndicate and the organs of the League were practicable, and how the syndicate could be persuaded to take the advice of the League.

Had Dr. Anselmino reason to think that all the manufacturers in the world would be prepared to join the syndicate, as its value would be largely lost if any stood out? He thought, personally, that British manufacturers would not be averse to considering such a proposal, though the great difficulty would be to decide the proportion which each manufacturer would get of the world total production.

If this plan could be put into practical effect, and the syndicate would agree to limit production and distribution in accordance with the advice of the League, Sir Malcolm Delevingne did not see at present any serious disadvantages.

M. BOURGOIS (France) indicated that the whole system would be futile if a single factory stood out from the syndicate. After the creation of the syndicate, one factory which would not belong to it could be set up in a country which had not adopted the system of certificates. The danger of smuggling would then be very great and the syndicate perfectly useless. A cocaine syndicate existed which grouped most of the factories. Nevertheless, two or three manufacturers did not belong to it. The smuggling of cocaine was considerable. The representative of India had quoted, for example, the fact that the illicit importation into India represented probably forty times the legitimate needs.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that he had only intended to unite the manufacturers round one table, and that other questions would have to be settled by them. He felt that his idea was perhaps somewhat premature, and he would be prepared to withdraw his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that he personally would be sorry if Dr. Anselmino withdrew his proposal. He shared the doubts felt by some members, and was not quite clear as to all the details of the suggestion, nor did he quite see how the proposed syndicate was going to function. He suggested that Dr. Anselmino be asked to re-examine the matter in the light of the present discussion, to get into touch with some of the leading manufacturers, if that seemed to him advisable, and to bring the question before the Committee at a later session.

M. SATO (Japan) said that he had been silent because, though he had no definite idea regarding Dr. Anselmino's proposal, he was extremely interested in it as being a new and valuable attempt to solve a difficult problem. He therefore warmly supported the suggestion of the Chairman.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that the Committee had not yet decided on the agenda of its January session. He was not quite sure whether he could make progress in discussing the matter with individual manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN explained that it was not desired to bind Dr. Anselmino to any particular course of action.

The Committee adopted the Chairman's proposal.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that he would accept the task entrusted to him.

SIXTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Saturday, October 8th, 1927, at 11 a.m.

Present: All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

173. Illicit Traffic: Case of Mme. Statnigross.

Dr. ANSELMINO (Germany) said that Mme. Statnigross had been arrested in Berlin and that the Berlin police had asked the Court at Hong-Kong to forward copies of the evidence in the case against her husband. It had been necessary for the Berlin Court to take steps to verify the facts, as Mme. Statnigross had at first denied all the accusations brought against her.

Pending, however, the receipt of evidence from Hong-Kong, the Berlin police had discovered the keys of a safe and had found in the safe all the correspondence regarding the transactions of Mme. Statnigross and the code used by the smugglers. The sources from which the drugs had been obtained were in France and Switzerland, and the whole affair had been brought to light by close collaboration between the authorities of Germany, Switzerland and Great Britain. The successful discovery of these operations was evidence of the value of international collaboration.

He hoped very shortly to have further particulars in regard to the case. Meanwhile, he would invite the authorities of France to join the authorities of Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Japan in the necessary researches. Mme. Statnigross had since

undertaken a number of journeys to Switzerland and France to visit those who delivered the drugs. She had found a skilful go-between to travel with the consignments in the person of Helen Roguvoi.

The Berlin police had discovered that Mme. Statnigross had made two extensive journeys in December 1926 and February 1927. On the first occasion, she had provided herself with a large wardrobe-trunk, which was no longer among her luggage when she returned to Germany. On the second occasion, she had acquired another similar trunk, built with a double wall. There was no doubt that both of these trunks had been used for the transport of large quantities of narcotics.

To accompany the trunks, Mme. Statnigross had obtained the services of a thirteen-year-old Russian boy from Paris. This boy had encountered difficulties in getting the trunk through the Customs at Marseilles, but had reported that in the end he was able to do so by a lavish distribution of tips. The boy had been traced to China and there lost.

Dr. CARRIÈRE (Switzerland) stated that the Swiss authorities had been able to trace Mme. Statnigross and her accomplices in Switzerland, but they had as yet been unable to obtain exact information with regard to their doings. The Swiss authorities were awaiting the result of the investigation opened in Germany before pursuing their investigations.

174. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council on the Work of the Tenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the draft report should be considered chapter by chapter.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that the members of the Committee had not yet received all the Minutes of the session. He would therefore suggest that the report should be taken on a first reading and that there should be a second reading at a subsequent meeting, when the members of the Committee had been able to examine the Minutes.

The Committee agreed.

Introduction.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) suggested that the following sentence should be added to the fourth paragraph of the introduction to the report, in reference to the presence of Mr. Lyall on the Committee:

“ His knowledge of those conditions proved of great assistance to the Committee. ”

The Committee agreed.

Ratification of the Geneva Convention.

M. SATO (Japan) asked that the reference to the ratification of the Convention by Japan should be amended in order to avoid any suggestion that the decision of the Special Committee in Japan, which was considering the matter, was being anticipated. He would suggest that the sentence should read:

“ The announcement was made that the ratification of the Convention by Japan may be regarded as assured as soon as this Committee had completed its work. ”

The Committee agreed.

The Committee further decided that the sentence relating to the ratification of the Convention by Roumania should read:

“ The Government of Roumania hopes that it may shortly be able to deposit the instrument of ratification of its adhesion, which it gave *ad referendum*. ”

Reservations made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Geneva Convention of 1925.

Two amendments were made in this section of the report, on the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain).

In the eighth paragraph the sentence referring to Article 6 (c) of the Convention was amended to read:

“ Without the provisions of Article 6 (c), a valuable means of discovering cases of abuse would be lost and there would be a loophole which would almost certainly be taken advantage of by illicit traders. ”

It was decided to amend the tenth paragraph as follows:

“ . . . and to the Norwegian Government unofficially, for its information and consideration, ” etc.

Progress Report.

Mr. Pinkney TUCK (United States of America) asked that the reference to the United States should read as follows :

“ In the United States of America seventy-two companies have already agreed to adopt the clause, ” etc.

On the request of M. SATO (Japan), the following sentence was added to the same paragraph :

“ The Marine Insurance Association of Japan has decided to adopt the clause which has been drawn up by the Marine Insurance Association of London with regard to the shipment of opium and narcotic drugs. The provisions of the clause have been in force since March 1st, 1927. ”

On the proposal of Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain), the following sentence was inserted in the sixth paragraph of this chapter of the report :

“ The reports are of not less importance for China herself, as they provide information which enables measures to be taken for dealing with the traffickers who are engaged in smuggling large quantities of the drugs into China. ”

Report of the Committee of Enquiry on the Production of Opium in Persia.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) wondered whether the introduction to this chapter of the report was not perhaps too severe, in view of the difficulties with which Persia was confronted.

The Committee decided to suppress the following passage :

“ The Committee feels that the measures which the Persian Government proposes to take are, considering the enormous quantities of Persian opium which have recently been finding their way into the illicit traffic in the Far East, disappointing. No action effective in the present connection will be taken for three years, and, even after the expiry of that period, progress is declared to be contingent upon several factors, and will at the best be slow. ”

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the following statement in the same chapter of the report :

“ Broadly speaking, opium which leaves Persia without such certificates is destined for the illicit traffic. ”

This statement was confirmed by the information given by the representative of the Persian Government to the Fifth Committee of the recent session of the Assembly, and it was based on facts within the knowledge of the Advisory Committee. Some reference should perhaps be made to the statement of the Persian representative. The alternative was to leave the passage as it stood, and to justify it, if necessary, later.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) observed that the Persian representative had argued that the proportion of Persian opium which reached the illicit traffic would become appreciably less as time went on, owing to the fact that India had decided to diminish her exports of opium for legitimate purposes. Some of the Persian opium, therefore, which had previously reached the illicit traffic would now go to supply the legitimate market.

After some discussion, it was agreed to substitute, for the sentence to which the Chairman had drawn attention, the following passage :

“ The decision by India to reduce her exports of opium has deflected to Persia a large demand of a legitimate character ; this must, unless the total amount of opium produced by Persia be increased, lead to a diminution of the quantity of opium which has in the past found its way from that country into illicit channels. Broadly speaking, opium which leaves Persia uncovered by import certificates gets into the illicit traffic ”, etc.

Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni suggesting a System for the Control of the Drug Traffic.

The opening sentence was amended to read as follows :

“ M. Cavazzoni presented to the Committee for its consideration a memorandum containing an elaborate scheme for the control of the drug traffic. ”

The CHAIRMAN pointed out, with reference to the second paragraph of this chapter of the report, that it would be unnecessary to annex a copy of the scheme to the report of the Advisory Committee, as a copy would be attached to the Minutes.

The Committee agreed.

Further consideration of the report was postponed to the next meeting.

SEVENTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held on Saturday, October 8th, 1927, at 3 p.m.

Present : All the members of the Committee and the Assessors, with the exception of M. Chu and M. Brenier.

175. Examination of the Draft Report to the Council (Continuation).

Proposed System for the Control of the Drug Traffic : Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) ventured to urge that his memorandum should be annexed to the report. He felt that if it were worth sending to the Governments it was also worthy of the consideration of the Council, and he hoped that the Committee would adhere to the Chairman's original proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that the insertion in the draft report of a clause providing that this memorandum should be annexed to the report had been purely inadvertent. It seemed undesirable that this particular proposal should be given exceptional treatment ; and that a precedent should be created which might in the future lead to financial and other difficulties. The general rule was that no document should be printed twice. The relevant line in the draft report, as decided by the Committee, should be omitted.

M. BOURGOIS (France) agreed that it was desirable not to create a precedent. It seemed to him, however, that the Committee had emphasised so clearly the importance that it attached to this document — a Committee had been appointed to compare the suggestions made in it with the regulations in the different countries — that it became an exceptional case.

Perhaps the memorandum might simply be published separately, and distributed together with the report. This would not involve extra cost.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) felt that these proposals were premature. The Committee had not accepted M. Cavazzoni's memorandum, but had merely referred it to a special Sub-Committee, with instructions to examine the methods of administration in the various countries which possessed efficient systems of control. When the report of this Sub-Committee was submitted, it might be right that the matter should go to the Council, but if the memorandum were annexed to or published with the report of the present session it would be taken as an indication that the Committee endorsed and attached special importance to the memorandum. He was sure that the argument that this was not a precedent would never be accepted.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that, after discussion, the Committee had decided to send his memorandum to the Governments. He felt that it had already received sufficient attention to warrant its not being entirely neglected. If, however, his proposal were rejected, he would support that of M. Bourgois. He admitted that the matter was a precedent, but it might be a precedent worthy of adoption.

The CHAIRMAN said that M. Cavazzoni was incorrect in stating that the Committee had decided to send his report to the Governments. The Chairman was, personally, strongly against its being added as an annex.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) said that on the previous day the Sub-Committee had unanimously agreed to send the memorandum to certain Governments.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) pointed out that this was in order to obtain their opinions on its merits.

M. SATO (Japan) proposed that mention should be made in the report that "the memorandum could be found annexed to the Minutes of the Committee's sixth Meeting", and that the Minutes of that meeting should be distributed to the members of the Council when the report was discussed.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked M. Sato for his suggestion, but said that it would be impossible for the Council to have the whole volume of the Minutes. He thought that, as copies were being sent to the Governments, a few more might easily be printed for the Council.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) proposed that the debate be considered closed and that a vote be taken.

The Committee decided, by six votes to four, that the debate should be closed.

M. SATO (Japan) explained the difference between his own and M. Bourgois' proposal. He agreed with M. Bourgois that the Minutes should be kept separate and that the memorandum be distributed to the Council *in extenso*, but differed in wishing to put a reference to the memorandum in the Chairman's report.

M. BOURGOIS (France) withdraw his proposal.

M. SATO (Japan) proposed that the following sentence in the draft report: "The scheme will be found annexed to this report" should read: "The scheme in question will be found annexed to the Minutes of the Committee's sixth meeting", and that arrangements should be made for the distribution of the Minutes containing the Cavazzoni memorandum when the report was submitted to the Council.

The Committee decided, by seven votes to three, to adopt the proposal of M. Sato.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) asked that it should be recorded that he had asked M. Sato privately as to the clear meaning of his proposal, and that M. Sato intended that only the Minutes of the one meeting should be circulated.

He proposed that the sentence: "The scheme did not repose on any broad base of experience" might be modified.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that this sentence be deleted.

This proposal was adopted.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) proposed the insertion of the following words after the words "best methods of drug control" in the fourth paragraph of the chapter under discussion: "and the preparation of a report on the subject based on the experience of existing measures and methods of administration which have been found to be effective".

This proposal was adopted.

On the proposal of M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands), *the Committee decided* that the names of the Sub-Committee mentioned at the end of the chapter should be put in alphabetical order.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) proposed that, after the names of the Sub-Committee, there should be added a statement that it had already held one meeting and decided on certain methods of work.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Sub-Committee was not reporting to the present session of the Advisory Committee, and that it would be out of place to mention what it had done so far. The Advisory Committee could have no cognisance of that until the Sub-Committee's report was submitted. The present report was that of the Advisory Committee, and it would be undesirable to mention in it, the incomplete proceedings of a Sub-Committee which had to report later on.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) asked that the report might include the Chairman's own words recorded in the Minutes of the tenth meeting as to the task of the Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN put to the Committee the proposal that the following words be inserted after the words "undertake this work" in the first sentence of the last paragraph of the chapter: "including a detailed study of M. Cavazzoni's memorandum".

This proposal was adopted.

Question of the Illicit Traffic.

Mr. LYALL pointed out that the words "but there is nothing to suggest that the illicit traffic is itself greater than it was before . . ." were not true in the case of the Far East. Some evidence showed a growth in the trade of drugs to China, and there was overwhelming proof that smuggling from China was increasing. He therefore proposed the following wording: "But there is very little to suggest that the illicit traffic is itself greater than it was before, and there are some encouraging signs".

This proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the first paragraph of this chapter should end as follows: "It may be mentioned that, at the present session, eighty-three reports were examined

relating to seizures and records of illicit transactions amounting in the aggregate to tons of morphine and diacetylmorphine in all parts of the world”.

This proposal was adopted.

Resolutions I to IV were adopted subject to minor drafting modifications.

The report as a whole was adopted (Annex 6).

Future Relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board: Resolution suggested by Sub-Committee 1.

The following resolution proposed by the Sub-Committee was discussed:

“In order to make it easier for the Geneva Convention to be ratified and come into force, and in order to make quite clear the nature of the future relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board, the Advisory Committee requests the Council to instruct it to make an exhaustive study of the question. The Committee might discuss the matter at its next session.”

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that, by a majority of three votes to two, the Sub-Committee had decided to request that a special paragraph should be inserted in the Chairman's report, together with the above resolution.

M. SATO (Japan) asked how the Sub-Committee had transformed its report from a large into an extremely small document.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) explained that in the plenary meeting it had been decided to add M. Cavazzoni to the Sub-Committee. In the discussions in the Sub-Committee, M. Cavazzoni had made certain declarations which had led the majority to think that there might be means of finding agreement, and that in any case the report should put forward both points of view. The resolution therefore asked the Council to instruct the Committee to study the question further in the hope of finding ground for agreement.

The CHAIRMAN did not understand how the proposed action would facilitate the ratification of the Geneva Convention, or why the Council need be requested to ask the Committee to study a question it had already taken up.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) explained that the minority of the Sub-Committee had felt that the uncertainty of the relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board might make some States hesitate to ratify the Convention.

M. SATO (Japan) thought that there would be no difficulty in deferring to the next session the study of the relations between the two bodies. He could not quite see why the obscurity of the relations between the Central Board and the Advisory Committee would cause States to hesitate to ratify the Convention.

If it were agreed to delete the first part of the resolution, part of his objection would be met, but he agreed with the Chairman that the special authorisation of the Council was not necessary to do the work proposed. He suggested that, instead of this resolution, a passage should be put in the Committee's report stating that the question had been adjourned until the next session.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that, though he had no personal objection to M. Sato's proposal, the majority of the Sub-Committee had felt the importance of any possibility of reaching unanimous conclusions and that the minority should be allowed to put forward its views without undue haste.

Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE (Great Britain) said that he was still opposed to the resolution, the reasons for which he could not understand. Of its supporters in the Sub-Committee the only one who had made his position quite clear was M. Cavazzoni himself, whose statements had shown that there would be no possibility of unanimous agreement. The adjournment of the subject to the next session would be pure waste of time and would give a wrong impression to the world of the general opinion of the plenary Committee on the subject. What would happen at the next session? What further study could be carried out? In January, the Committee would be in the same position as it was to-day. There would have been ample time at the present session for M. Cavazzoni to submit a minority report if he desired, and Sir Malcolm Delevingne did not think that it was in order to give the minority a chance to make a statement that the resolution had been proposed. He wished to pay a tribute to the frankness and clearness of M. Cavazzoni which he had greatly appreciated.

He therefore suggested that the question of the relations between the Advisory Committee and the Central Board be allowed to drop. He did not anticipate that when

the Central Board came into existence any serious difficulty would be found by two bodies of sensible persons in settling their relations and working in harmony.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) agreed with Sir Malcolm Delevingne that the matter should be dropped, adding that the Committee would not be in any better position to discuss it at the next session.

M. BOURGOIS (France) said that he had voted for the resolution because he felt, contrary to Sir Malcolm Delevingne and M. van Wettum, that there was a hope of reaching agreement. This hope had been shared by the majority of the Sub-Committee and by M. Cavazzoni himself.

M. CAVAZZONI (Italy) thanked Sir Malcolm Delevingne for his frank attitude. He thought that the feelings of M. Sato and of the other members who had voted for the proposal were that an attempt should be made to enquire further into the matter. It might then be possible for them to discuss it thoroughly and to allow the opponents of the scheme to explain their point of view.

