

**REPORT
OF THE
INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP
TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND
SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM
PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA**

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL RECORDS: FORTY-SECOND SESSION

SUPPLEMENT No. 45 (A/42/45)



UNITED NATIONS

New York, 1988

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

The present report was submitted to the Security Council under the symbol S/19251.

[19 January 1988]

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL		v
I. INTRODUCTION	1 - 10	1
II. LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER MEASURES ADOPTED BY STATES: RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE	11 - 12	3
III. INDIVIDUAL CASES OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS	13 - 17	5
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18 - 27	6

Annexes

I. QUESTIONNAIRE ADDRESSED TO ALL MEMBER STATES AND NON-MEMBER STATES REGARDING THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA AND NAMIBIA		8
II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS		10
Algeria		10
Argentina		12
Australia		12
Austria		15
Bahrain		15
Barbados		15
Belgium		15
Bolivia		16
Brazil		16
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic		17
Canada		18
Chile		18
China		18
Cuba		19
Czechoslovakia		19
Denmark		20
Egypt		20
Ethiopia		20
Finland		21
German Democratic Republic		22
Greece		22
Holy See		23
Indonesia		23
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		24
Ireland		24
Israel		25
Italy		25
Jamaica		25

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Kuwait	26
Malaysia	27
Netherlands	28
New Zealand	28
Nicaragua	29
Nigeria	30
Norway	31
Pakistan	35
Poland	35
Qatar	36
Saudi Arabia	37
Singapore	39
Spain	39
Sweden	40
Syrian Arab Republic	40
Thailand	40
Turkey	41
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	41
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	42
United Republic of Tanzania	43
Venezuela	44
Yugoslavia	45
 III. CASES OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS	 46

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

3 November 1987

Excellency,

I have the honour, in accordance with paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986, to transmit herewith the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa adopted on 3 November 1987.

On behalf of the Group, I would like to request that this report be issued as a document of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Tom Eric VRAALSEN
Chairman of the
Intergovernmental Group to Monitor
the Supply and Shipping of Oil and
Petroleum Products to South Africa

His Excellency
Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar
Secretary-General
United Nations

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its forty-first session, the General Assembly decided to establish an Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa (resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986). The Assembly authorized its President, in consultation with the chairmen of regional groups and the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, to appoint 11 Member States as members of the Intergovernmental Group on the basis of equitable geographical distribution and to ensure representation of oil-exporting States and shipping States. Following such consultations, the President of the Assembly announced the establishment of the Group, consisting of the following Member States: Algeria, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and United Republic of Tanzania.
2. The Intergovernmental Group elected Mr. Tom Eric Vraulsen (Norway) as Chairman, Ms. Nabeela Al-Mulla (Kuwait) as Vice-Chairman and Mr. Wilbert K. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania) as Rapporteur.
3. The Intergovernmental Group decided to invite representatives of the liberation movements of southern Africa, namely, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to attend its meetings as observers. A letter was addressed to the Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) as well as to the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU) expressing the desire of the Group to co-operate closely with those organizations in this matter.
4. The Intergovernmental Group authorized the Chairman to send a letter with a questionnaire to Governments of Member States and non-member States concerning legislative, technical, administrative and other measures to prevent the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia. In a statement on 26 March 1987 addressed to non-governmental organizations, the Chairman sought their co-operation. The statement was sent by the Department of Public Information of the United Nations Secretariat to more than 800 non-governmental organizations.
5. The Intergovernmental Group requested the Secretariat to provide it with available relevant information pertaining to the supply of oil to South Africa and to examine the possibility of enhancing its data base in this respect.
6. It held three formal meetings and four informal meetings. The present report was adopted by the Intergovernmental Group on 3 November 1987.
7. Among the measures the international community has been employing to induce the South African racist régime to eradicate apartheid are restrictions on the exportation of oil and petroleum products to Pretoria. In fact, an oil embargo on South Africa was recommended by the General Assembly in its resolution 32/105 G of 14 December 1977, as part of specific measures aimed at eliminating apartheid. Efforts by the Security Council to impose a mandatory oil embargo have failed despite repeated recommendations by the Assembly. The establishment, however, of the Intergovernmental Group by the Assembly in 1986, following proposals to that effect by the United Nations Seminar on Oil Embargo against South Africa, held at Oslo from 4 to 6 June 1986 (see A/41/404-S/18141, annex) and the World Conference

on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held in Paris from 16 to 20 June 1986 (see A/41/434-S/18185, annex), is considered an important step towards improving the effectiveness of the present voluntary oil embargo.

8. The potential effectiveness of an oil embargo is evident. Since oil is virtually the sole strategic raw material that South Africa lacks, Pretoria's dependence on the international community and its vulnerability to international pressure are absolute. Oil and petroleum products are vital for South Africa's transport sector and for the military and police forces, and account for a substantial part of the energy needs of the manufacturing industry and agriculture.

9. Owing to its voluntary nature the oil embargo has neither been strictly applied, nor closely monitored and therefore has not reached its potential effectiveness. Understandably the régime has strived to thwart international efforts to impose an effective oil embargo. As Pretoria is ready to pay premium prices, and as the world experiences an over-supply of oil, private companies have strong incentives to transport oil to South Africa under mostly secret arrangements involving oil producers, shipping companies, charterers, oil traders and a host of middlemen. Under these circumstances, officials of States, be they oil producing or oil trading and transporting, are often unaware of the arrangements to supply oil to South Africa. It should be noted that the embargo so far has not resulted in the cessation of the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa; instead it has led to the expansion of an illegal oil business with South Africa through the involvement of middlemen and others who have been able to circumvent the decisions of most oil-exporting States regarding their prohibition of the export of oil to South Africa. While small companies and middlemen are reported as being the main violators of the oil embargo, the role of major transnational oil companies, such as British Petroleum (BP), Caltex, Mobil, Shell and Total, which own subsidiaries in South Africa, cannot be underestimated. Both BP and Shell are reported to be actively involved in oil imports to South Africa. In addition, tanker companies, through a series of chartering schemes, are attempting to conceal their role in the violation of the oil embargo.

