

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 <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	<i>Bolivia.</i>
M. Chao-Hsin CHU <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	<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 TUCK<sup>2</sup> . . . . . *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.

## 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 leakage 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 for 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 DELEVINGNE (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 Keelung. 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 Keelung 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 VISARNVAJA (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 DELEIVINGNE (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 th's to be the case.

28. Propaganda : Resolution of the Council dated December 8th, 1924<sup>1</sup>.

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.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 WETTUM (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 *acquit 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 transshipment 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 WERTUM (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 DELEIVINGNE (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? <sup>1</sup>

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 it 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 longer 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 concessionnaire, 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, 240 of which were compressed into 120 packages and the remaining 756 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 amendment<sup>1</sup>.*

(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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 transshipments 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 <sup>1</sup>	Portugal	Portugal
Siam <sup>1</sup>	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”

<sup>1</sup> 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 ”<sup>1</sup>.

*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 1921<sup>1</sup>.

*Netherlands.* — This Government refers to the reply to the questionnaire of 1921. No change in the legislation is expected. Regulations enclosed<sup>1</sup>.

*Norway.* — Sends regulations in force<sup>1</sup>.

*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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 Argentina, 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 <sup>1</sup>.

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 <sup>2</sup>	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 <sup>2</sup>	
		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

Chosen                      Formosa                      Kwantung Leased Territory

*Netherlands Colonies.*

1923

Netherlands East Indies

1924

Surinam

*Portuguese Colonies.*

1924

Macao

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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) <sup>1</sup>	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
CANADA (1924)	COLONY (1923)
CEYLON (1923)	KWANTUNG (1923)
CEYLON (1924)	MALTA (1923)
CHOSEN (1923)	MALTA (1924)
CYPRUS (1924)	MAURITIUS (1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (1924)	NIGERIA (1924)
DENMARK (1922-1924)	POLAND (1923)
FIJI (1924)	ROUMANIA (1923)
FORMOSA (1923)	ST. VINCENT (1924)
FRANCE (1923)	SOUTHERN RHODESIA (1924)
FRANCE (1924)	STRAITS SETTLEMENTS (1923)
GIBRALTAR (1924)	SWEDEN (1924)
GILBERT AND ELLICE ISLANDS (1923)	UNION OF S. AFRICA (1924)
GREAT BRITAIN (1924)	ZANZIBAR (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)	

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	JAPAN
AFGHANISTAN	LATVIA
ALBANIA <sup>2</sup>	LIBERIA <sup>5</sup>
ARGENTINE	LICHTENSTEIN
AUSTRALIA	LITHUANIA
AUSTRIA	LUXEMBURG
BELGIUM	MEXICO
BOLIVIA	MONACO <sup>6</sup>
BRAZIL	NETHERLANDS
BULGARIA	NEW ZEALAND
CHILE	NICARAGUA
CHINA	PANAMA
COLOMBIA	PARAGUAY
COSTA RICA	PERSIA
CUBA	PERU
DANZIG	POLAND
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC <sup>3</sup>	PORTUGAL
ECUADOR	ROUMANIA
ESTHONIA	SALVADOR
GERMANY	SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF
GREECE	SIAM
GUATEMALA	SPAIN (last three quarters)
HAITI	SWITZERLAND
HONDURAS	TURKEY <sup>7</sup>
HUNGARY <sup>4</sup>	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 Abyssinia<sup>1</sup>, Albania<sup>2</sup>, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup>, Hungary<sup>4</sup>, Liberia<sup>5</sup>, Monaco<sup>6</sup> and Turkey<sup>7</sup>, 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The Government of the Dominican Republic states that there is no manufacture, and that imports are chiefly from the United States.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> There is no traffic in this country.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> 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, nor 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 1924	1,636 200 nil	India	1,636 200 nil	nil nil	1,636 200 nil	nil nil	1,636 200 (c)	nil	4,504	
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 <sup>1</sup>	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	7,200 000			774 000			39,210	(e) The statistics established by the Customs Administration does not separate raw opium, prepared opium, and medicinal opium.
FRENCH COLONIES (b)	1923	26 246									

I. RAW OPIUM STATISTICS (concluded).

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout.)