M. Cavazzoni said that the previous day he had departed considerably from his original position. He felt that the explanations that could be given to the Committee would interest the Council and all the Members of the League, for the matter would come up for full discussion at the next ordinary session of the Assembly in connection with the budget. The previous day he had moved towards reconciliation because he had the great desire to recommend to the Italian Government that it should ratify the Geneva Convention. If this became possible, he felt that a delay of a few months would be of no great consequence. If, however, the Committee were prepared to accept the proposals of M. Sato, he would also vote for them.

M. SATO (Japan) explained that his proposal was to accept the draft report of the Chairman, including the passage relevant to this subject which occurred under the title "General".

M. BOURGOIS (France) drew the attention of the Committee to the important declaration of M. Cavazzoni, which echoed his remarks in the Sub-Committee. He was glad to have been the means of constituting a Sub-Committee where such a declaration had been made, and he would repeat that, before such a clear mark of good will, the Committee had no right to refuse to consider the matter further.

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE (Great Britain) said that M. Bourgois and M. Fotitch had not made it clear that what M. Cavazzoni desired was an alteration of the Geneva Convention.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were three proposals before the Committee — first, that of Sir Malcolm Delevingne that the whole matter be allowed to drop; secondly, that of M. Sato that the draft report be accepted, stating that a discussion had taken place and that the matter had been referred to the next session; lastly, that of M. Fotitch that a paragraph leading up to the resolution should be inserted in the report.

M. FOTITCH withdrew his proposal.

The Committee then voted on the two remaining proposals.

It decided, by five votes to three, to reject the proposal of Sir Malcolm Delevingne and by five votes to three to adopt that of M. Sato.

The CHAIRMAN said that certain consequential alterations in the report might be necessary; these the Secretariat should be asked to make.

176. Date of the Next Session of the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee decided to give the Chairman power to fix the date of the next session, it being understood that this would begin on April 10th, 1928, unless the Council should decide to meet in April or May, in which case the session would be held on January 16th.

177. Close of the Session.

M. VAN WETTUM (Netherlands) wished to thank the Chairman for the very able way in which he had accomplished his task.

M. BOURGOIS (France) wished also to express the appreciation of the Committee of the high competence of the Chairman. The report he had presented to his colleagues was the most remarkable of the reports which had been submitted to the Council.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee, and declared the tenth (extraordinary) session at an end.

LIST OF ANNEXES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Agenda for the Tenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Advisory Committee . . | 86 |
| 2. Progress Report by the Secretary | 87 |
| 3. Letter from M. Henri Brenier (Assessor) to the Chairman of the Opium Committee relating to the Work of the Advisory Committee during its Tenth (Extraordinary) Session | 106 |
| 4. Policy of the Chinese Government regarding the Suppression of the Illicit Use of Opium : A Scheme for the Prohibition within three Years of the Illicit Use of Opium, submitted by the Ministry of Finance to the Central Political Council | 107 |
| 5. Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni on a Scheme for the Control of the Drug Traffic | 109 |
| 6. Report to the Council on the Work of the Tenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Committee | 118 |

ANNEX 1.

**AGENDA FOR THE TENTH (EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION OF THE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

Adopted by the Committee on September 28th, 1927.

1. Adoption of Agenda.
 2. Progress Report by the Secretary.
 3. Position with regard to the Ratification of the Geneva Opium Convention of 1925.
 4. Reservations made by the Swedish Government to Article 6 (c) of the Convention adopted by the Second Opium Conference.
 5. Illicit Traffic.
 6. Method of entering Statistics relating to Seized Drugs in Annual Reports sent in by Governments.
 7. Consideration of the Formation of an International Syndicate of Drug Manufacturers (Proposal by Dr. Anselmino).
 8. Method of Circulation of Unofficial Information.
 9. The Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Production of Opium in Persia circulated to the Members and Assessors of the Committee, taking note of the Discussion thereon in the Fifth Committee and the Assembly with reference to the Question of Illicit Traffic.
 10. Discussion on the Respective Duties of the Advisory Committee and the Permanent Central Board. Proposal by M. Fotitch.
 11. Discussion on Document O. C. 666. Memorandum by M. Cavazzoni.
 12. Letter from the Danish Government with regard to the Minutes of the Ninth Session concerning the Carl Ruben Case.
-

ANNEX 2.

PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.

Submitted to the Committee on September 28th, 1927.

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1925. | <p>No. I. — "The Committee desires to call the special attention of the Council to the long delay in bringing the Geneva Convention of February 1925 into force. Notwithstanding the resolutions adopted by the Council and Assembly during the years 1925 and 1926 on the subject, the number of ratifications deposited up to the present date, nearly two years after the close of the Conference, is very small. The Committee would, in particular, respectfully remind the Council that, under Article 36 of the Convention, the Convention will not, in existing circumstances, come into operation until at least seven of the States represented on the Council, of which two must be States having permanent seats, have ratified it, and that up to the present only one permanent Member and one non-permanent Member of the Council have done so. The Committee would urge in the strongest way that great difficulties will continue to be encountered in dealing with the huge illicit traffic which still exists unless the further powers which the Convention confers are obtained and that serious harm is being caused by the long delay in bringing the Convention into general operation. The Committee therefore ventures to address an urgent request to the Council that it will give the question of early ratification its most serious consideration at its next meeting."</p> | <p>All States Members of the League and Parties to the Hague Convention with the exception of:</p> <p>Australia, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Great Britain, India, Monaco, New Zealand, Portugal, Salvador, Union of South Africa.</p> | <p>April 12th, 1927 C.L.35.</p> | <p>BELGIUM. — Ratified August 24th, 1927.</p> <p>CHINA, August 10th, 1927. — As the Chinese Government is not a signatory of the Convention, the question of ratification does not arise.</p> <p>CUBA, May 26th, 1927. — The Government has asked the Senate to consider the question of ratification of the Convention, and a new narcotic law is in preparation.</p> <p>CZECHOSLOVAKIA. — Ratified April 9th, 1927.</p> <p>DANZIG. — Adhered June 16th, 1927.</p> <p>ESTONIA, May 31st, 1926. — The question of the ratification will be on the agenda of the autumn session of Parliament.</p> <p>FRANCE. — Ratified July 2nd, 1927.</p> <p>GERMANY, May 10th, 1927. — The matter has been referred to the competent authorities and a further communication will be sent later.</p> <p>HAITI, May 6th, 1927. — Note has been taken of the resolution.</p> <p>JAPAN, June 22nd, 1927. — The Government is taking every measure to ensure early ratification.</p> <p>NETHERLANDS, September 5th, 1927. — The Convention has already been approved by the States-General, by the Law of December 30th, 1926. It will be ratified by the Netherlands as soon as the national legislation has been adapted to the provisions of the Convention. A draft Law to replace the Netherlands Opium Law of 1919 has been drawn up and will shortly be laid before the Second Chamber of the States-General. The legislation regarding opium and other dangerous drugs in the Netherlands East Indies is already in conformity with the provisions of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925. Preparations are being made to amend the legislation in Surinam and Curaçao in order to bring it into line with the Convention of February 19th, 1925; the work is already well advanced.</p> <p>NICARAGUA, June 4th, 1927. — As soon as the National Congress meets, the question of ratification will be placed before it for its approval.</p> <p>SIAM, February 28th, 1927. — The Government is giving earnest consideration to the question of ratifying the Convention.</p> <p>VENEZUELA, June 2nd, 1927. — Adhered <i>ad referendum</i>.</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic.</p> | <p>No. II. — "The Advisory Committee, after a careful examination of a large mass of information in regard to the illicit traffic in the drugs which has again been placed before it, reports to the Council that, while information continues to accumulate as to the huge extent of the traffic and the methods by which and the channels through which the drugs are smuggled, information is still almost completely lacking as to the sources from which the drugs are obtained by the illicit traffickers. The Committee regards it as one of the most urgent needs of the present moment that those sources should be discovered, and, in view of the universal character of the menace and of the interest which all countries have in averting that menace from their own peoples, the Committee desires to urge as strongly as possible that a systematic and searching enquiry should be undertaken (if that has not already been done) without delay by the Governments of all the countries which manufacture the drugs or import them on a considerable scale, with a view to discovering from whom and by what methods the illicit traffickers procure their supplies. The Committee recommends that, in addition to any methods of investigation which the Governments may think it desirable to employ for the purpose of this enquiry, a thorough examination should be made of the books, registers, of purchasers, and sales of the drugs, and other records of the manufacturers or importers of the drugs, and of all persons dealing in the drugs on a considerable scale, so as to track down the drugs to the point at which they reach the illicit traffickers; and all such manufacturers, importers and dealers should be required, for the purpose of the special enquiry proposed, to furnish full particulars in regard to any transactions which are not clearly proved to be destined for medical and scientific purposes. Further, the Committee desires again to place on record its views that any such manufacturer, importer or dealer found to be knowingly supplying the drugs for other than medical or scientific purposes should, in addition to any penalty to which he may be liable under the laws in force, be prohibited from manufacturing, importing or dealing in any of the drugs for the future. The Committee would also urge that the greatest care should be taken to ensure that licences to</p> | <p>All States Members of the League and Parties to the Hague Convention.</p> | <p>April 9th, 1927. C.L.34</p> | <p>AUSTRALIA, July 29th, 1927. — Illicit traffic in dangerous drugs is confined almost wholly to opium and cocaine smuggled into the Commonwealth by passengers and crews of oversea vessels. Neither of these drugs is produced in the Commonwealth and imports are allowed only under licence and for medicinal or scientific purposes. Illicit trafficking in opium and cocaine obtained by licensed importers may be regarded as negligible, as a strict supervision is kept over imports to ensure that the drugs are not improperly used. A few instances have come under notice in which licensed pharmacists have supplied small quantities of cocaine to drug addicts, but in such instances suitable action has been taken to prevent recurrence of such offences. So far as legitimate imports are concerned, it is therefore not considered, that any enquiry by the Commonwealth Government on the lines suggested in your letter would be of advantage. With regard to opium and cocaine smuggled into Australia from overseas, every effort is made to suppress the traffic, and where a seizure is made the source of supply is, if possible, ascertained. In most instances, prohibited goods when discovered are disowned, and no information as regards such goods is obtainable.</p> <p>ARGENTINE, July 25th, 1927. — Forwards Decree and Laws. See document O.C.650.</p> <p>CANADA, May 7th, 1927. — Drugs not manufactured in Canada and all such narcotics, whether legally or illegally entering, must come from abroad. Legal entries are most carefully covered by import certificates, only issued to well-known and reputable licensed wholesalers and manufacturers. The use to which these persons put the drugs is most carefully followed up by a regular system of records until they are disposed of either in the process of manufacture or by sale to retail druggists. Control exercised by means of returns received from retail druggists and a comprehensive checking of prescriptions issued. Every retail druggist is required to keep a detailed record of prescriptions. Illegal entries are promptly reported from time to time to the League of Nations, and wherever possible full information is furnished as to the source of supply. It would appear therefore that</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|---|---|---------------|-------------------|---|
| <p>Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic (continued).</p> | <p>manufacture, purchase, import, export or deal in the drugs should only be issued by the Government authorities to persons who can fully establish the <i>bona-fide</i> character of their business."</p> | | | <p>there is no action open to Canada which has not already been taken with a view to ensuring absolute control of the authorised traffic and the employment of every effort to keep illegal traffic to a minimum.</p> <p>CUBA. May 24th, 1927. — A system of registering certificates for imports of drugs is in force and the certificates are not given except for medical and scientific purposes.</p> <p>CZECHOSLOVAKIA, August 19th, 1927. — Cases of illicit traffic in narcotics seldom occur in Czechoslovakia, and as soon as they are reported the proper authorities make careful enquiries in order to discover the sources of supply and the channels used by the trafficker. The businesses of wholesale chemists and druggists are supervised by medical officers, who are also responsible for inspecting their premises and their books, in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 of Governmental Decree No. 147/25 of the Collection of Laws and Decrees. The books show the quantity of the goods in stock, received, manufactured, sold or otherwise disposed of, and exported, with dates; these particulars must be given for each drug separately. Against each item is also shown the name of the other party concerned (seller, importer, purchaser, acquirer). According to reports recently received by the Ministry of Public Health from all the departments in the country, there have been no derelictions of duty in this respect. No narcotics are imported or exported unless it can be proved that they are for scientific or medical purposes. Under the regulations in force, dealers or manufacturers knowingly delivering narcotics for other than medical or scientific purposes are liable to relatively severe penalties; they are refused import and export certificates, and their trade licences may be withdrawn. The Ministry of Health has recently applied to the Ministry of Commerce for the issue of a limited number of licences to manufacture, import and deal in narcotics to persons who can satisfy the authorities of their commercial <i>bona fides</i>.</p> <p>DANZIG, August 26th, 1927. — In the Free City it has not been found that there is any increase in the illicit trade in narcotics; on the</p> |

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|---|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
| <p>Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic (continued).</p> | | | | <p>contrary, by very strict supervision, the illicit trade has been almost completely suppressed. In the rare cases in which offences have occurred, it has almost invariably been found that the drugs were stolen from consignments imported before the Danzig Opium Laws came into force. In every case, however, it has been possible to ascertain how these consignments arrived in Danzig, and to establish the fact that they were imported before the Danzig Laws came into force. The proposed measures (inspection of dealers' books, etc., compulsory furnishing of information, etc.) are already required by law. The new draft law to be passed in accordance with the Convention of February 19th, 1925, greatly increases the existing powers, so that any kind of additional examination can be carried out if required. If the head of a commercial firm which has obtained a licence for trading in narcotics infringes the law (which has never hitherto occurred), he will lose his licence. Further, in this trade, the inspecting authorities have already power under the Danzig legislation to withdraw licences at any time.</p> <p>GERMANY, May 19th, 1927. — If the Government thinks it possible to take action in this matter, the Foreign Office will inform the Secretariat.</p> <p>INDIA, April 21st, 1927. — Cocaine is not manufactured in India; morphia is only manufactured at the Government Factory at Ghazipur, and only small amounts of cocaine and morphia are imported.</p> <p>MONACO, May 16th, 1927. — There are no manufacturers or importers of narcotics from whom traffickers could obtain supplies. Only pharmaceutical chemists are allowed to deal in these drugs, and they may not dispense them except on the prescription of a recognised doctor. Care is taken, and greater care will be taken in future, that narcotics are not delivered by dispensaries except on a medical prescription or on production of a certificate from the head of a laboratory as required by law. Any traffickers there may be can only obtain supplies outside the Principality, or from persons who do not live in Monaco and who spend most of their time in night-clubs and places of amusement.</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic (continued).</p> | | | | <p>NETHERLANDS, September 5th, 1927. — In the Netherlands, the books and registers of all persons manufacturing or dealing in narcotics are regularly and systematically inspected. This inspection is regarded as effective and as giving satisfactory results. In accordance with the intention of this resolution, as soon as a case is suspected, the Netherlands Government will carry out not only the normal enquiries but also a special exhaustive examination of the books and registers. The Netherlands Government adheres to the principle that any licensed person wilfully delivering narcotics for unlawful purposes is thereafter forbidden to deal in such goods. Licences are granted only to persons whose <i>bona fides</i> is above suspicion. In the Netherlands East Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, no narcotics are manufactured, and only negligible quantities are imported.</p> <p>NEW ZEALAND, June 14th, 1927. — Dangerous drugs are not manufactured in New Zealand and are imported only in reasonable quantities for domestic use. There is no reason to believe that any considerable illicit traffic in the drugs is carried on. The books of all importing firms are carefully inspected from time to time to see whether any illegal transactions take place.</p> <p>NORWAY, July 26th, 1927. — The Inspector of Pharmacies, whose instructions on this matter are very strict, supervises the purchase of drugs by chemists and druggists in Norway. Any druggist concerned in illicit dealing loses his licence; in the case of pharmaceutical chemists, the licence may be cancelled by order of the Courts. There are no exporting interests to interfere with the supervision of the drug trade, and cases of illicit dealing are extremely rare.</p> <p>PORTUGAL, April 29th, 1927. — See document O.C.606. Decree of August 2nd, 1926.</p> <p>ROUMANIA, June 9th, 1927. — Authorisations for the import of narcotics are only given to chemists and druggists and wholesale merchants, and then only after the amount previously imported has been satisfactorily accounted for.</p> |

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Leakage of Drugs into the Illicit Traffic (continued). | | | | UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, June 10th, 1927. — Very little smuggling into the Union of South Africa occurs. The small amount done is mainly by members of crews of vessels from the East whilst at Union ports. |
| Postal Traffic. | No. III. — "The Committee requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to call the attention of all Governments in Europe, and of such other Governments as appear likely to be interested in the matter, to the fact that enormous quantities of dangerous drugs are being exported to China by post. In this connection, the attention of these Governments should, it is suggested, be invited to Resolution XI appended to the report forwarded last year by the Committee to the Council. A copy of the list of seizures received by the Committee from the Chinese Maritime Customs ¹ , through the International Anti-Opium Association of Peking, should be forwarded, and the Governments should be requested to exercise special vigilance in the case of all postal matter destined for China in so far as this is possible." | All States Members of the League and Parties to the Hague Convention. | April 9th, 1927. C.L.33. | <p>BELGIUM, June 8th, 1927. — The General Post Office has been asked to state how far it is in a position to exercise special supervision over these mails, as suggested by the Advisory Committee. The Belgian Government will forward this information as soon as it comes to hand. It is pointed out, however, that, so far, this question has not specially concerned Belgium; the lists of seizures made by the Chinese Customs contain no mention of any fraud in connection with postal matter sent from Belgium to China.</p> <p>CANADA, May 7th, 1927. — There is every reason to believe that in so far as Canada is concerned there is no export by post of dangerous drugs to China. It is contrary to the laws of this country for narcotic drugs to be sent in the mails, with the exception of packages sent in the ordinary course of business from licensed dealers to their customers, and the competent authorities are satisfied that, as all such transactions are scrupulously reported and checked and as these drugs are not manufactured in Canada, there is no ground for believing that there is any export of them to China by post.</p> <p>CUBA, May 16th, 1927. — Cuba is not a producing country, so that no special supervision of this kind is necessary.</p> |

¹ Replies from the following Governments have been received regarding the seizures by the Chinese Maritime Customs:

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Austria | O.C. 627. | Great Britain | O.C. 569 (c) |
| Czechoslovakia | O.C. 569 (a) | Netherlands | O.C. 569 (b) |
| Germany | O.C. 569 (b) | Switzerland | O.C. 569 (b) |

No replies have yet been received from France and Hungary, to which the list of figures was also sent. Further postal seizures at Shanghai during the January quarter of 1927 made by the Chinese Maritime Customs were reported to the League by the British representative on the Committee, details of which will be found in document O.C.608. Copies of this document were sent with a covering letter to the Governments of Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Japan and Switzerland in June last. Up to the present time, no replies have been received.

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <p>Postal Traffic (continued).</p> | | | | <p>GERMANY, May 20th, 1927. — The matter has been referred to the home authorities. If the German Government thinks it possible to take action in connection with the resolution, the Foreign Office will inform the Secretariat.</p> <p>ITALY, June 27th, 1927. — The Minister of Communications has given instructions to prevent these drugs being sent by letter or parcel post and to have them confiscated. Special instructions have been given to the provincial central offices having authority over the post offices from which mails are despatched to China to watch carefully any postal matter suspected of containing narcotics, particularly opium.</p> <p>MONACO, May 3rd, 1927. — The Government has no authority to exercise any kind of supervision over the operations performed in the Principality by the offices of a service which is under the direct control of the French Department of Posts and Telegraphs.</p> <p>NETHERLANDS, September 5th, 1927. — In the opinion of the Netherlands Government, the procedure proposed by the Swiss Government (see document O.C.555) is wholly desirable, and will constitute the most practical means of attaining the object set forth in the resolution. Attention has been given to the question of the measures which can be taken by the Netherlands authorities with a view to exercising special supervision over the despatch of narcotics by post. Copies of the circular letter and annexes have been sent to the Colonial Government, though this question is of purely secondary importance to the Colonies.</p> <p>NEW ZEALAND, June 28th, 1927. — There is no reason to believe that the dangerous drugs are being sent by post from New Zealand to China or the Far East. The postal and Customs authorities have, however, been instructed to exercise vigilance in the case of all postal matter destined for China.</p> <p>NORWAY, July 26th, 1927. — It is prohibited to send opium and other narcotics by post except for medical purposes and with</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (concluded).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <p>Postal Traffic (continued).</p> | | | | <p>the permission of the country of destination. The mails are under the supervision of the postal and Customs authorities, who have instructions to adhere strictly to the regulations on the subject. Since the last information received, no narcotics are known to have been despatched from Norway to the Far East by post.</p> <p>POLAND, July 14th, 1927. — Narcotics may only be exported if the consignments are accompanied by the certificates required by the Order of January 20th, 1925, concerning import and export procedure. The provisions of paragraph 4 of this Order constitute a sufficient guarantee that any narcotics exported will be sent only to persons entitled to import them. There is very little possibility of narcotics being unlawfully exported on fraudulent declarations, inasmuch as Poland is not a narcotic-manufacturing country but a consuming country. All industrial and commercial establishments and all pharmaceutical chemists are required to keep an exact record of all quantities of these drugs bought and sold, stating the origin and the name of the purchaser; consequently, any illegal exports cannot exceed the quantity of narcotics imported into Poland by the same illegal channels. This double risk would appear to exclude any possibility of fraudulent export.</p> <p>PORTUGAL, April 29th, 1927. — The Portuguese postal and telegraphic service regulations strictly prohibit the despatch of narcotics by post, as provided by the Universal Postal Union and by the Universal Postal Convention approved by the Stockholm Conference of 1924.</p> <p>SWITZERLAND, May 21st, 1927. — The Federal authorities responsible for the enforcement of the law on narcotics have consulted the General Post Office, which has instructed clearing offices to pay special attention to letters and parcels addressed to China. The Trade in Narcotics Order expressly forbids the despatch of narcotics by ordinary or registered post.</p> <p>VENEZUELA, May 18th, 1927. — Note has been taken of the resolution.</p> |

POSITION OF TURKEY AS REGARDS THE HAGUE CONVENTION.

RESOLUTION IV.

Resolution IV of the ninth session of the Advisory Committee reads as follows :

“ The Committee :

“ (1) Takes note of the fact that the Turkish Government has not replied to the letter sent out on the instructions of the Council on October 20th, 1926 ;

“ (2) Requests the Secretary-General to arrange that, if no answer is received from the Turkish Government before the March meeting of the Council, the attention of the Council should be called to this omission. ”

The Turkish Government was communicated with unofficially through a Turkish member of the Information Section of the Secretariat.

As no reply was received by the Secretariat before the Council met in March, the following paragraph was inserted in the Council report on the work of the ninth session of the Advisory Committee :

“ The question of the ratification of the Hague Convention by the Government of Turkey was again discussed by the Advisory Committee. It will be remembered that this question was brought before the Council in September last by the representative of Sweden, my predecessor as Rapporteur to the Council on questions relating to the traffic in opium and drugs, in his report to the Council on the work of the eighth session of the Committee. As I understand no reply has been received from the Government of Turkey to the letter addressed to it on October 20th, 1926, by the Secretary-General, on the instructions of the Council, it might be considered desirable to bring the matter once more to the attention of that Government. ”

Accordingly, the Secretary-General wrote to the Turkish Government on March 30th, 1927, drawing its attention to the fact that his previous letter, dated October 20th, 1926, remained unanswered and enclosing a copy of it. No reply has as yet been received.

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Traffic in South American States.</p> | <p>No. V. — "The Committee calls the attention of the Council to the difficulty experienced by the Committee in forming an opinion as to the exact situation of the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs in Central and South America, due to the incomplete information at the Committee's disposal regarding these countries. The Committee therefore requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to approach the Governments of these countries in order to obtain :</p> <p>(1) Regular annual reports to be despatched on October 1st of each year, and to be based on the model form now generally adopted ;</p> <p>(2) Copies of the laws and regulations in force concerning the traffic in narcotics ;</p> <p>(3) Information with regard to the administrative arrangements for enforcing the laws and regulations in vigour and, in particular, information as to the acceptance and application of the import and export certificate system ;</p> <p>(4) Information as to whether these Governments intend to ratify or adhere to the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925 ;</p> <p>(5) Information as to the illicit traffic in narcotics in their respective countries ;</p> <p>(6) In cases where the Hague Convention of 1912 has not yet been ratified and enforced, information as to when such ratification and enforcement may be expected. "</p> | <p>Argentine, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela.</p> | <p>April 14th, 1927.</p> | <p>CUBA, May 28th, 1927. — With regard to the transmission of annual reports, it has been difficult to get the necessary information during the years 1925 and 1926, but the work has now been finished, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is communicating with the Ministry of Health, asking the Ministry of Health to transmit urgently the information required, so that the Cuba Government will be able to forward its annual reports.</p> <p>SALVADOR. — See document O.C.640.</p> |
| <p>Free Ports.</p> | <p>No. VI. — "The Committee desires to draw the attention of the Council to the necessity for controlling adequately the opium and drug traffic in free ports and free zones. It requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to approach the Governments of countries where free ports and free zones exist, in all cases where these Governments have not already furnished information, with a view to obtaining complete lists of such free ports and zones, and statements as to whether the national legislation regarding opium and narcotic drugs is applied in these free ports or zones. Governments which do not apply their national drug regulations in the</p> | <p>All Members of the League, except : Czechoslovakia, Brazil, Danzig, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Siam, Sweden.</p> | <p>April 2nd, 1927. C.L.31.</p> | <p>GREECE, June 21st, 1927. — The traffic in opium in the Salonika Free Zone is subject to exactly the same supervision as is practised in the rest of Greece. The exporter has to present to the Finance Ministry, either directly or through the Zone authorities, an application for export from the competent authorities of the country of destination. The Salonika Zone authorities give authority for export on production of a licence issued by the Finance Ministry. The same arrangements apply to the import of opium from the Free Zone into Greek territory.</p> <p>SWEDEN. — Full information is contained in document O.C.646.</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|--|----------|--------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------------|--------|---------------|--|---------------|--|----------------|--|---------|--|------------|
| Free Ports (continued). | free ports or zones within their territories should be asked to furnish precise information as to the system of control they apply in such areas, and to forward copies of the relevant regulations." | | | <p>SWITZERLAND, April 22nd, 1927. — This question is regulated by Article 39 of the Order of the Federal Council of June 23rd, 1925, concerning the trade in narcotics. The Order provides that, with the authority of the Federal Public Health Department, imported raw opium may be stored in a Federal Customs warehouse or in a free port; in such case the opium may not be exported without an export licence. The effect is, in the first place, that there is a general prohibition of the storage of narcotics in a free port, the only exception (referring to opium alone) being subject to the formal authorisation of the Public Health Department; secondly, that opium stored in a free port under such authorisation is subject to inspection as if it were in Swiss territory, since it cannot be exported without an export licence. This regulation, which was introduced into the Order on the advice of the Customs Department, satisfies in advance the wishes expressed by the Advisory Committee. There are three free ports in Switzerland: at Basle, Geneva and Lausanne.</p> <p>The following countries have replied, stating that no free ports nor free zones exist within their territories:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Albania,</td> <td>India,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Austria,</td> <td>Irish Free State,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Belgium,</td> <td>Japan,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bulgaria,</td> <td>Luxemburg,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Canada,</td> <td>New Zealand,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cuba,</td> <td>Salvador,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estonia,</td> <td>Kingdom of the</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Haiti,</td> <td>Serbs, Croats</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>and Slovenes,</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Union of South</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Africa,</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Venezuela.</td> </tr> </table> <p>See also documents: O.C. 71 O.C. 537 and Annex O.C. 559 O.C. 632</p> <p>Although the resolution was not sent to the Governments of the Netherlands and Danzig, as these Governments had already sent information, the following letters have been received.</p> <p>DANZIG, August 26th, 1927. — In the territory of the Free City there is only one free zone — in the municipality of Danzig. The same laws regarding the drug trade are in force in the free zone as in the rest of the territory.</p> <p>NETHERLANDS, September 5th, 1927. — Although the Secretary-General has not asked the Netherlands Government for</p> | Albania, | India, | Austria, | Irish Free State, | Belgium, | Japan, | Bulgaria, | Luxemburg, | Canada, | New Zealand, | Cuba, | Salvador, | Estonia, | Kingdom of the | Haiti, | Serbs, Croats | | and Slovenes, | | Union of South | | Africa, | | Venezuela. |
| Albania, | India, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Austria, | Irish Free State, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Belgium, | Japan, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bulgaria, | Luxemburg, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Canada, | New Zealand, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cuba, | Salvador, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estonia, | Kingdom of the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Haiti, | Serbs, Croats | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | and Slovenes, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Union of South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Africa, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Venezuela. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Free Ports (continued).</p> | | | | <p>information regarding free ports and free zones, the Royal Government thinks it is desirable — in view of the fact that the information previously given on this subject is no longer correct — to inform the Secretary-General of the present position as regards free ports in the Netherlands Colonies. In the Netherlands East Indies there are at present two areas which do not form part of the Customs zone:</p> <p>(a) The Island of Weh (province of Atjeh and dependencies), in which is situated the port of Sabang;</p> <p>(b) The Riouw Archipelago (province of Riouw and dependencies), including the port of Tandjongpinang.</p> <p>These areas do not form part of the zone in which the Government of the Netherlands East Indies levies import and export duties, but they are subject in the same manner as the Customs zone to the national legislation concerning opium and other dangerous drugs. The discrimination between the Customs zone and the free zone does not affect the maintenance of the regulations governing the import and export of narcotics. In the Netherlands, Surinam and Curaçao, there are no free ports or free zones.</p> |
| <p>Statistics of Import and Export in Annual Reports and Export Authorisations.</p> | <p>No. VII. — "The Committee requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to approach the various Governments which forward reports with the object of explaining to them that the annual reports should give statistics of actual imports and exports and not of the quantities which may have been authorised for import or for export. The object is to obtain statistics which represent the actual facts as regards import and export, as otherwise comparisons between the imports and exports of one country with the exports or imports of the corresponding country are rendered difficult or impossible. The Committee also recommends that, in cases where an exporting country authorises an export of narcotics to another country which has not accepted or applied the import and export certificate system, the exporting country should, in all cases, inform the country of destination of the fact that such an export authorisation has been given."</p> | <p>All States Members of the League Parties to the Hague Convention.</p> | <p>April 7th, 1927. C.L.32.</p> | <p>ARGENTINE, May 18th, 1927. — The question has been referred to the Department concerned.</p> <p>AUSTRALIA, June 10th, 1927. — The report of the Commonwealth contains statistics of actual imports and exports. With regard to the second part of the resolution, the export from the Commonwealth of opium and other dangerous drugs is only permitted subject to the following condition:</p> <p>"The persons requesting permission to export the goods in question must produce to the Collector of Customs for the State from which the export is to be made a certificate signed by the proper authority of the Government of the country to which it is intended to export the preparations that the quantity ordered is for the purchaser's legitimate business and for bona-fide medical and/or scientific purpose."</p> <p>CHINA, August 10th, 1927. — This Government has not authorised, so far, any export of narcotics</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <p>Statistics of Import and Export in Annual Reports and Export Authorisations (continued).</p> | | | | <p>to any other country. It will certainly act in accordance with the resolution if such authorisation should be issued in the future.</p> <p>CUBA, April 28th, 1927. — The Cuban Drugs Act prohibits the import of narcotics except with the previous authorisation of the Health Department, which is granted only if the drugs are to be used for medicinal and scientific purposes; hence the first part of the resolution does not apply to this country, nor, in view of the fact that Cuba does not export drugs, is the second part applicable.</p> <p>ESTONIA, April 14th 1927. — The terms of the resolution will be put into effect by the responsible authorities.</p> <p>GERMANY, June 2nd, 1927. — The matter has been brought to the attention of the competent authorities.</p> <p>GREAT BRITAIN, May 7th, 1927. — The annual report of the British Government on the traffic in drugs is already prepared on the basis recommended in the first paragraph of the resolution.</p> <p>GUATEMALA, June 22nd, 1927. — Note has been taken of the resolution.</p> <p>HUNGARY, July 25th, 1927. — In future, the annual reports will contain statistics of actual imports and exports, and not of quantities for which import or export licences have been granted. The recommendation in the second paragraph of the resolution has long been operative in Hungary.</p> <p>NETHERLANDS, September 5th, 1927. — In the annual reports for the Netherlands territory in Europe, the quantities imported and exported are stated in accordance with this recommendation. The Colonial Governments have been requested to adhere to the recommendation. The Netherlands Government regrets that it is unable to follow the second part of the recommendation at present because it has not yet been made compulsory in the Netherlands to apply for a special licence for each consignment exported. As soon as the new opium law comes into force, introducing the system</p> |

I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (continued).

| Subject. | Resolution. | To whom sent. | Date of despatch. | Replies. |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| <p>Statistics of Import and Export in Annual Reports and Export Authorisations (continued).</p> | | | | <p>of import and export certificates, the Government will be prepared to carry out the recommendation. The authorities of the Netherlands East Indies always send a copy of the export certificate to the country of destination. The recommendation has been forwarded to the Governments of Surinam and Curaçao.</p> <p>NORWAY, July 26th, 1927. — The annual reports are based on statistics of actual imports and exports. As regards the question of export licences, the quantities of these products exported from Norway are infinitesimal. Should occasion arise, however, the authorities will carefully adhere to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.</p> <p>SALVADOR, May 30th, 1927. — A report will be sent in conformity with the resolution of the Advisory Committee.</p> <p>SWITZERLAND, April 22nd, 1927. — The statistics given in the reports of the Federal Public Health Department represent actual imports and exports, as required by the resolution, and not quantities for which import and export licences have been issued. As regards the second part of the resolution, the Federal authorities decided two months ago (February 10th) to forward to the Governments concerned copies of the export licences issued. This procedure is now regularly followed, so that the resolution of the Advisory Committee can be regarded as effectively applied in Switzerland.</p> |
| <p>Annual Reports from certain Governments which have not hitherto sent them.</p> | <p>No. VIII.—“ The Committee notes that certain Governments which do not send regular annual reports on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs apparently omit to do so since the narcotic question appears to them to be of little or no domestic importance in their territories. The Committee wishes to point out that a country in which drug addiction is not prevalent and in which there is little or no traffic in narcotics may still, on account of its geographical position or for other reasons, be of importance from the point of view of control over the international narcotic traffic. The Committee therefore requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to communicate with the Governments</p> | <p>Albania, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Haiti, Luxemburg.</p> | <p>April 1st, 1927.</p> | <p>HAITI, April 26th, 1927. — The Secretary-General's letter has been forwarded to the proper authority, and the Department of Foreign Affairs will inform the Secretariat in due course of its decision.</p> <p>LUXEMBURG, April 2nd, 1927. — The Secretary-General's letter has been forwarded to the Director-General of Public Health for action.</p> |

**I. ACTION ARISING FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE LAST SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (concluded).**

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Annual Reports from Certain Governments which have not hitherto sent them <i>(continued).</i></p> | <p>of the following States: Albania, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Haiti and Luxemburg, with the object of obtaining regular annual reports from these countries. The Committee suggests that, if this recommendation be approved, a separate letter should be issued to each such Government; in this letter a brief statement could be given of the reasons leading the Committee to attach special importance to the regular receipt of the report in question."</p> | | | |
| <p>Date of Despatch of Annual Reports</p> | <p>No. IX. — "In view of the importance which the Committee attaches to the examination of the annual reports from Governments, and in order that these reports may be received in time for adequate examination, the Committee requests the Council to invite the Secretary-General to send each year to all Governments, two months before the date fixed for the despatch of their report, a letter expressing the hope that they will be in a position to forward their report on or before the due date."</p> | <p>All European Governments.</p> <p>All non-European Governments.</p> | <p>May 18th, 1927.</p> <p>July 24th, 1927.</p> | |
| <p>Information from Estonia and Lithuania.</p> | <p>No. X. — "In view of the geographical position of Estonia and Lithuania, which renders these two countries important from the point of view of the transit of drugs between certain manufacturing and consuming countries, the Committee requests the Council to invite the Governments of Estonia and Lithuania to furnish as detailed information as possible with regard to their laws and regulations relating to the import, export and transit of narcotic drugs, and also to supply copies of any laws or regulations in force governing the internal trade in opium and drugs. It would be of great assistance to the Committee if the Government of Lithuania, which has already accepted the import and export certificate system, would be good enough to state whether that system is now effectively applied."</p> | <p>Estonia, Lithuania.</p> | <p>April 1st, 1927.</p> | <p>ESTONIA. — Detailed information contained in document O.C. 641.</p> |

II. REPLIES RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST SESSION TO CIRCULAR LETTERS CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH SESSION.