I	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 (k)		(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) <sup>1</sup> .	1923	nil		nil	1,392 677	1,392 677	nil	1,392 677	1,638 023 (l)	17,264	(k) Excluding 958 kg. manufactured in narcocon 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 <sup>1</sup> . . . .	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	(l) Excluding 18 kg. used in the manufacture of other drugs.
KWANTUNG <sup>1</sup> . . . .	1923	14,545 000	Persia	15,545 000	nil	14,545 000	2,235 000 (i)	12,310 000	(m)	687	(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.
SPAIN . . . . .	1924 (n)										(n) Only the figures for the first six months have been received (see doc. O.C. 23(q)1)
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	
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	

<sup>1</sup> 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	
	1923	67	United Kingdom								
		1	Switzerland	68	nil	68	6	62			(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.
BRITISH COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES not separately specified <sup>1</sup>	1923 (a)	20									
	1924 (b)	69									
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO .	1924	3		3						258	
CANADA . . . . .	1924	106	United Kingdom	106			8			9,030	(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.
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	(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.
FINLAND . . . . .	1924	125	Great Britain							3,364	
		23	Denmark								
		1	Germany	149							
FRENCH COLONIES. .	1923 (c)	185									(d) Cameroons and Togo.
FRENCH INDO-CHINA	1923	7								20,000	(e) Excluding Irish Free State.
FRENCH MANDATED TERRITORIES (d)	1923	13		13							(f) Contained in preparations.
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							

<sup>1</sup> 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.)

I	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 <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	1923 (a)	2	222												(b) 105 kg. 687 were sent back to England by the Department of Customs and Excise.
	1924 <sup>2</sup>	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 <sup>3</sup>	18	447											20,000	(f) Manufacturing 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) <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	1923	11	236 (i)	43	200	54	436	(h)		0	216			17,264	
FORMOSA <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	1923	12	810 (i)	Nil		12	810	Nil		Nil				3,655	(i) Importation from Japan proper.
KWANTUNG <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	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		43	587	Nil		Nil		42	587	5,903	
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA . . . . .	1924	14	791	Nil		14	791	Nil		16	159 (j)			6,928	

<sup>1</sup> Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

<sup>2</sup> See list under Table II.

<sup>3</sup> The figures are included in those for Japan and territories.

#### IV. HEROIN AND SALTS OF HEROIN.

(Weight given in kilos and grammes throughout).

1	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 <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	1923 (a)	0	119												(b) Including 734 kg. 850 seized in Hong-Kong and brought to Great Britain for disposal.
	1924 <sup>2</sup>	0	883												
CANADA . . . . .	1924	15	189	nil		15	189			negligible				9,030	(c) Excluding Irish Free State.
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	
FRENCH COLONIES . . . . .	1923 <sup>2</sup>	negligible													
GREAT BRITAIN . . . . .	1924	739	905 <sup>b</sup>	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 (KOREA) <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	1923	2	562 <sup>d</sup>	1	350	3	912							17,264	
FORMOSA <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	1923	23	059 <sup>d</sup>			23	059							3,655	
KWANTUNG <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	1923	14	025 <sup>d</sup>			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	

<sup>1</sup> Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

<sup>2</sup> See list of colonies under Table II.

<sup>3</sup> 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.)

I	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 <sup>1</sup>	1923 (a)	0	759										(a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, note (a).
	1924 <sup>2</sup>	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 <sup>2</sup>	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	

<sup>1</sup> Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

<sup>2</sup> See list of colonies under Table II.

### VII. ALKALOIDS OF OPIUM NOT SPECIFICALLY NUMERATED

(Weight in kilos and grammes throughout.)

I	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.)

I	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.)