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Export Authorisations. | No. II of the Eighth Session of the Advisory Committee. — "The Committee recommends that the administrations called upon to decide on an application for export of drugs to a country not applying a system of import authorisations should endeavour to ascertain whether the application submitted to them is a legitimate one. This recommendation is made in the spirit which inspired Article 18 of the Geneva Convention of February 19th, 1925." | All States Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912. | October 26th, 1926. C.L.131. | <p>ITALY, undated, received January 27th, 1927. — The measures referred to in the resolution are already adopted. The existing regulations lay down that applicants must state the reasons for which such drugs are to be exported. After the facts have been verified, the applications are transmitted by the various prefects' offices to the Ministry of the Interior accompanied by an explanatory note.</p> <p>JAPAN, January 27th, 1927. — No dangerous drugs can be exported from Japan without the permit of the authorities, who grant it only on the strength of the import certificate issued by the authorities of the importing countries. The authorities, in order to control the export from Japan to China and her adjacent countries which have not adopted the import certificate system, and where they consider special precautions necessary because of existing conditions, had decided, before the Committee considered the problem, to take the steps suggested. It is improbable that Japan will be called upon in the immediate future to export to any countries other than those mentioned above.</p> <p>LIBERIA, February 21st, 1927. — The communication has been brought to the attention of the Government.</p> <p>NICARAGUA, May 17th, 1927. — Does not produce either opium or any other dangerous drugs; no action will be taken therefore for the moment as regards applications for the export of such drugs.</p> <p>SIAM, February 28th, 1927. — The communication has been noted.</p> |
| The Inclusion of Seizure Returns in Annual Reports. | No. IV. — "The Committee recommends that the Governments, in their annual reports to the League, should be asked to state the total quantities of each of the drugs (including opium) seized by their authorities during the year, taking care to distinguish the seizures made by the Customs authorities from other seizures." | All States Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912. | October 27th, 1926. C.L.126. | <p>CZECHOSLOVAKIA, February 21st, 1927. — The Government agrees to the resolution.</p> <p>LIBERIA, February 21st, 1927. — The Government will report to the League whenever any seizure of dangerous drugs is made.</p> <p>SIAM, February 28th, 1927. — The resolution has been noted.</p> |
| Traffic in the Persian Gulf. | No. VII. — "The Committee has again examined the situation in regard to the export of opium from the Persian Gulf to the Far East. The bulk of the opium exported from the | Argentina, Austria, Belgium, China, Denmark, France, | November, 8th, 1926. C.L.141. | <p>GERMANY, January 21st, 1927. — The resolution has been submitted to the competent authorities.</p> <p>NORWAY. — See document O.C. 598.</p> |

II. REPLIES RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST SESSION TO CIRCULAR LETTERS CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH SESSION (continued).

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|
| Traffic in the Persian Gulf (continued). | Gulf continues to be sent to the Far East under false declaration of destination and undoubtedly finds its way into the illicit traffic. The Committee notes that the recommendation made by it, in paragraph (b) of Resolution II of its report for 1925, that Powers whose ships are engaged in traffic with the Persian Gulf should adopt measures to control the conveyance of opium from the Persian Gulf on such ships and to prevent its diversion into the illicit traffic, has not been carried out except by one of the States whose ships are engaged in the traffic with the Far East. The result has been that, while the measures taken by the latter Power have prevented the traffic from being carried on in the ships of that Power, the traffickers continue to carry it on in the ships of other countries. It accordingly asks the Council to make urgent representations to the Governments of the countries whose ships were engaged in the traffic during the past year to take the necessary measures for the control of the traffic. Further, the Committee recommends that the Governments of Powers having extra-territorial rights in Persia should be asked to institute a control over their nationals in Persia on the lines of the regulations already made by some Powers in order to prevent their engaging in the illicit trade in opium." | Germany. Great Britain. Italy. Japan. Netherlands. Norway. Portugal, Spain. Sweden. Switzerland, United States of America. | | |
| Maritime Insurance. | No. VIII. — "The Committee desires to call special attention to the steps taken in Great Britain in regard to maritime insurance with a view to preventing the insurance of consignments of opium or drugs destined for illicit purposes, and would urge that similar steps should be taken as soon as possible in other countries whose nationals undertake the business of maritime insurance." | All States Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912, with the exception of Great Britain. | October 26th, 1926. C.L.133. | <p>AUSTRALIA, January 15th, 1927. — The matter has been taken up with the Federal Council of Maritime Underwriters of Australia and Tasmania, which, in September 1926, intimated that it had decided to adopt the terms of the London Agreement and to insert a clause in the terms thereof in all future cargo policies issued.</p> <p>CUBA, December 14th, 1926. — The resolution has been noted with interest.</p> <p>CZECHOSLOVAKIA, February 4th, 1927. — As Czechoslovakia produces no narcotics and consequently exports none, the measures recommended in this resolution would be of no practical value in this country.</p> <p>DENMARK, June 21st, 1927. — The Danish Association of Marine Underwriters decided on April 1st, 1927, to introduce the</p> |

II. REPLIES RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST SESSION TO CIRCULAR LETTERS CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH SESSION (*continued*).

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Maritime Insurance (<i>continued</i>).</p> | | | | <p>following obligatory clause into all the policies :</p> <p>“ Opium and/or other dangerous drugs covered by the provisions of the International Opium Convention of 1912 can only be insured on the following conditions :</p> <p>“(1) The goods must be correctly described to the underwriter ;</p> <p>“(2) They must be carried by the normal route ;</p> <p>“(3) The transaction must be legitimate.</p> <p>“ Any application for compensation of any kind will be rejected as not covered by this policy if the three statements above cannot be proved correct by the production of the necessary Government licences and other satisfactory documentary evidence. ”</p> <p>JAPAN, April 30th, 1927. — The Marine Insurance Association of Japan has decided to adopt the clause which has been drawn up by the Marine Insurance Association of London with regard to the shipment of opium and narcotic drugs. The provisions of the clause have been in force since March 1st, 1927.</p> <p>NETHERLANDS. — See document O.C. 596.</p> <p>SALVADOR, December 29th, 1926. — The question is receiving the attention of the authorities.</p> <p>VENEZUELA, January 15th, 1927. — The matter has been referred to the competent department, which will take any necessary steps.</p> |
| <p>Postal Traffic.</p> | <p>No. IX. — “ The Committee draws attention to the evidence it has received of the extensive use of the post by illicit traffickers in morphine and the drugs with the Far East. As this is a danger to which all countries are exposed, the Committee recommends :</p> <p>“(a) That the Council should bring the matter to the notice of all Governments and of the Universal Postal Union ;</p> <p>“(b) That notice of any seizure of drugs sent from abroad through the post should be sent immediately, with particulars of the place at which and the date on which the drugs were posted, to the authorities of the country from which the drugs were sent :</p> | <p>All States Members of the League Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912, and to the Office of the Universal Postal Union.</p> | <p>October 27th, 1926. C.L.120.</p> | <p>AUSTRALIA, January 24th, 1927. — Action will be taken in accordance with the terms of the resolution.</p> <p>ITALY, January 13th, 1927. — Instructions have been given to the Post Offices to seize consignments of drugs wrongfully despatched by letter post, and such seizures will be notified to the postal authorities in the countries of origin.</p> <p>Authorisations for import, export and transit of drugs by means of parcel post must first be obtained from the Ministry of the Interior. This is only given on production of a permit from the competent authorities in the place of destination. The seizure of</p> |

II. REPLIES RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST SESSION TO CIRCULAR LETTERS CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH SESSION (continued).

| <i>Subject.</i> | <i>Resolution.</i> | <i>To whom sent.</i> | <i>Date of despatch.</i> | <i>Replies.</i> |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Postal Traffic (continued).</p> | <p>"(c) That a list of all such seizures and of the results of the investigations made should be included in the annual reports of the Governments to the League."</p> | | | <p>postal packets despatched from abroad for any purpose whatsoever is notified to the postal authorities in the country of origin.</p> <p>LIBERIA, February 21st, 1927. — The resolution has been laid before the Government.</p> <p>NICARAGUA, May 17th, 1927. — Note will be taken of the dangers of the secret traffic in opium through the post, and both the Customs authorities and the Department of Communications will be consulted with a view to complying with the resolution.</p> <p>SIAM, February 28th, 1927. — The resolution has been duly noted by the Government.</p> <p>SWITZERLAND. — Detailed information is given in document O. C. 555.</p> <p>VENEZUELA, January 31st, 1927. — The department concerned has taken note of the particulars of the resolution.</p> |
| <p>Communication between Authorities with regard to Illicit Traffic.</p> | <p>No. X. — "The Advisory Committee asks the Council to draw the attention of the Governments to the importance of direct communication between the authorities which are entrusted with the enforcement of the laws on the suppression of the illicit traffic. The Committee has already several times laid stress on this point, and the matter is dealt with in Article 3 of the Final Act of the Opium Conference. Communications of this kind might be established either by exchange, between these authorities, of information on administrative or Police measures or by direct contact between the said authorities."</p> | <p>All States Members of the League and Parties to the Opium Convention of 1912.</p> | <p>October 26th, 1926. C.L.129.</p> | <p>LIBERIA, February 21st, 1927. — The text of the resolution has been brought to the attention of the Government.</p> <p>SIAM, February 28th, 1927. — The resolution has been noted by the Government.</p> |

ANNEX 3.

WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE DURING ITS TENTH
(EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION.

LETTER FROM M. HENRI BRENIER (ASSESSOR) TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
OPIUM COMMITTEE.

Submitted to the Committee on September 28th, 1927.

Marseilles, September 29th, 1927.

Following upon the letter in which I asked you to inform my colleagues that, owing to unavoidable business calls, I should be unable to attend the present session of the Committee, I have the honour to send you a few brief observations which I would ask you to lay before the Committee at some suitable time during the present session. The simplest way, of course, would be for you to submit this letter to them; and I should like it to appear in the Minutes of the session.

I. *The Question of Graphs.*

I am sorry that, in the report to the Council on the ninth session of the Committee (January 17th to February 3rd, 1927), no mention was made of the question of graphs, although, after a discussion at the fifth meeting, a Sub-Committee was formed at the sixth meeting to consider the subject.

I do not entirely agree with my friend M. van Wettum that "inaccurate graphs are more dangerous than inaccurate statistics" (page 39 of the Minutes of the Ninth Session). I think, with M. Bourgois, that attention can always be drawn to the degree of accuracy of the graphs by a short explanatory note on the same sheet.

Moreover, I would emphasise their value in simplifying our work. We are deluged with documents, so that in the long run we tend to lose sight of the dominant factors in the problem of opium and other dangerous drugs. These factors, after all, are not very numerous. With graphs, attention is immediately drawn to these dominant factors; we form a direct idea of the proportions of things. It cannot be seen that this is any objection to the graphical method. Nobody has any illusions as to its mathematical value, but that is not the point in the present case. I feel bound once more to urge most strongly that this method of presenting the facts should be adopted, with any correctives that may be desirable.

II. *Illicit Traffic.*

This question is tending more and more to occupy the first rank. I am afraid we may find ourselves in a cul-de-sac. I therefore think — as I and several other members of the Committee have been urging for years, and urged again at the last session (page 53 of the Minutes) — that an effort should be made to establish effective supervision of factories on uniform lines. This applies, of course, only to drugs. We all know, however, that, with the exception of British India (there are great difficulties as regards the independent States in India), the countries that produce the raw materials are not at present prepared, or have not adequate administrative arrangements, to supervise the production of those raw materials. The Persian Government's memorandum of March 4th, 1927, and Colonel D. W. MacCormack's statement at the Council meeting on March 11th, 1927 (document A. 8. 1927. XI), are most illuminating on this point. It is relatively much easier to check the smuggling of raw materials. But as regards the actual drugs — which are much more harmful — the facilities for concealment and the thirst for gain are so great that nothing can be done until all countries inspect all factories, following the same principles and using the same practical methods, even though an import and export certificate system — also uniform — is not genuinely and universally applied.

III. *Dr. Anselmino's Memorandum on the Establishment of an International Union of Drug Manufacturers* (document O. C. 638).

While I fully appreciate the intentions of our colleague Dr. Anselmino — who, indeed, had already made the same suggestion — I regret that for my own part, as an assessor, I cannot accept his proposals.

Unfortunately, I have not time to set out my objections at length. With regard to the over-production of drugs, in view of the present receptive condition of many countries (even continents, such as Africa), where the medical organisation is rudimentary and where, in consequence, a vastly preponderant proportion of the consumption of drugs is undoubtedly illicit in the medical sense, I think that, if only to counteract the unquestionable over-production that goes on in the factories, the manufacturers' first thought when they form their union will be to look for markets, and they will take careful note of this ignorance in many countries of the legitimate use of drugs, and endeavour to arrange sales in those countries to chemists or druggists whose honesty is not above suspicion — particularly druggists.

Moreover, under the legislation of some countries, narcotics may be sold by druggists — which, incidentally, is inadmissible.

An international manufacturers' union could only be of service not merely to the manufacturers themselves but to the cause which the Committee has at heart, if the purchase and sale of harmful drugs were so organised in all countries, from the legislative and administrative points of view, as to enable an effective campaign to be carried on against abuses of whose existence there is, alas, no doubt.

(Signed) H. BRENIER,
League of Nations Assessor.

O. C. 678.

ANNEX 4.

POLICY OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT REGARDING THE SUPPRESSION
OF THE ILLICIT USE OF OPIUM.

A SCHEME FOR THE PROHIBITION WITHIN THREE YEARS OF THE ILLICIT USE OF OPIUM,
SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE TO THE CENTRAL POLITICAL COUNCIL.

*Document communicated to Mr. Lyall by Mr. Kuo Tai-chi, Commissioner of Foreign Affairs
at Shanghai of the Nationalist Government of South China.*

Pursuant to the decision of the Central Political Council of the Kuomintang to prohibit within three years all illegal traffic in opium by first instituting over it a Government monopoly, the Ministry of Finance, at the order of the Central Political Council, has created the Bureau for the Prohibition of Opium within the territory now under the Nationalist Government, and has drawn up the following scheme whereby absolute Government control leading to total prohibition of the illegal traffic may be effectively carried out:

1. To centralise all organs for the prohibition of opium within the country, so that the Opium Bureau established by the Ministry of Finance shall be regarded as the central organ in charge of the opium traffic. The Bureau, in turn, shall establish branches in various provinces or special districts in order to supervise the prohibition in various localities. At the same time, the Government, through the highest military and naval authorities, shall instruct various local military or naval forces not to connive at or unlawfully facilitate the activities of private opium-dealers or to interfere with the duties of the local Opium Bureau.

2. To control the shipping of opium. One of the biggest obstacles to effective control of the opium traffic lies in the fact that illegal shipments of opium by private merchants are still rampant. Therefore, all shipments of opium must be centrally controlled so that full record of the trade may be kept. Furthermore, heretofore certain military authorities and other private companies have thrived upon the trade by unlawfully facilitating the shipment of opium. For reason of all these possible leakages, no reliable record of the trade can be made unless all shipments of this nefarious drug be controlled by one central organ. Branch offices of this central organ should be established at various ports of transit and in the various regions of production. All transshipments of opium must be made by such offices through specified routes to the warehouses designated by the respective opium bureaux. Thus a system of checking can be established for the control of all shipments.

3. To create special guard and detective forces in the provinces, each having from one to three companies of 300 men. These forces shall protect the shipments while in transit and at the same time detect all other illegal traffic. The number of companies of such forces to be stationed in each province is to be decided according to the conditions prevailing in that particular province.

4. To collect stamp, licence and shipping taxes. This step is taken with the view of gradually cutting down the use of opium instead of prohibiting its use altogether at one stroke, which has been proved impossible. This will also help to ascertain the amount of opium which is transhipped, sold and consumed every year within the country. The taxes are of four kinds:

(a) *Stamp tax.* — All legitimate shipments of opium must be stamped. All shipments, when not stamped, are regarded as "private" and therefore illegal shipments, and are subject to confiscation.

(b) *Special permit tax.* — This tax is payable by merchants who obtain a licence to engage in the trade.

(c) *Private house tax.* — This tax is payable by those establishments which obtain a licence to serve opium smokers.

(d) *Transshipping tax.* — This tax is payable by merchants who ship opium from one place to another.

5. A yearly decrease of the supply and sale of opium. The amount of opium which is shipped, sold and consumed in the territory every year shall be listed at the beginning of the 17th Year (1928) of the Republic. By the end of that year, there shall be a decrease of one-third of the amount listed. By the end of the 18th Year (1929) of the Republic, another similar decrease shall be made, and in the 19th Year (1930), the remaining 40 per cent shall be wiped out. For example, if in 1928 the amount of opium consumed is worth \$30,000,000, then in 1929 the amount will be reduced to \$20,000,000, till by the end of 1930 no consumption whatsoever shall be permitted. All opium addicts below the age of 25 shall be deprived of the use of the drug altogether, while those above shall be given an allowance according to their age and condition, until finally it is discontinued within a given period.

6. Special offices of sale shall be opened.

7. All cultivation of opium shall be prohibited upon the declaration of prohibition, and forthwith cultivation of opium shall be stopped in the following provinces: Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Fukien, Kiangsi, Hunan, Hupeh, Kiangsu, Anhwei, Honan, Szechuan, Yunnan and Kweichow. In all other provinces, cultivation of opium shall be prohibited upon the arrival of the Nationalist Army there. Importation of morphine, cocaine and heroin, as well as all other poisonous and narcotic drugs, except for medicinal purposes, shall also be prohibited.

8. A strict and careful investigation of the entire system of prohibition with the view of checking up the results achieved shall be instituted, so as to ensure the ultimate fulfilment of the aim of prohibition. The Ministry of Finance shall from time to time send investigators to the various branch bureaux to report on the progress of the prohibition, and to detect also whether there is any contravention, dishonest practices, etc.

The above scheme is still under consideration but is understood will soon be proclaimed effective by the Government.

ANNEX 5

PROPOSED SCHEME FOR THE CONTROL OF THE DRUG
TRAFFIC.

MEMORANDUM BY M. CAVAZZONI, SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 1ST, 1927.

Part I.

PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH THE ATTACHED DRAFT IS BASED

The principles upon which the following draft is based are those of the Hague and Geneva Conventions. Some of them, which from a certain point of view might be considered innovations, are only the logical development of criteria established by the two Conventions.

The main new developments are the following :

(a) *A distinction between the importation of drugs and their actual delivery to the importer.* — In order to facilitate control, it is desirable that only the smallest possible quantity of drugs should be in the hands of the dealer. It is therefore proposed that they should be deposited in Government warehouses. The dealer, at whose disposal they will remain, will be able each time to withdraw only the quantities for which he will have received a special authorisation — “ a certificate of officially approved delivery ” — account being taken of the present and immediate requirements of trade.

(b) *The same system is proposed for the export of drugs.* — The quantities to be consigned will, up to the total amount authorised, be withdrawn from the Government warehouses or factory stores, where they are deposited under Government protection, on production of the above-mentioned certificate of officially approved delivery.

(c) *In the event of purchase from a national factory,* the wholesaler, when withdrawing a given quantity of the goods, will have to furnish with a certificate of officially approved delivery, which will be presented to the factory for the delivery in question.

In the absence of such a system, the authorities cannot know either the quantities actually held by a wholesaler or the quantities thrown on the market by the manufacturing industry of the country. Nor can they know whether the quantities possessed or held by each person authorised to sell or distribute any of the substances included in the Convention exceed the total amount covered by that person's guarantee.

(d) *Modification in the case of purchases for Government use.* — In the case of purchases by Governments, it seems expedient to introduce some modification into the present system of import certificates.

It is clear from Article 22 (3) of the Geneva Convention that the aim of its authors was to establish a distinction between purchases intended for general medical and scientific purposes and purchases for Government purposes. It is equally clear that the only legitimate concern regarding the quantities accumulated in a country refers to the quantities intended for general medical and scientific purposes and not to the quantities accumulated by Governments, regarding which no information may be asked for nor any opinion expressed.

In these circumstances, every import certificate issued by a Government to any of its administrative services in order to permit the purchase for Government purposes of narcotic drugs covered by the Convention will not, as is the case with import certificates issued to an ordinary wholesaler, be required to indicate the quantities of drugs previously imported by the Government in the course of the year.

(e) *Guarantee.* — Although more than two years have passed since the attention of Governments was drawn “ to the advisability in certain cases of requiring dealers who are licensed by the Government to trade in the substances covered by the Convention to deposit or give sureties for a sum of money sufficient to serve as an effective guarantee against their engaging in the illicit traffic ”, it does not seem as if many manufacturing countries had given to the question such attention as the recommendation merits.

The introduction of a system stipulating the deposit or giving of " sureties for a sum of money sufficient to serve as an effective guarantee against their engaging in the illicit traffic " would banish all motives for selling drugs for other than medical and scientific purposes.

The Italian delegate attaches the utmost importance to the general acceptance underlying the recommendation reproduced above, a recommendation which was made by the Second Geneva Conference and incorporated in the Final Act of the Convention which that Conference framed. He attaches even greater importance to the adoption of effective measures in application of this principle.

The application of the principle would automatically eliminate shady elements from the wholesale or export business. With regard to the methods of applying the principle of requiring the deposit or of sureties for a sufficient sum of money, no one disputes that, on this point, it is for each Government to decide. Neither the established manufacturer nor the retail chemist can have any cause to complain of this system. But those Governments which state to-day that they cannot distinguish between applicants for licences for wholesale trade, and which are therefore more or less committed to issuing licences to persons who later sell their stocks to the illicit traffic and then disappear, would be able to demand, as a condition for granting of the licence, the previous deposit of an adequate guarantee.

Governments which have undertaken to issue " effective laws or regulations " would have to include among those laws or regulations a system of effective guarantees.

The Italian delegate is of opinion that the Advisory Committee should consider the practicability of a system of guarantees to prevent dealers furnished with a licence from participating in illicit traffic. He considers that the Council of the League should forward the results of these enquiries to the Governments concerned.

COMPLETE STATISTICS OF OPIUM DERIVATIVES.

We recognise the progress made by including ecgonine in the Geneva Convention, just as much as we deplore the omission of codeine from the two above-mentioned Conventions.

Codeine, though a narcotic poison, is not to-day generally considered one which gives rise to the drug habit, and it is not included in the restrictions laid down by the Hague Convention or in the Convention adopted by the Second Geneva Conference. Nevertheless, codeine is a raw material which can be used in the manufacture of other narcotics giving rise to the drug habit, and is also a means of ascertaining the use that has been made of the quantities of the substances from which it is manufactured. Hence, if the supervision we desire to establish in order to prevent illicit traffic in narcotics giving rise to abuse is to include a strict justification of the use made of each particle of opium entering the factory, as well as of each of the drugs into which this opium has been converted, it will remain a factor which cannot be disregarded.

I cannot, however, believe that, in any attempt to seek ways and means of combating illicit traffic and of obtaining a strict check on all the raw materials and all the finished narcotic products manufactured from these raw materials, one can leave out of account, as a factor permitting the activities of a factory to be exactly ascertained, any single one of the narcotics thus manufactured.

Accordingly, if we allude to narcotics not giving rise to the drug habit and which are derivatives of opium, we only do so in view of the part those narcotics play not in the direct spread of the drug habit as a result of their use but in the evasions which may be resorted to in the absence of control over these materials.

The Italian delegate thinks that the conditions which make evasions possible should be very carefully gone into. Clearly it is not enough to establish a minute scrutiny of certain opium derivatives if, at the same time, no account at all is taken of other derivatives simply because they are not supposed to give rise to the drug habit.

The Italian delegate therefore suggests to the Advisory Committee that it should consider whether codeine is a possible factor in the illicit traffic. This is in no sense an insinuation against the accuracy of the data furnished by the firms which manufacture opium derivatives. At the same time, it seems reasonable to require that this system of control recommended should allow the furnished data to be verified by taking account of *all* manufactured derivatives.

STATISTICS OF PERSONS AUTHORISED TO DEAL IN NARCOTICS.

The information regarding the number of persons authorised in one way or another to deal in narcotics which come under the Convention is as important to the Advisory Committee, in its efforts to establish methods of control which will prevent the illicit traffic, as are the details regarding the machinery for applying the law.

It would seem as impossible to determine the medical and scientific requirements of a country without information concerning the population as it would be to decide whether measures of prevention or control are adequate without reliable information concerning the number of persons to be controlled.

The Italian delegate is therefore of opinion that no enquiries into the conditions governing the illicit traffic can be considered complete unless they include — among other things — investigations into the number of persons who, because they are authorised to sell or stock the narcotics in question, must be subject to inspection or some special supervision. If we really want to know whether the measures taken to fulfil the obligations incurred by the parties to the Convention are such as will enable them to discharge these obligations adequately, we must also determine the proportionate importance of the controlling organisation and of the number of persons to be controlled.

NARCOTIC DRUGS NOT GIVING RISE TO THE DRUG HABIT.

Among the factors of less importance in the illicit traffic we must certainly *not* include those harmless substitutes which, now or in future, may take the place of drugs giving rise to abuse and thereby throw the existing stocks of the latter on to the illicit market.

The Italian delegate considers that any study of the conditions giving rise to illicit traffic must include the examination of this question, and he ventures to suggest that the competent organs should undertake an enquiry as to how far narcotics not lending themselves to abuse and not coming under the Convention are capable of replacing narcotics which give rise to the drug habit.

FINES, IMPRISONMENT, PREMIUMS ON SEIZURES AND REDUCTION OF SENTENCES.

Rewards for seizures and premiums for persons furnishing information should, as far as possible, be taken from a fund which might be created out of the fines inflicted for offences against the drug laws and regulations. Similarly, a reduction of sentences as a reward for information leading to the arrest and sentence of other traffickers might, in some cases, be included among the measures deserving the Committee's attention.

Part II.

TEXT OF THE DRAFT

I. IMPORTATION OF RAW MATERIALS

1. IMPORT CERTIFICATES.

All persons importing drugs required for the manufacture of morphine and cocaine and their respective salts, and also any of the preparations specified in Article 14 of the Hague Convention, must be in possession of a certificate issued by the Government of the importing country, in accordance with the current system of import certificates.

2. COMPETENT AUTHORITY.

The issue of import certificates must be confined to a single authority in each country, so that it may be possible at any moment to ascertain the total quantity of raw materials allowed to be imported during the year.

3. REGISTRATION.

The quantities of raw materials allowed into the country must be entered in special registers.

4. NUMBERING OF CERTIFICATES.

Import certificates must be numbered consecutively. Mention must be made therein not only of the quantity to be imported, with the name and address of the importer, but also of the name and address of the exporter and the time within which import must be effected; also the total quantity for which import certificates have been issued since January 1st. of the current year, including the last certificate, shall also be indicated.

5.

This system will enable the exporting country to form an approximate idea as to whether excessive quantities of any of the substances covered by the Convention are being accumulated in a certain country and whether there is a risk of that country becoming a centre of illicit traffic.

It is considered that the fact of re-exportation makes it difficult to prove whether excessive quantities of raw materials are being accumulated, the system can be modified by indicating at the same time the quantities allowed to be re-exported.

6. CANCELLED OR UNUSED IMPORT CERTIFICATES.

Quantities covered by import certificates which have not been used within the time allowed for importation must be deducted from the quantities originally allowed.

7. MEASURES TO PREVENT THE FORGING OF IMPORT CERTIFICATES.

The same precautions should be adopted to prevent the forging or alteration of certificates, more especially as regards the indication of the quantity for which the certificate has been issued, as are taken in the case of banknotes and cheques.

8. PROHIBITION TO EXPORT.

If a Government is prepared to issue import certificates on condition that the materials imported are used exclusively in home factories, re-export being prohibited, this fact should be stated on the import certificate.

9. SURETIES AND GUARANTEES.

Before issuing the import certificate, the authorities should in every case satisfy themselves that the sureties or guarantees deposited by the applicant are sufficient to justify the granting of the certificate.

10. INSPECTION UPON ARRIVAL.

In order to ensure the efficient supervision of narcotics and accurate statistics in regard thereto, every consignment of raw materials should be subjected to immediate inspection, whether the materials are intended for manufacture in home factories or are introduced temporarily with a view to subsequent re-exportation.

The letters and serial numbers given on the packages should be specified. The registration of the actual imports of all raw materials covered by the Convention up to the time of unloading or arrival, including those placed in a Customs warehouse, will provide for the removal of one of the principal causes of discrepancies in international statistics relating to narcotics and will also enable the movements of such substances to be followed more easily.

For this reason, the system should be given most careful consideration by all countries. It was introduced into Japan in January 1921.

11. DISTINCTION BETWEEN IMPORT AND ACTUAL DELIVERY.

The regulations governing the supervision of materials covered by the Convention must stipulate that, in the case of imports, an authorising Government must make a very clear distinction between the import of raw materials and actual delivery to the importer.

12. CONTROL OF IMPORTS.

The control must be arranged in such a way that the importer, although authorised to import up to the total amount indicated in the import certificate issued to him, is only authorised to take delivery of the quantity recognised by the authorities as not in excess of the immediate requirements of production.

13.

The quantity so obtained by the importer must be entered in the register next to the quantity authorised for import and the quantity actually imported and stored in Government warehouses.

14. GOVERNMENT DOUBLE-LOCKED WAREHOUSES.

The remainder of the authorised imports must be left in the custody and under the control of the authorities of the importing country. A special Government warehouse must be provided for the purpose, or a warehouse with a double lock accessible only to the owner of the imported substances in the presence of the responsible authorities.

15. OFFICIAL APPROVAL-OF-DELIVERY CERTIFICATE.

The withdrawal of a portion of the quantities imported shall be authorised by means of an "official approval-of-delivery certificate".

16. INDICATION ON OFFICIAL APPROVAL-OF-DELIVERY CERTIFICATES OF THE TOTAL QUANTITY ALLOWED TO BE DELIVERED DURING THE CURRENT YEAR.

The official approval-of-delivery certificates must be numbered consecutively and be issued by a single authority. They must specify not only the quantity allowed to be delivered but also the name and address of the person authorised to take delivery of the substances to which the certificate refers, the time within which delivery must take place and the total quantity for which delivery certificates have been issued since January 1st of the current year, including the last official approval-of-delivery certificate.

17. NECESSITY OF SPECIFYING THE QUANTITIES COVERED BY CANCELLED OR UNUSED DELIVERY CERTIFICATES.

Quantities covered by official approval-of-delivery certificates which have not been used within the time stipulated must be deducted from the quantities already delivered.

18. MEASURES TO PREVENT THE FORGING OF DELIVERY CERTIFICATES.

The same precaution now in force for the prevention of the forging or alteration of banknotes or cheques should be adopted to prevent the forging of certificates, or any other methods of altering the amount of the substances covered by the certificate.

19. OBLIGATION TO ACCOUNT FOR QUANTITIES ALREADY OBTAINED BEFORE TAKING FURTHER DELIVERY.

The importer will not be authorised to take delivery of a further quantity of the raw material from the stock warehoused under Government control unless he satisfies the authorities beforehand as to the use made of the quantities which he was previously authorised to obtain.

20.

Each delivery must be countersigned. The competent authorities must inspect importers' registers whenever a request is made for delivery of part of the materials warehoused under Government control.

21. INSPECTION.

Constant inspection should be undertaken and visits made at unexpected times; this inspection must be thorough. When examining stocks, care should be taken to check not only the quantities registered and stored in the warehouses but also to see that identity marks, letters and serial numbers correspond to the entries. In the absence of this precaution it is hardly possible to prevent two different importers, whose stocks are subjected to inspection, from fraudulently presenting the same substances to be inspected.

II. PRODUCTION IN FACTORIES.

22. CONTROL OF RAW MATERIAL ENTERING FACTORIES.

Every factory where drugs are manufactured should be obliged to keep a special book in which each consignment of raw materials must be entered as it arrives. These entries should be made in such a way as to enable the authorities to ascertain at any moment: (a) the total quantity entering the factories; (b) quantities used in the production of derivatives or preparations; (c) quantities destroyed; (d) quantities delivered; (e) quantities remaining in stock; (f) quantities of derivatives converted into other drugs not covered by the Convention.

23. PROOF OF EMPLOYMENT OF PREVIOUS DELIVERIES BEFORE FURTHER DELIVERIES ARE AUTHORISED.

Authorised producers who apply for an official approval-of-delivery certificate in order to obtain and take into their factory any one of the substances covered by the Convention cannot obtain that certificate unless they satisfy the competent authorities as to the use made of the quantities which they have previously been allowed to purchase, to take from the Government warehouses or to hold in any way.

24. DELIVERY OF DRUGS BY FACTORIES.

Any delivery of substances covered by the Convention must be subject to the production of an official approval-of-delivery certificate issued by the competent authorities.

25. A RECEIPT MUST BE OBTAINED FOR DELIVERIES.

An authorised producer cannot effect delivery of any substances covered by the Convention unless the person authorised to take such delivery hands him a receipt specifying the quantities delivered and the identity marks to be affixed to each receptacle containing the drugs.

26. LETTERS AND CONSECUTIVE NUMBERING OF RECEPTACLES.

To enable all quantities to be traced, all receptacles must be marked with letters and consecutive numbers so that they can be identified at any time.

27. PLACING OF DRUGS IN THEIR RECEPTACLES IMMEDIATELY AFTER MANUFACTURE.

In view of the fact that the affixing of letters and serial numbers to receptacles is intended to enable the receptacle to be traced from the time when it leaves the factory until it is opened and its contents used for medicinal and scientific purposes, manufacturers should be compelled to place derivatives and preparations in their receptacles as soon as possible after manufacture and to enter in special books both the quantities manufactured and the marks affixed to the receptacles in which those quantities have been placed.

28. LOSSES WHICH OCCUR IN PROCESS OF MANUFACTURE.

Manufacturers should present a periodical statement showing the quantities of raw materials, manufactured drugs or other preparations which are lost or go astray in the process of manufacture, and obtain from the competent authorities a certificate authorising them to deduct such quantities from their books.

29. DAILY ENTRIES BY THE MANUFACTURERS.

The manufacturers must enter quantities received, delivered and remaining in stock from day to day. These entries must be kept at the disposal of the authorities for checking if required.

30. MANUFACTURERS' STOCKS MUST NOT EXCEED THE QUANTITIES ALLOWED BY GOVERNMENTS.

Statistics relating to the manufacture of drugs in their respective countries should be frequently supervised by Governments. If it should appear that any factory is accumulating excessive quantities of any of the drugs covered by the Convention, or if there is any risk of that factory supplying the illicit traffic, the Government should take custody of quantities which, in its opinion, exceed the ordinary stocks which the factory is allowed to possess.

31. MANUFACTURE MUST BE SUSPENDED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT CONSIDERS THAT STOCKS ARE EXCESSIVE.

Unless the manufacturer is able to furnish a satisfactory reason, no further official approval-of-delivery certificates will be issued to him to enable him to take delivery of substances covered by the Convention until his stocks have been reduced to a quantity which the Government considers not to be excessive.

Manufacture will, however, be authorised provided the drugs are placed in Government warehouses immediately after manufacture.

32. MONTHLY STATEMENTS TO BE PREPARED, SIGNED AND CERTIFIED UPON OATH.

Monthly statements showing: (a) the stocks available at the beginning of the month and new arrivals; and (b) the use to which they have been put and stocks available at the end of the month must be prepared, signed and certified upon oath by a responsible member of the firm authorised to manufacture the drugs. This statement must be transmitted to the competent Government authorities, together with any other particulars they may require, on the basis of forms approved by them.