I	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 <sup>1</sup> .	1923 <sup>(a)</sup> 1924 <sup>2</sup>	4	152										(a) See remark and list of colonies under Table II, note (a).
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO . . . . .	1924	0	227										(b) 2 kg. 840 have been sent back to Germany.
CANADA . . . . .	1924	42	424	nil				2	886 <sup>b</sup>			9,030	(c) Including 826 kg. of raw cocaine.
CEYLON . . . . .	1923 1924	1	030	nil		1	030	nil		1	030	4,504	(d) Excluding Irish Free State.
	1924	4	423	nil		4	423	nil		4	423		(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.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA . . . . .	1924	137	354	nil		137	354	nil		137	354	13,595	
DENMARK . . . . .	1924	28	166	nil		28	166	6	121	22	045	3,289	(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.
FINLAND . . . . .	1924	16	960	nil		16	960	nil		16	960	3,364	
FRANCE . . . . .	1924	1,055	000 <sup>c</sup>					23	000			39,210	(g) Importation from Japan proper.
FRENCH COLONIES . . . . .	1923 <sup>2</sup>	3	354									20,000	(h) These figures are included in those of Japan and dependencies, column 7.
FRENCH INDO-CHINA . . . . .	1923	negligible											
GREAT BRITAIN . . . . .	1924	419	468	nil		419	468	176	847	242	621	44,200 <sup>(d)</sup>	
INDIA . . . . .	1923	39	078									319,075	
JAPAN AND DEPENDENCIES (including Chosen, Formosa, Kwantung, etc.)	1923	nil		3,313	620 <sup>e</sup>	3,313	620	5	251 <sup>f</sup>	3,308	369	77,674	
CHOSEN (KOREA) . . . . .	1923	19	525 <sup>g</sup>	nil		19	525	negligible		19	525 <sup>h</sup>	17,264	
FORMOSA . . . . .	1923	24	790 <sup>g</sup>	nil		24	790	1	360	23	430 <sup>h</sup>	3,655	
KWANTUNG . . . . .	1923	32	025 <sup>g</sup>	nil		32	025	nil		32	025 <sup>h</sup>	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	

<sup>1</sup> Certain small quantities of preparations of which the drug content was not known have not been included.

<sup>2</sup> 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	6,527	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
AUSTRIA . . . . .	1924	100 000	1 532	0.01532	6,527	
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.<sup>1</sup> 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 enclosed<sup>2</sup>. 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.

<sup>1</sup> These laws are in the archives of the Secretariat.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>
- 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 drug 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 (1).

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 <sup>1</sup>	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 <sup>2</sup>	×	×	—	—
BRAZIL <sup>3</sup>	—	×	—	—
BULGARIA <sup>1</sup>	—	—	×	—

<sup>1</sup> In these cases, statistics were sent in reply to a request made by the Opium Preparatory Committee for the information of the Conferences.

<sup>2</sup> Cocaine statistics only sent.

<sup>3</sup> Imports only.

	1921	1922	1923	1924
CANADA	—	×	×	×
CHILE <sup>2</sup>	×	×	×	—
* CHINA	—	×	—	—
COLOMBIA	—	—	—	—
COSTA RICA	—	—	—	—
CUBA <sup>2</sup>	×	×	×	—
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	—	—	— <sup>2</sup>	—
ESTHONIA	×	×	×	—
FINLAND	—	—	×	×
FRANCE	—	—	×	×
GERMANY	×	—	—	—
GREAT BRITAIN	×	×	×	×
GREECE <sup>1</sup>	×	×	×	—
GUATEMALA <sup>2</sup>	×	×	—	—
HAITI <sup>3</sup>	Letter despatched to the Secretariat on January 8th, 1924. No year stated, but annual imports, exports and consumption given.			
HONDURAS	—	—	—	—
HUNGARY <sup>1</sup>	×	×	×	×
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 <sup>1</sup>	—	—	—	—
NORWAY <sup>4</sup>	—	×	×	×
PANAMA	Letter despatched on March 26th, 1923, saying that details were sent in reply to questionnaire of 1921.			
PARAGUAY	—	—	—	—
PERSIA <sup>1</sup>	×	×	—	—
PERU	—	—	—	—
POLAND	×	×	×	—
PORTUGAL	—	—	—	—
ROUMANIA <sup>5</sup>	×	×	×	—
SALVADOR	No year given. General information despatched to the Secretariat on June 20th, 1923.			
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES	—	—	—	—
*SIAM	×	×	×	×
SPAIN <sup>4</sup>	—	—	×	×
				(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	×	—	—	—

<sup>1</sup> In these cases, statistics were sent in reply to a request made by the Opium Preparatory Committee for the information of the Conference.

<sup>2</sup> Imports only.

<sup>3</sup> Imports and exports.

<sup>4</sup> Imports and consumption.

<sup>5</sup> 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 sates 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. Dodou-nashvili 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 cases<sup>1</sup>. 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 Kautshaungmiau, or any part of the Kiang Su Province. "Kautshaungmiau" is the Chinese name of the arsenal,

<sup>1</sup> 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>Shiketani 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 460½ 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 Chinese<sup>1</sup>, 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 fosso 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.”