33. ENTRIES MUST BE UNIFORM.

In order to ensure uniformity of entries on the part of the authorised manufacturers, the competent authorities should prepare forms for the use of manufacturers or any other class of persons authorised to trade in any of the materials covered by the Convention.

34. INSPECTION.

Apart from any other inspection which may be deemed advisable, an inspection of the manufacturer's books must be made by the authorities whenever a request is presented for a delivery by or to the factory.

35. VERIFICATION OF STOCKS.

Manufacturers' stocks should be verified at least once a quarter in order to check the amounts registered.

III. DESPATCH OF DRUGS FROM THE FACTORY — SALE TO AGENTS.

36. OBLIGATION FOR A WHOLESALE MERCHANT WHO DESIRES TO PURCHASE DRUGS FROM HOME FACTORY TO OBTAIN IMPORT CERTIFICATES.

Import certificates, which are an essential part of the system for controlling consignments from one country to another of narcotics covered by the Convention, must also be included in the internal control system of narcotics manufactured in the country.

37.

If a wholesale merchant desires to purchase narcotics from a factory in his own country, he must obtain an import certificate similar to that necessary for an importer who desires to purchase from abroad. Instead of indicating the name and address of the exporting factory from which it is desired to obtain the narcotics, the certificate should mention the name and address of the home factory.

38. IMPORT CERTIFICATES FOR THE PURCHASE OF NARCOTICS FOR GOVERNMENT USE.

In the case of a Government purchasing for its exclusive use, the import certificate delivered by the Government itself to one of its administrative services allowing the purchase of narcotics covered by the Convention need not indicate, as in the case of import certificates issued to an ordinary wholesale merchant, the quantity of narcotics previously imported by the Government during the course of the year.

39. NECESSITY OF ISSUING AN OFFICIAL APPROVAL-OF-DELIVERY CERTIFICATE IN ORDER TO CHECK THE QUANTITY OF DRUGS REMOVED.

In the case of drugs manufactured in a national factory, the wholesale merchant, when taking delivery of a given quantity of drugs, must obtain, besides the authorisation granted by the above-mentioned import certificate, an official approval-of-delivery certificate to be presented to the factory as a receipt for the delivery of the drugs. In the absence of such a system, the authorities cannot know the quantities actually held by a wholesale merchant who holds import certificates, nor the quantities actually put on the market by the country's manufacturing industry, nor whether the quantities possessed or held by any person authorised to sell or to distribute any substance covered by the Convention exceed the amount provided for by the guarantee furnished by such person.

40. INDICATION OF THE MARKS AFFIXED TO THE RECEPTACLES IN THE OFFICIAL APPROVAL-OF-DELIVERY CERTIFICATES.

In order to be able to check subsequent movements more easily, official approval-of-delivery certificates should indicate the identity marks affixed to the receptacles which have been delivered.

41. INDICATION OF DELIVERY CERTIFICATES OF THE TOTAL QUANTITY ALLOWED TO BE DELIVERED DURING THE CURRENT YEAR.

Official approval-of-delivery certificates must be numbered consecutively and be issued by a single department. They must specify not only the quantity allowed to be delivered but the name and address of the person authorised to take delivery, the time within which the delivery must take place and the total quantity for which delivery certificates have been issued since January 1st of the current year, including the last official approval-of-delivery certificates.

42. INDICATION OF THE QUANTITIES COVERED BY CANCELLED CERTIFICATES.

Quantities covered by the official approval-of-delivery certificates which have not been used within the time stipulated must be deducted from the quantities already delivered.

43. MEASURES TO PREVENT THE FORGING OF DELIVERY CERTIFICATES.

The same precautions now in force for the prevention of the forging or alteration of banknotes and cheques should be adopted to prevent the forging of certificates or the alteration of the quantity for which a delivery certificate is issued.

44. OBLIGATION TO ACCOUNT FOR PREVIOUS IMPORTS, PURCHASES OR DELIVERIES BEFORE THE ISSUE OF A DELIVERY CERTIFICATE.

In view of the fact that the granting of an official approval-of-delivery certificate entitles the applicant to stock narcotics up to the amount indicated on the certificate, and that this might give rise to illicit traffic in such narcotics, such certificate can only be delivered after the applicant has accounted satisfactorily to the authorities for the use of the quantities of narcotics which he had previously been authorised to purchase from a factory.

45. VERIFICATION OF SURETIES OR GUARANTEES BEFORE ISSUING THE CONSIGNMENT CERTIFICATE.

Before issuing the official approval-of-delivery certificate applied for, the authorities should satisfy themselves in each case that the sureties or guarantees given by the applicant are sufficient to justify the granting of the certificate applied for.

IV. EXPORTATION OF MANUFACTURED DRUGS.

46. EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

According to the export certificate system in force, the exporter should obtain from his Government a certificate authorising him to export a certain quantity of drugs.

Such a certificate should only be granted when the Government has received a copy of the import certificate relating to the same quantity of drugs issued by the authorities of the country of destination. If this country does not apply the import certificate system, the Government of the exporting country should satisfy itself, before issuing the export certificate, that the quantity of drugs in question is intended for legitimate purposes.

47. SINGLE AUTHORITY TO ISSUE CERTIFICATES.

Only one authority in each country should issue export certificates, so that the total amount of drugs whose export has been authorised during the current year may be ascertained at any moment.

48. REGISTRATION.

The quantities of narcotic raw materials the export of which is authorised should be inscribed in special registers.

49. NUMBERING OF CERTIFICATES.

Export certificates should be numbered consecutively. They should mention not only the quantities to be exported, the name and address of the exporter, the name and address of the importer to whom they are addressed, and the period within which the exportation must take place, but also the total amount for which export certificates have been issued since January 1st of the current year, including the last certificate issued.

50. CANCELLED OR UNUSED EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

Quantities covered by export certificates which have not been used within the time allowed for exportation must be deducted from the quantities originally allowed.

51. MEASURES TO PREVENT THE FORGING OF EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

(See No. 7.)

52. SURETIES AND GUARANTEES.

(See No. 9.)

53. DISTINCTION BETWEEN AUTHORISED EXPORTS AND ACTUAL QUANTITIES DESPATCHED.

The regulations governing the supervision of the substances covered by the Convention should establish the principle that, in the event of exportation, the Government which has authorised the export of a certain quantity should keep a record of each consignment of drugs despatched until the total of the authorised quantity is reached. In pursuance of the principles set forth in Chapters III and V, the exporter must not despatch the various consignments of drugs without having previously obtained an official approval-of-delivery certificate. In consequence of these principles, the wholesale dealer may stock only a limited quantity of these substances. Whether he obtains the substances for export from a home factory, or whether he buys them from a foreign factory, he should be obliged to deposit them, in the first case, in the factory warehouses and, in the second case, in the Government warehouses, on their arrival.

In each case, he can only remove the quantities which he desires to despatch on presentation of the official approval-of-delivery certificate relating thereto.

V. IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURED DRUGS.

The same rules as those concerning the import of the raw materials are valid (see Chapter I).

54.

In the case of imports made by a Government for its own exclusive use, the principles contained in No. 38 should be applied.

VI. DISTRIBUTION OF THE DRUG.

55.

The inscription of letters and serial numbers on the receptacles should, as has been said, enable the successive stages in the progress of each receptacle to be followed from the time of leaving the factory until its contents are used for medicinal and scientific purposes. These letters and numbers should be mentioned in each registration.

All the quantities taken from stock or deposited in the factory warehouses, and the successive stages of their passage through the hands of the wholesale dealer and retail merchant until their use by the chemist or doctor and, in cases of export, until such time as they are despatched, should be compulsorily checked under Government supervision.

All persons who effect such transfers or for whose benefit such transfers take place should mention each transaction and state the quantity of narcotic drugs and the marks and numbers of each receptacle in order to enable them to be accurately identified.

VII. FINES AND IMPRISONMENT.

Although fines are never sufficient to deter those engaged in the traffic, who should as often as possible be sentenced to imprisonment, heavy fines should also be inflicted in order to render illicit traffic more difficult. These should form a fund for providing rewards in cases of seizure and to informers.

VIII. REWARDS IN CASES OF SEIZURE OR OF INFORMATION LEADING TO SEIZURE.

With a view to making it easier for the authorities to obtain information leading to seizures and confiscations of the narcotic drugs covered by the Convention, rewards should be offered to persons giving such information according to a scale which could be determined by the various Governments.

Rewards in the case of seizures and rewards to informers should be paid out of the fines inflicted, so that their payment should entail no additional expense even in the event of the drugs being destroyed.

Further, this system of rewards for information should be given the greatest publicity.

IX. REDUCTION OF PENALTIES AS A REWARD FOR INFORMATION LEADING TO THE ARREST OR CONVICTION OF A PERSON ENGAGED IN ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

Persons engaged in the illicit traffic should be notified that, when sentence is pronounced, account will be taken of information having led to the arrest and conviction of the persons who supplied the drugs, and that, if judgment has already been delivered, information voluntarily offered after the Court has pronounced sentence may lead to a remission of part of the penalties inflicted.

ANNEX 6.

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ON THE WORK OF THE
TENTH (EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE.

Approved by the Committee on October 8th, 1927.

The Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs has the honour to present to the Council a report on the proceedings of its tenth (extraordinary) session, held at Geneva from September 28th to October 8th, 1927. This extraordinary session was convoked by the Chairman in pursuance of the discretion accorded to him by the resolution dated March 11th, 1927, of the Council. The primary object of the session was to consider the question of the illicit traffic, but advantage was taken of the opportunity presented to discuss various cognate questions and to deal with certain documents which had either been referred to the Committee or had been circulated to it by order of the Council. The Committee hoped in this way to expedite the disposal of certain somewhat urgent matters, and also to lighten materially the volume of work which, as experience shows, tends to become too heavy to admit of satisfactory treatment if one meeting only is held each year.

The Committee held seventeen public and two private sessions. Following in this respect what has now become the customary procedure, all questions of general interest were debated at public meetings; the private sessions were few and brief and were concerned with details of the illicit traffic which it seemed undesirable to disclose.

No representative of the Government of China was present during the Committee's deliberations. The Committee had the pleasure of welcoming Mr. Lyall, appointed by the Council resolution of March 9th, 1927, as the assessor having knowledge of the conditions in the Far East. His knowledge of those conditions proved of great assistance to the Committee. Colonel Woods, who was absent at the last session, attended the present session. The Committee was also glad to have the assistance of Mr. Pinkney Tuck, who represented the Government of the United States of America in an unofficial capacity.

Apart from the changes mentioned above, the composition of the Committee was the same as at the preceding session.

M. Brenier, an assessor of the Committee, was prevented by urgent professional duties from attending.

A full list of the members and assessors present is appended:

| | |
|--|---|
| Sir John CAMBELL, C.S.I. (<i>Chairman</i>) | <i>India.</i> |
| Dr. CARRIÈRE (<i>Vice-Chairman</i>) | <i>Switzerland.</i> |
| Dr. ANSELMINO | <i>Germany.</i> |
| Dr. CUELLAR | <i>Bolivia.</i> |
| M. BOURGOIS | <i>France.</i> |
| Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE, K.C.B. | <i>Great Britain.</i> |
| His Excellency M. CAVAZZONI | <i>Italy.</i> |
| His Excellency M. N. SATO | <i>Japan.</i> |
| M. W. G. VAN WETTUM | <i>Netherlands.</i> |
| His Excellency M. FERREIRA | <i>Portugal.</i> |
| M. Constantin FOTITCH | <i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.</i> |
| His Highness Prince CHAROON | <i>Siam.</i> |
| Mr. Pinkney TUCK | <i>United States of America.</i> |

Assessors:

Mr. L. A. LYALL.
Colonel Arthur Woods.

Secretary:

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

RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION.

As the Committee stated in its report on the work of the ninth session, it regards the immediate ratification and the rigid enforcement of the Geneva Convention of 1925 as the most valuable single step which can at present be taken to combat the illicit traffic. It is glad that this view has been unanimously endorsed by the Council and the Assembly, and it desires to reiterate it. A close examination of all the material connected with the illicit traffic which has come before it since its last session serves to confirm the correctness of its views. Time after time, in case after case, the Committee has been forced irresistibly

to the conclusion that, until the Geneva Convention comes into operation, it will be difficult to secure the effective application of measures which experience has shown to be essential if the illicit traffic is to be effectively checked.

The Committee records, with much satisfaction, that considerable progress has already been made towards this eminently desirable end. The Convention has now been ratified by twelve countries, and six adhesions have been received. Various statements and declarations have also been made recently which indicate that a further substantial advance may be expected in the near future. It was announced, during the recent session of the Fifth Committee of the Assembly, that the Swiss Government intended to propose very shortly to the Swiss Parliament the ratification of the Convention. That Convention is at present being examined by a special committee in Japan, appointed for the purpose by the Privy Council, to which the Convention has been submitted by the Japanese Government. The announcement was made that the ratification of the Convention by Japan may be regarded as assured as soon as this Committee has completed its labours. The Swedish Government would be glad to ratify, but there are for the moment certain technical difficulties, connected with Articles 8 and 6 (c) of the Convention, which impede progress. The Government of Canada intends to submit legislation to ensure ratification at the next session of Parliament. The Government of Austria intimated that it would probably ratify the Convention in the course of the month of September 1927. The position in Norway is much the same as in Sweden; Article 6 (c) of the Convention presents difficulties which for the moment prevent ratification. The Government of Luxemburg intends to ratify the Convention at the current autumn session of its Parliament. The Netherlands Government proposes to ratify the Convention as soon as the Bill amending its existing laws to bring them into conformity with the stipulations of the Convention has been voted by Parliament. Salvador has ratified. The Government of Roumania hopes that it may shortly be able to deposit the instrument of ratification of its adhesion which it gave *ad referendum*.

It will be observed that several of these countries occupy a position of special importance with reference to the traffic in drugs; and the Committee welcomes, with the most lively satisfaction, the declarations and statements cited above as indicating a strong movement in favour of ratification.

Unfortunately, three nations only of those now represented on the Council have ratified, out of the seven necessary to secure the entry into force of the Convention. In its last report the Committee stated that it "desired to emphasise, as strongly as possible, that the coming into effective operation of the Convention depends mainly upon the Council itself". Time has somewhat modified the position: eighteen countries have now ratified or adhered, and the coming-into-force of the Convention now depends *solely* upon the States represented on the Council. The Committee earnestly hopes that the gravity of the position will be realised and that the States Members of the Council will take immediate action to place in the hands of the League an instrument without which, in our considered opinion, it will be impossible to cope satisfactorily with a traffic which is admittedly a reproach to our civilisation. (See Resolution I.)

RESERVATIONS MADE BY THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT TO ARTICLE 6 (c) OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION OF 1925.

At the Council meeting of June 13th, 1927, the question of the ratification by the Swedish Government of the Geneva Convention of 1925, subject to a reservation as regards Article 6 (c), was referred to the Committee for a report embodying its views on the subject.

By arrangement with the Swedish Government, a representative of that Government was present when this question was discussed by the Committee; and, as it appeared that the Government of Norway felt difficulties similar to those experienced by Sweden, unofficial arrangements were made to secure that a representative of the Norwegian Government should be in a position to attend the meeting if that was desired. The Government of Sweden was represented by M. Hennings, accompanied by M. Friedrichs as his technical adviser. The Government of Norway was good enough to send, unofficially, a representative — Dr. Lange — who was present throughout the discussions.

The Swedish Government considers that its accession to the Convention would involve certain changes in its national legislation which, without giving any additional guarantees against the illicit traffic in narcotics, would cause such inconvenience to its population that the adoption of these changes could hardly be recommended. Its objections did not touch the fundamental principles of the Convention but related solely to certain subsidiary provisions of a technical character; and the Committee was also glad to observe that the Swedish Government considered that these objections "do not seem entirely to preclude the possibility of accession".

Article 6 (c) of the Convention requires pharmacists — among others — to enter in their books all sales and other distribution of certain narcotic drugs, unless they should

adopt the alternative course which is provided for by the Convention of filing and preserving the relevant medical prescriptions.

The Swedish Government considers that the entry of such details would involve the upkeep of records dealing in meticulous detail with many comparatively unimportant transactions and would delay, and greatly complicate, the making-up of prescriptions. They feel that the control in Sweden is so strict and the standard of pharmaceutical practice there is so high that these provisions would in fact add little or nothing to the effective measures of control which are already in existence. The position is also complicated by the fact that, in Sweden, medical prescriptions are, in the eyes of the law, the property of those to whom they have been given, even after these prescriptions have been dispensed.

M. Hennings elaborated these arguments with much skill and with a technical knowledge which greatly impressed the Committee. On behalf of Norway, Dr. Lange associated himself generally with the exposition of the case, as given by the representative of Sweden; and he drew a most graphic picture of the special difficulties which a sparse population and great distances created in the case of his own country.

An interesting discussion ensued. The members of the Committee were much impressed by the fact that the legal position created grave difficulties, quite apart from any consideration of the merits of the case. Ratification, subject to a reservation, would in this case be null and void unless the reservation were accepted by all the contracting parties. Again, they attached great importance to the fact that the system contemplated by the Convention had in fact been in operation for a considerable time in various countries, and that no serious practical difficulties had been encountered.

They felt that, with this body of acquired experience to draw on, and while not losing sight of the special conditions existing in Norway and Sweden, it seemed probable that the difficulties which would be encountered in these countries had perhaps been over-estimated. The number of prescriptions containing narcotics to be dealt with by any one pharmacist would not, in the nature of things, be likely to exceed the number dealt with by individual pharmacists in England, Germany or Switzerland, where the system had worked smoothly for some time. The Committee felt also that Article 6 (c) of the Convention constituted a safeguard which experience had shown to be necessary, as a measure of general applicability, against the illicit traffic. Without the provisions of Article 6 (c), a valuable means of discovering cases of abuse would be lost, and there would be a loophole which would almost certainly be taken advantage of by illicit traffickers. In view of the great importance it attached to the enforcement of the Convention, unweakened by particular reservations in the case of certain countries (which might provoke similar and less justified reservations from others), the Committee felt that the very strongest case would have to be made out before it would be justified in recommending that the reservation proposed should be regarded as unobjectionable. During the course of the discussion, the subject was examined in detail by the representatives of Sweden and Norway, in informal contact with the representatives of Great Britain, Germany and Switzerland on the Committee — these gentlemen having been chosen on account of their expert knowledge as to the working of the Convention system of control in their respective countries. After the fullest consideration, the three members of the Committee arrived at the conclusion that in view of the very precise and clear terms of Article 6 (c), it was impossible to give that article any interpretation other than that which plainly resulted from its wording. They felt it impossible to recommend acceptance of the proposed reservation, but insisted on the great importance which they attached to ratification of the Convention by Sweden; and they most earnestly hoped that the Swedish Government would reconsider the necessity for maintaining its reservation.

The Committee, after consultation with the representative of Sweden, felt that it would, in all the circumstances, be undesirable for it to pronounce a definite opinion on the point in issue at its present session. It hoped that the information which had been placed at M. Henning's disposal as to the practical working of the system in other countries would serve to remove the difficulties which had hitherto been anticipated by the Swedish Government; and it considered that, until that Government had had an opportunity of examining this information, and of learning the general trend of the discussion before the Committee, it would be premature to come to any final decision in the matter.

The definite suggestion which the Committee therefore makes for the consideration of the Council is that a copy of this section of its report, together with copies of the relevant minutes of the meetings, should be forwarded to the Swedish Government officially, and to the Norwegian Government unofficially, for their information and consideration, with the intimation that the Committee proposes to reconsider the question at its next session.

PROGRESS REPORT.

The progress report was drawn up by the Secretary to indicate what measure of advance had been achieved as regards various resolutions of the Committee, passed with special reference to the control of the illicit traffic. In many cases, time has not permitted of

a sufficient number of replies being received from the interested Governments to give a clear presentment of the position; and for this reason, and because all such questions will again come under review at the next session, the Committee does not propose to refer to any but the more important points in its present report.

The position as regards the ratification of the Geneva Convention has already been stated.

The measures suggested by the Committee to impede the despatch of opium from the Persian Gulf to "illicit" destinations appear to have been reasonably successful. The Committee is still, however, without information from two Governments whose national flags have been utilised in connection with this traffic. The Government of Norway has taken administrative action in this matter and has pointed out, in the proper quarters, how undesirable it is that its flag should be connected in any way with such a traffic.

This action appears to have been most effective; the Committee is unaware of any instance where, subsequent to the issue of this circular, the Norwegian flag has been utilised to cover shipments from the Gulf to "illicit" destinations.

The Committee has much pleasure in reporting most satisfactory progress as regards the general adoption of the maritime insurance clause, designed with the object of rendering more difficult the despatch by sea of consignments of drugs intended for the illicit traffic. This measure formed the subject of Resolution VIII of our eighth session. In paragraph 5 of our last report (ninth session), the position as it then stood was stated: the Committee at that time felt satisfied with the progress achieved. Since that date the International Federation of Maritime Insurance Associations has recommended the adoption of the clause to all its members, who have in their turn accepted this recommendation; the Association of Underwriters at Amsterdam has also decided to adopt the clause; and the insurance companies in Switzerland have taken a similar action. In the United States of America, seventy-two companies have already agreed to adopt the clause; and, of the four remaining companies, three have agreed to accept it if it is signed by the fourth. It is anticipated that in a short time the clause will be universally adopted there. The Marine Insurance Association of Japan has decided to adopt the clause which has been drawn up by the Marine Insurance Association of London with regard to the shipment of opium and narcotic drugs. The provisions of the clause have been in force since March 1st, 1927.

The Committee found itself much hampered in its work by the fact that the quarterly reports of seizures which were formerly sent to the Committee by the Chinese Maritime Customs, through the International Anti-Opium Association of Peking, have now been discontinued. These reports, which often related to seizures which were, for various reasons, of special importance from the point of view of the Committee, were promptly received; and they gave all relevant details enabling the Committee and the Governments concerned to take action and institute enquiries. The reports are of not less importance for China herself, as they provide information which enables measures to be taken for dealing with the traffickers who are engaged in smuggling large quantities of the drugs into China. The reports which the Government of China have recently been forwarding contain no details. They merely mention the total quantities seized: the details, which are essential before any fructuous action can be taken, are not communicated. A resolution dealing with this matter is appended to our report -- Resolution II.

In view of the remarks of the Chinese representative on the Council at the sixth meeting of the forty-fourth session held on March 11th, 1927, the Committee is satisfied that the course it suggests will present no difficulties.

Resolution III deals with a minor but not unimportant question. In recent years seizures have in several countries become so large, relative to the volume of the licit traffic, that the Committee finds some difficulty in ascertaining what the internal consumption of such countries really is. Last year, for example, the seizures in one country were over four times the quantity licitly imported: and, in the absence of definite information as to the manner in which seized drugs are disposed of, the Committee cannot form any clear idea as to the position in such cases. It would therefore suggest to all Governments that it would be a great convenience to the Committee, and would materially facilitate its task, if each Government would — as provided in Article 22 (1) (e) of the Geneva Convention of 1925 in respect of the reports to be sent to the Central Board — communicate in its report to the League information as to the precise manner in which confiscated substances have been disposed of, together with such other information as may be useful in regard to such confiscation and disposal.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY ON THE PRODUCTION OF OPIUM IN PERSIA.

This report, and the connected papers, were examined by the Committee in the light of the decisions taken at the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly in respect of this

question. The Committee is interested in the matter, with special reference to the question of the probable effect of the measures which the Persian Government proposes to take upon the very grave situation which now exists. The Committee desires to pay a tribute to the thoroughness and skill of the Committee of Enquiry, and to its shrewdness and far-sightedness in dealing with a most difficult, delicate and complicated situation. It also desires to express its thanks to the Government of Persia for the manner in which that Government has responded to the suggestions made by the Committee of Enquiry. In the course of the discussion it was pointed out that Persian opium had in the past been freely used as a raw material for the manufacture of morphia and that there was every reason to believe that, should price considerations admit of this, it would again be so used in the future. In some respects Persian opium is indeed peculiarly adapted for use as a raw material for drug manufacture, inasmuch as it contains an unusually large percentage of codeine. The only reason why Persian opium has not been used for the preparation of morphine and similar drugs in recent years is that it has commanded a fictitiously high price in the illicit trade of the Far East.

Persia has not yet ratified the Hague Convention of 1912; and her signature of that Convention was accompanied by the important reservation that she would not agree to undertake measures to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry. The Committee feels that, with this vital reservation upon a fundamental point still in force, it would be optimistic to expect that much progress can be made in combating the illicit trade. It would also point out that the Persian Government proposes to accept the import and export certificate system three years hence; from the date of such acceptance it will reduce by ten per cent each year (subject to certain conditions and reservations) "the quantity annually permitted to leave the country without production of opium import certificates". The decision by India to reduce her exports of opium has deflected to Persia a large demand of a legitimate character; this must, unless the total amount of opium produced by Persia be increased, lead to a diminution of the quantity of opium which has in the past found its way from that country into illicit channels. Broadly speaking, opium which leaves Persia uncovered by import certificates gets into the illicit traffic; the undertaking is therefore a conditional promise that, three years hence, the Government of Persia will begin to reduce by ten per cent a year a traffic which now finds its way, almost exclusively, into illicit channels. The Committee cannot but regret that the Persian Government should have felt unable to advance further than this. It recognises, however, that the action which that Government agrees to take constitutes a considerable step in advance, and the present situation is so menacing that it welcomes any amelioration of it. It will watch the progress which may be achieved in this matter with the most lively and sympathetic interest.

MEMORANDUM BY M. CAVAZZONI SUGGESTING A SYSTEM FOR THE CONTROL OF THE DRUG TRAFFIC.

M. CAVAZZONI presented to the Committee, for its consideration, a memorandum containing an elaborate scheme for the control of the drug traffic. In placing his memorandum before the Committee, M. Cavazzoni explained that, in his view, the campaign against the narcotic traffic had not been so successful as had at first been anticipated. The drug traffic still continued: its volume was still enormous. Something was clearly lacking. The Committee, the Council, the Assembly — all had displayed the most praiseworthy energy; but, despite all this, the results were most disappointing. He felt that, this being so, the probability was that the methods adopted had been wrong. For too long Governments had been allowed to adopt individual measures for the indirect limitation of manufacture and for supervision over the traffic. More universal and more vigorous methods must be followed if the desired results were to be attained. A uniform method must be prescribed — a method enabling all Governments to apply, with uniformity and certainty, the principles underlying the Conventions of The Hague and of Geneva. He desired that each Government should be made aware of his views in this matter, and that each Government should have before it his scheme, which indicated how it could accomplish the task it had undertaken and fulfil the solemn obligations it had accepted.

The detailed scheme which he submitted for consideration was, he thought, in accord with the letter and the spirit of the Convention of The Hague and of the Geneva Convention of 1925. (The scheme in question will be annexed to the minutes of the sixth meeting.)

In the course of the discussion, it became clear that the Committee was prepared to consider sympathetically M. Cavazzoni's suggestions; but doubts were felt as to the practicability of some of his detailed proposals, while the difficulty which would be experienced in inducing Governments to accept and apply them was stressed. There was no country where the scheme, as it stood, was applied. Many of its provisions are already in force in some countries; others had adopted variants of these proposals which are believed

to be working satisfactorily and which they would therefore be unwilling to change. The wholesale alteration of laws, rules, and regulations was not a task which any Government would lightly undertake.

Despite these objections and difficulties, the Committee felt that the moment was opportune for a general examination of the question of the best methods of drug control and the preparation of a report on the subject based on the experience of the existing measures and methods of administration which have been found to be effective. The Geneva Convention of 1925 would, it hoped, shortly be in force ; and Governments might be glad of assistance in drawing up a practical and adequate code of control based on their obligations under that Convention. The experience of the Committee as a whole, and in particular the experience of individual members who had supervised complicated control systems in their own countries, would be, or might be, invaluable to Governments which may shortly be faced with the problem of evolving, but with little experience to guide them in the task, a code of control which will be practical, adequate, and in conformity with the provisions of the Conventions. The conditions are such that this work, if it is to be done, must be undertaken by the Committee itself ; no other body is in a position to undertake it.

The Committee felt that several dangers would have to be guarded against when drafting such a code. It would be unwise in itself, and unsound from a tactical point of view, to insist on uniformity.

Conditions varied ; methods of administration were different ; national psychologies were not the same. It would also have to be borne in mind that the honest trader must not be unnecessarily hampered in carrying on his legitimate business. So also over-elaboration must be avoided ; any unnecessary complexity would arouse opposition and would defeat its own end.

It was eventually decided that a Sub-Committee should be appointed to undertake this work, including a detailed study of M. Cavazzoni's memorandum. The work was too heavy, too detailed, too technical to be susceptible of adequate treatment by the Committee as a whole. The intention is that the Sub-Committee should have a few preliminary meetings during or immediately after the present session ; that the bulk of the work should then, so far as that is practicable, be settled by correspondence ; and that the Sub-Committee should again meet prior to the next session of the Committee. The composition of the Sub-Committee is as follows : Dr. ANSELMINO, M. BOURGOIS, Dr. CARRIÈRE, M. CAVAZZONI, Sir Malcolm DELEIVINGNE and M. VAN WETTUM.

THE QUESTION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC.

Following the practice which has been adopted of recent years, the Committee examined, case by case, all the seizure reports received since the time of its last meeting. To give a concrete idea of the magnitude of the work involved and of the broad base of experience which this system places at the disposal of the Committee, it may be mentioned that, at the present session, 83 reports were examined relating to seizures and records of illicit transactions amounting in the aggregate to tons of morphine and diacetylmorphine in all parts of the world.

The Committee desires to emphasise the point that its opinions, and such recommendations as it may make in connection with this matter, are firmly based upon experience which is not at the disposal of any other authority.

As the Committee pointed out in its previous report, it is largely as a result of its labours that the actual facts as regards the illicit traffic are now becoming known. The real position, formerly imperfectly realised, is now being discovered. The facts are also obtaining a wider degree of publicity. All this, in its turn, has produced the not unnatural impression that things are getting worse instead of better ; that the illicit traffic is increasing ; that the situation is out of control.

The Committee does not share this view, and it finds no evidence in support of it. It has no desire to minimise the enormous extent of the illicit traffic ; indeed, it has, in its last report, insisted as strongly as possible upon the importance of the widest possible recognition that an enormous volume of illicit traffic still exists. Quantitative statements are impossible in such a matter ; but the Committee sees no reason to think that the illicit traffic is increasing. More and more publicity is being given to seizures ; they attract in an increasing degree the attention of the public. But there is very little to suggest that the illicit traffic is itself greater than it was before, and there are some encouraging signs.

Co-operation between Governments is unquestionably much better than it was only a short time ago ; the exchange of information between national administrative, Customs and police authorities is quicker and covers a wider field ; the system of control generally is being steadily improved by an increasing number of Governments ; the import and export certificate system, on which all control depends, is becoming more widely adopted and is

gradually being more efficiently applied. The effect of these measures on the volume of the illicit traffic is not — and cannot be — open to doubt. Slowly — far too slowly — we regretfully admit — these measures are producing their inevitable effect. The fruits cannot be fully gathered because almost all practical measures of control depend for their efficacy upon their universal — or almost universal — application. That, despite every effort, is what the Committee has hitherto been unable to secure. As we have pointed out before, the performances of the nations lag far behind their contractual obligations. In case after case the Committee found that any loophole in the wall of defence had instantly been seized on by the illicit traffickers. If a country does not accept, or does not in practice strictly enforce, the import and export certificate system, it at once and inevitably becomes a base for illicit operations. If administrative control is inadequate, the best intentions and the most elaborate laws do not prevent the illicit traffic from flourishing.

Free ports, if not efficiency and adequately controlled, become bases of the illicit trade. Where wholesale dealers are not effectively supervised, the illicit traffic immediately springs up. Where licences are not withdrawn from manufacturers or traders whose products are regularly finding their way into the illicit traffic, that lucrative trade inevitably continues.

Enumeration of the different classes of cases would be tedious. The case is analogous to water under tremendous hydraulic pressure; it feels and saps its way steadily, irresistibly, to every furthest point of the system to which the pressure reaches. It searches automatically and continuously for any flaw, any imperfection, any method of breaking down the iron barrier that surrounds it; it is for ever striving to overcome its bonds and to break free. And so it is with the illicit drug traffic. Wise laws, good regulations, honesty of purpose, efficiency in practice, a sustained common effort, are all alike required before the illicit traffic can be effectively dealt with; and unfortunately, experience has shown that these essentials cannot be obtained over any very wide field. In this matter, as we have so often insisted, the Committee is entirely in the hands of the individual Governments. They — and they alone — can stop this traffic, which is a reproach to our civilisation. The action which it is necessary for them to take in order to achieve that end has been explained, reiterated, and insisted upon.

Colonel Woods, who summarised his impressions after listening to the examination of the detailed seizure reports, felt that the early and general ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1925 was one of the most important methods by which improvement could be effected. The situation was infinitely serious; something must be done. Obviously, the most effective method of control would be to stop the illicit traffic at its source. There were, say, forty factories in the world, controlled by eight nations. If each such country discharged its international obligations and controlled effectively the intake into, the manufacture in, and the output from, these factories, the drug problem would be solved. There were methods of securing this control which left legitimate traffic unhampered. The various Convention Conferences had elaborated such methods; and this Committee has urged upon Governments their adoption time and again. Everything necessary had been done except that the last step, the conclusive step, had not yet been taken by all the interested Governments. Colonel Woods proposed a resolution giving effect to his suggestions as regards this matter. The Committee, after a brief discussion, accepted Colonel Woods' resolution unanimously in principle. It was then referred to a small drafting sub-committee, and it appears substantially in its original form as Resolution IV appended to this report.

GENERAL.

The Committee dealt with two interesting and important subjects: the first, a suggestion by Dr. Anselmino for the formation of a private syndicate of drug manufacturers with the view of combating the existing abuses in the drug traffic; the second, a discussion, initiated on the suggestion of M. Fotitch, as to the relations which will subsist between this Committee and the Central Board when the latter is constituted.

It appears unnecessary to treat either question in our report, as in both cases it was finally decided to defer any decision till the next session.

The Committee desires to thank the Secretariat staff for all the assistance which they have rendered during the current session. It is recognised that a long meeting, held immediately after the close of the Assembly, has subjected the staff to a very heavy strain. The Committee would in particular call attention to the excellent work of the minute writers, to whom it is much indebted.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution I.

The Committee desires to draw the special attention of the Council to Resolution I passed at the Committee's ninth session. Further experience has strengthened the conviction of the Committee of the absolute necessity, if the illicit traffic is to be adequately dealt with, of the powers which the Geneva Convention of 1925 confers. Until that Convention comes into operation, over as wide a field as possible, little progress can be hoped for in combating the illicit traffic. As twelve ratifications of, and six adhesions to, that Convention have now been recorded, the entry into vigour of the Convention depends solely on the action taken by the States Members of the Council. Four further ratifications by such States are necessary before the Convention comes into force. The Committee ventures to repeat its urgent request that the Council will give this question its most serious consideration at its next meeting.

Resolution II.

The Committee requests the Council to represent to the Government of China that it would prove of the greatest assistance to the Committee in its work if it were provided with a report as to all important seizures of narcotic substances effected by the Chinese Maritime Customs at the various ports and stations which are controlled by that service. Such reports would also help other Governments to prevent the illicit export of narcotics into China. The reports, to be of value, should be forwarded to the League as soon as possible after the end of each quarter; and they should contain all relevant details (such as quantities, description of packages, labels — of which samples should be sent whenever possible — route followed, origin of the goods if known, references to the bills of lading under which forwarded, name of consignor and consignee, and in general all details which will assist in tracing the origin of the goods and the precise manner in which they came to find their way into the illicit traffic).

Resolution III.

In view of the large seizures now being effected in several countries — seizures which in some cases exceed the volume of the licit traffic — and the fact that all Governments do not give precise information as to the manner in which narcotic substances so seized are dealt with, thereby rendering it difficult to form an accurate idea as to the position of the traffic, the Committee requests the Council to be good enough to ask all Governments to state, in their annual reports, the precise manner in which such confiscated substances have been dealt with, and to give such other information as may be useful in regard to such confiscation or disposal.

It will be observed that this resolution reproduces the wording of Article 22 (I) (e) of the Geneva Convention, which imposes an obligation of this character in respect of the reports to be sent by the contracting parties to the Central Board when the latter is constituted.

Resolution IV.

The illicit traffic undoubtedly continues "on an enormous scale"¹, it is "backed by huge financial resources"², and "drugs are still being smuggled in very large quantities"³. It appears impossible at present to restrict the export from producing countries of raw opium and coca leaves to the small quantity necessary to supply the medical needs of the world. Experience also shows that the smuggling of drugs can be restricted to a considerable extent, but cannot be wholly stopped by measures that fall short of complete control, in view of the great financial gains which ensue from the smuggling of even small quantities. If all drug factories were adequately controlled by their Governments the drug problem would in large measure be solved.

The Committee therefore requests the Council to urge as insistently as possible upon all Governments Members of the League and parties to the Opium Conventions that all factories manufacturing dangerous drugs should be owned, or adequately controlled, by their Governments. Under either system the Governments would at least:

¹ See Report of the Committee to the Council on the Work of its Second Session (document A.15.1922).
² See Report of the Committee to the Council on the Work of its Seventh Session (document A.28.1926).
³ See Report of the Committee to the Council on the Work of the Ninth Session (document C.29.M.19.1927).

(1) Regulate, and require an accurate accounting of, all internal traffic, including the purchase of raw materials, manufacture, sales, distribution, storage ;

(2) Strictly control the issue and possession of licences or authorisations for the manufacture, sale, distribution and storage of the drugs ;

(3) Adopt, and rigidly enforce, the import and export certificate system ;

(4) Strictly control the export of dangerous drugs to any country which does not enforce the import and export certificate system. Where this system is not in force in the importing country, the Government of the exporting country must satisfy itself, beyond reasonable doubt, that the demand is for legitimate purposes only. This precaution is particularly important, since the readiest route which the illicit traffic can follow is through those countries which do not enforce the import and export certificate system. It is recognised that this will present various difficulties until the Central Board has been constituted ; but it is imperative that such control should be exercised, as far as that is practicable, by the exporting countries until the Central Board begins to function. Experience in certain countries has shown that, even in present circumstances, a large measure of effective control can in fact be exercised in such cases.

Appendix.

AGREEMENT DRAWN UP BY THE FIRST OPIUM CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 11TH, 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 |

CONVENTION DRAWN UP BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 19TH, 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 | | Belgium | | |
| Belgium | | Bolivia | Belgium | |
| Brazil | | Brazil | | |
| Bulgaria | Bulgaria | Bulgaria | Bulgaria | Bulgaria |
| Canada | Canada | | | |
| 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 |

| <i>Convention</i> | <i>Signatures</i> | | <i>Final Act</i> | <i>Ratifications</i> | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <i>Protocol</i> | | | <i>Convention</i> | <i>Protocol</i> |
| Irish Free State | | | Irish Free State | | |
| Japan | Japan | | Japan | | |
| Latvia | Latvia | | | | |
| 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 |
| Switzer'and | | | Switzerland | | |
| Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa | | | Union of South Africa | Union of South Africa |
| Uruguay | | | Uruguay | | |

Adhesions

Bolivia ¹ (subject to ratification and to the
Declarations given below)
Danzig
Dominican Republic (*ad referendum*)
Egypt
Monaco

Adhesions

Roumania (*ad referendum*)
Salvador
San Marino
Sarawak
Venezuela (*ad referendum*).

¹ Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government by means of export certificates.
The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported : Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo. (See Minutes of second meeting.)

INDEX

Abbreviations.

Govt. = Government.

Memo. = Memorandum.

Resol. = Resolution.

Advisory Committee

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Agenda | |
| Adoption | 9 |
| Items | 86 |
| Discussion and procedure concern- | |
| ing | 7-9 |
| Assessors | 6, 7, 13, 78, 106, 118 |
| Attendance of Chinese and Norwegian | |
| representatives during discussion of | |
| certain items | 7, 24 |
| Chairman | 6 |
| Opening speech | 7 |
| Close of session | 83 |
| Date of 11th session | 7, 9, 83 |
| Duties, respective of Committee and Perm. | |
| Central Board | |
| Postponement of question | 124 |
| Proposal of M. Fotitch | 7, 9 |
| Sub-Committee for examination of | |
| proposal | |
| Constitution | 22 |
| Examination of report by Advi- | |
| sory Committee | 43-50 |
| Resol. : Discussion | 82-83 |
| Members | 6, 7 |
| Minutes of ninth Session | |
| Letter of Danish Govt. concerning | |
| 7, 7-8, 9, 31 | |
| Minutes of tenth (extraordinary) session | |
| Approval | 50 |
| Request for brief minutes | 24 |
| Publicity of meetings | 7 |
| Report (draft) to Council on work of tenth | |
| Session | |
| Examination and adoption | 78-82 |
| Text | 118-124 |
| Resolutions | |
| Adoption | 82 |
| Text | 125-126 |
| Vice-Chairman | 6 |
| Agenda | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee. | |
| Agreements etc. | |
| <i>See</i> : Conventions. | |
| America | |
| South | |
| <i>See</i> : South American States. | |
| United States <i>see that title.</i> | |
| Annual Reports | |
| <i>See</i> : Reports, Annual. | |
| Assessors | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee. | |
| Barry Dock, London | |
| Seizure of drugs on S. S. «Fumana» | 54 |
| Berlin | |
| Seizure of drugs in | 67-69, 70 |
| Boehringer and Co, Basle | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic : in Germany. | |
| Bombay | |
| Seizure of drugs in | 62 |
| Brenier, Henri | |
| Letter, Sept. 28th 1927, to Chairman of | |
| Opium Committee | 43, 106-107 |
| Broensen, Arwed (Firm) | |
| Illicit traffic : Transactions | 62 |

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Caffeine, Nature of | 69 |
| Calcutta | |
| Seizures of drugs in | 58, 59 |
| Carl Ruben Case | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic : Seizures in port of | |
| Copenhagen. | |
| Cavazzeni, M. | |
| Proposed system for control of drug traffic | |
| Memo. 7, 7-8, 9, 32-33, 33-34, 37-41, 41-43, | |
| 79-81, 109-117 (<i>text</i>), 122-123 | |
| Central Board, Perm. | |
| Duties, respective of Board and Advisory | |
| Committee | |
| Postponement of question | 124 |
| Proposal of M. Fotitch | 7, 9 |
| Sub-Committee for examination of | |
| proposal | |
| Constitution | 22 |
| Examination of report by Advisory | |
| Committee | 43-50 |
| Resol. : Discussion | 82-83 |
| Chairman of Committee | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee. | |
| China | |
| Attendance of representative during dis- | |
| cussion of certain items | 24 |
| Conveyance of drugs by post to | 12-13, 92-94 |
| Illicit traffic : Drugs seized | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic : Seizures : in | |
| China. | |
| Import and export certificates system : | |
| Situation in | 43 |
| Import from Switzerland : Agreement con- | |
| cluded with Switzerland | 61 |
| Purchase of opium by chinese navy | 66 |
| Suppression in South-China of opium | |
| production and traffic | 29, 107-108 |
| Coca leaves | |
| Export from producing countries | 125 |
| Cocaine | |
| Seizures : | |
| in Calcutta | 58 |
| at Hong-Kong | 53 |
| in Port of Copenhagen | 7, 7-8, 9, 31, 53 |
| in Trieste | 58 |
| Committee of enquiry on production of Opium | |
| in Persia | |
| <i>See</i> : Persia : Report etc. | |
| Committee on Opium traffic | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee. | |
| Contraband | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic. | |
| Conventions | |
| Agreement, Feb. 11, 1925 | |
| Ratifications etc. : List | 126-127 |
| Geneva, 1925 | |
| Art. 6 : Swedish reservation 7, 13-19, 19-21, | |
| 78, 119-120 | |
| Art. 22 e) : Application desirable | 27, 125 |
| Importance of ratification as regards | |
| illicit traffic | 82, 124, 125 |
| Ratifications | 10-17, 78, 87, 118-119 |

Conventions (continued)

Hague, 1912
 Adhesion of Turkey: League communications re unanswered Resol. of Advisory Committee and Council 22, 95
 Import Agreement between China and Switzerland 61

Copenhagen, illicit traffic in 7, 7-8, 9, 31, 53

Cuba
 Illicit traffic in 64, 66

Dairen
 Shipment of goods to the Far East from 69-70

Documents
 List of publications: Request for complete list up to October 1927 24
 re Seizures: Method of presentation
See: Illicit traffic: Seizures: Method of entering statistics etc.
 Unofficial information: Methods of circulation 8, 27-29

Drugs
 Leakage of
See: Illicit traffic.
 Manufactured
See: Manufacture etc.

Dutch East Indies
See: Netherlands East Indies.

Estonia
 Import and Export etc.: Information concerning 24, 101
 Seizure of drugs in 58

Exports and Imports
See: Imports etc.

Factories, Control of
See: Manufacture etc.

Far East
 Opium conditions in
 Report from Foreign Policy Association 29
 Report by Mr. Herbert L. May 36-37
 Postal traffic with
See: Postal traffic: Conveyance of drugs etc.: to China.
 Shipment into from Dairen 69-70
 Traffic between the Far East of the Persian Gulf
See: Persia: Traffic

Foreign Policy Association
 Report on opium conditions in the Far East 29, 36

Free ports and zones
 Control in various countries 22-24, 90-98
 Opportunities for illicit traffic 124

Friederici and Co.
See: Illicit traffic: in Germany

« Fumana » S. S.
 Seizure of drugs on 54

Genoa
 Seizure of drugs in 53

Graphs
 Opinion de M. Brenier 106

Hamburg
 Illicit traffic in 70

Havana
 Seizure of drugs in 64

Hoffman-La Roche and Co
 Firm distinct from Roche and Co 65

Hong-Kong
 Seizure (cocaine and morphine) 53, 53-54, 63-64

Hoorstra, M.
 Purchase of raw opium 70-71

Illicit traffic
 Cases: Collation by Secretariat 63
 Communication between authorities with regard to 25-26, 105
 Between Dairen and the Far-East
See below: Shipment etc.
 Discussion in connection with letter from Danish Govt. and Memo. of M. Cavazzoni 7-8
 in Germany 65, 70, 77
See also below: Transactions etc.
 Leakage of drugs into 11-12, 88-92
See also: Manufacture and Manufacturers: Control: Proposals etc.
 Position, General 81-82, 123-124
 Relation of question to ratification of Geneva Convention 82, 124, 125
 Roche and Co: Affair of 65-66
 Resolution proposed by Colonel Woods 71-72, 72-75
 Schulten Case 64
 Seizures:
 in Canada 59-60
 in China 52-53, 53, 53-54, 54-58, 58, 59, 61, 63-64, 65
 in Cuba 64, 66
 in Dutch East Indies 59, 66
 on S. S. " Fumana " 54
 in Germany 67-69, 70
 in India 58, 59, 59-60
 in Italy 53, 61, 63
 Method of entering statistics relating to seized drugs 8, 24, 26-27, 50-51, 82, 102, 125
 in Port of Copenhagen (cocaine)
 Letter from Danish Govt 7, 7-8, 9, 31, 53
 Reports: Question of units of weights and measures 64
 Returns: Inclusion in annual reports proposed
See above: Methods
 in Straits Settlements 62
 in United States 59, 64, 65
 Shipment of goods into Far-East from Dairen: Note from British representative 69-70
 Smuggling of drugs into Iraq 65
 in Spain 64-65
 Statement, General, by Colonel Woods 71-72, 72-75
 Transactions by Firm of Arwed Broemsen of Hamburg 62
 Transit traffic 65
 Use of the territory of one country to carry on traffic in another: Legislative measures 51-52
See also: Manufacture etc. of drugs: Control: Proposals concerning: Persia: Traffic in Persian Gulf

Imports and Exports
 Control, Proposed system of Memo. by M. Cavazzoni
 Discussion . 7, 7-8, 9, 32-33, 33-34, 37-41, 41-43, 79-81, 122-123
 Sub-Committee 39, 41, 42, 43, 123
 Text 109-113
 Export authorisation to countries not applying system of import authorisation 102
See also below: Statistics etc.
 Import from Switzerland to China: Agreement 61
 Statistics in annual reports and export authorisations 24, 98-100
 System of import certificates
 Method of application
See above: Control: Proposed system
 Situation in China 43

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Information, Unofficial | | Persia | |
| <i>See</i> : Documents : Unofficial information etc. | | Report of Commission of inquiry into production : Discussion 8-9, 30-31, 79, 121-122 | |
| Insurance, Maritime | | Traffic in Persian Gulf . . . 24-25, 86, 102-103 | |
| <i>See</i> : Maritime etc. | | Portugal | |
| Iraq | | Statement concerning illicit traffic 24 | |
| Smuggling of drugs into 65 | | Postal traffic | |
| Italy | | Conveyance of drugs by post | |
| Seizure of drugs in 61, 63 | | to China 92-94 | |
| Japan | | Control 12-13, 104-105 | |
| Illicit traffic with Far-East | | Destruction of postal packets of narcotic substances in Cuba 66 | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic : Shipment etc. | | Information given by official of Universal Postal Union . . . 21, 25, 35-36 | |
| Kiaochow | | Production of Opium | |
| Seizures in 52-53 | | in Persia | |
| „ Kumamoto Maru ” S. S. | | <i>See</i> : Persia : Report etc. | |
| Traffic in the Persian Gulf 66 | | in South China : Suppression 29 | |
| Legislative Measures | | Progress Report | |
| Punishment of persons using the territory of one country to carry on illicit traffic in another 51-52 | | <i>See</i> : Reports | |
| Taken by different countries <i>See under the various subjects</i> | | Publications | |
| Lithuania | | <i>See</i> : Documents | |
| Imports and exports etc. : Information concerning 24, 101 | | Rangoon | |
| Manufacture and Manufacturers of drugs | | Seizure of drugs in 59-60 | |
| Control : Proposals concerning | | Raw Opium | |
| Observations of M. Henri Brenier 106 | | Exports from producing countries 125 | |
| National Control of factories : | | Information supplied by Netherlands Govt. re Movements of a quantity purchased by Hoornstra 70-71 | |
| Memo. by M. Cavazzoni 7, 7-8, 9, 113-117 (<i>text</i>) | | Reports | |
| Resol. by Colonel Woods 72, 72-75 | | Annual | |
| Resol. of Advisory Committee 82, 125-126 | | Date of despatch 24, 101 | |
| Syndicate, Int. proposed by M. Anselmino 8, 13, 75, 77 | | From certain Govts which have not hitherto sent them 24, 100-101 | |
| Observations of M. Henri Brenier 107 | | Seizures : Method of entering statistics concerning 8, 24, 102 | |
| Postponement of question 124 | | South American States : Position 22, 96 | |
| Maritime Customs, Chinese | | Statistics in | |
| Report on Seizures : Request for 82-125 | | <i>See under</i> : Imports etc. : Statistics | |
| Seizure of drugs 58, 59, 61 | | Progress report by Secretary | |
| Maritime Insurance 25, 29, 103-104 | | Discussion 10-13, 22-24, 24-26, 79, 120-121 | |
| May, Herbert L. | | Text 87-105 | |
| Report on opium conditions in Far East 29, 36-37 | | Seizure reports : Question of Units of Weights and Measures used in 64 | |
| Minutes of Committee | | Roche and Co, Tokio | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee | | Investigation into affair by Swiss authorities 65-66 | |
| Montreal | | Ruben, Carl | |
| Seizure of drugs in 59-60 | | <i>See under</i> : Illicit traffic : Seizures : in port of Copenhagen | |
| Morphine | | Schulten Case | |
| Seizure at Hong-Kong 53-54 | | <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic | |
| Netherlands East Indies | | Seizures | |
| Seizure of drugs in 59, 66 | | <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic | |
| New York | | Shanghai | |
| Seizure of drugs in 65 | | Seizure in 54-58, 65 | |
| Norway | | Singapore | |
| Attendance of Norwegian delegate during discussion of Convention (1925) 7 | | Seizure of drugs in 62 | |
| Illicit traffic in Persian Gulf : Circular addressed to Norwegian shipowners 24-25 | | Smoking of Opium | |
| Penalties | | in Far East : Survey | |
| <i>See</i> : Legislative measures : Punishment etc. | | <i>See</i> : Far East : Opium conditions in | |
| Penang | | South American States | |
| Seizure of drugs in 62 | | Annual reports and information 22, 96 | |
| | | Spain | |
| | | Illicit traffic in 64-65 | |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Statistics | |
| Import and export <i>see that title</i> | |
| Seizures, statistics concerning | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic : Seizures : | |
| Method etc. | |
| Stattnegross, Mme | |
| Case relating to illicit traffic | 77-78 |
| Syndicate, Int. for the manufacture of narcotics | |
| <i>See</i> : Manufacture and manufacturers of | |
| drugs : Syndicate etc. | |
| Strychnine, Nature of | 69 |
| Switzerland | |
| Imports to China : Agreement concluded | |
| with China | 61 |
| Transit traffic | |
| <i>See</i> : Illicit traffic | |
| Treaties etc. | |
| <i>See</i> : Conventions | |
| Turkey | |
| Adhesion to Hague Convention, 1912 | |
| Absence of reply | 22, 95 |
| United States of America | |
| Illicit traffic : Seizure of drugs in | 59, 64, 65 |
| Maritime insurance in | 29 |
| Universal Postal Bureau | |
| Request to, for information concerning | |
| postal traffic | 21, 25, 35-36 |
| Vancouver | |
| Seizure of drugs in | 59-60 |
| Vice-Chairman | |
| <i>See</i> : Advisory Committee | |
| Vienna | |
| Export (illicit) of drugs to Shanghai | 65 |
| Weights and Measures, Units of | |
| Conversion into metric system proposed | 64 |