10. The South African régime has also resorted to exploitation of alternative energy technologies (conversion of coal to oil), as well as exploration of oil and natural gas. Furthermore, the régime is also attempting, through building and enlarging strategic oil stockpiling facilities, to lessen the effects of an embargo that would be internationally and strictly implemented.

II. LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER MEASURES ADOPTED BY STATES: RESPONSES
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

11. The Intergovernmental Group decided to send a questionnaire to Member and non-member States to seek information on their implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and, in particular, of paragraph 4 of Assembly resolution 41/35 F, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"4. Requests all States concerned, pending a decision by the Security Council, to adopt effective measures and/or legislation to broaden the scope of the oil embargo in order to ensure the complete cessation of the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly, in particular:

"(a) To apply strictly the 'end users' clause and other conditions concerning restriction on destination to ensure compliance with the embargo;

"(b) To compel the companies originally selling or purchasing oil or petroleum products, as appropriate for each nation, to desist from selling, reselling or otherwise transferring oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly;

"(c) To establish strict control over the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia by intermediaries, oil companies and traders by placing responsibility for the fulfilment of the contract on the first buyer or seller of oil and petroleum products who would, therefore, be liable for the actions of these parties;

"(d) To prevent access by South Africa to other sources of energy, including the supply of raw materials, technical know-how, financial assistance and transport;

"(e) To prohibit all assistance to apartheid South Africa, including the provision of finance, technology, equipment or personnel for the prospecting, development or production of hydrocarbon resources, the construction or operation of oil-from-coal plants or the development and operation of plants producing fuel substitutes and additives such as ethanol and methanol;

"(f) To prevent South African corporations from maintaining or expanding their holdings in oil companies or properties outside South Africa;

"(g) To terminate the transport of oil to South Africa by ships flying their flags, or by ships that are ultimately owned, managed or chartered by their nationals or by companies within their jurisdiction;

"(h) To develop a system for registration of ships, registered or owned by their nationals, that have unloaded oil in South Africa in contravention of embargoes imposed;

"(i) To impose penal action against companies and individuals that have been involved in violating the oil embargo;

"(j) To gather, exchange and disseminate information regarding violations of the oil embargo."

12. At the time of preparation of the present report, the following 50 States have sent substantive replies to the questionnaire: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Holy See, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kuwait, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. (For the questionnaire, see annex I; for the replies of Governments, see annex II.) The Group has conducted a general review of the replies so far received. In this context, it has been noted that most of the replies do not respond directly to all the questions contained in the questionnaire. In several cases the replies have not stipulated the introduction of legislation or comparable measures concerning the oil embargo against South Africa. Instead, the embargo is incorporated as a general policy of the Governments concerned within the broader policy of sanctions against the apartheid régime.

III. INDIVIDUAL CASES OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

13. As indicated above, the Intergovernmental Group has not received sufficient information from Governments on the implementation of the oil embargo against South Africa, or the violation thereof, to enable it to present a comprehensive report on all aspects of the situation. The detection of individual cases of violation of the oil embargo depends on sophisticated methods of information collection regarding the movement of ships between the ports of oil-producing States or of centres of oil export to South African ports. Distinctions in this regard have to be made between calls on South African ports for bunkering or for emergency and stoppages for the delivery of oil.

14. The Intergovernmental Group also considered alleged violations reported to it since its first meeting (see annex III). These cases are still being considered by the Group. It should be also noted that the cases considered below do not by far represent all of South Africa's oil imports in the period covered by the report.

15. Thus far, the main source of information concerning alleged violations of the oil embargo has been the Shipping Research Bureau, whose information has been submitted in the form of data sheets.

16. In order to diversify its sources of information, the Intergovernmental Group requested the Secretariat to study the possibilities of acquiring data on movements of ships to and from South Africa from sources within the United Nations system. Preliminary contacts with firms handling data of this character have been made with a view to exploring the possibility of diversifying its sources of information. The Group considers that it is essential to explore ways of improving its collection of data. In the mean time, it commends the efforts of non-governmental organizations in providing data on the movement of ships to and from South Africa. While all these sources of information are vital to the work of the Group, it is even more important that the Group enjoy the support and co-operation of all Member States and, in particular, of oil-exporting and oil-shipping States. Although the Group has been at work for less than eight months, it has been able to establish constructive contacts with Member States concerned.

17. The Intergovernmental Group finally wishes to stress that the publication of the cases received, contained in annex III, does not in any way imply a charge against or a passing of judgement on the individual States concerned or companies under their jurisdiction.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

18. The Intergovernmental Group believes that the international community should consider without delay the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions and should use all available pressure on the South African régime to induce it to eradicate apartheid through peaceful means. An oil embargo can be one of the most effective means of pressure, short of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Thus the Group believes that the Security Council is under a special obligation to impose a mandatory oil embargo against South Africa. This would complement the mandatory arms embargo imposed by the Council in its resolution 418 (1977) and would contribute to deterring the apartheid régime's oppression of the black people of South Africa and its aggression against independent African States, as well as to expediting its withdrawal from Namibia.

19. The Intergovernmental Group recognizes the importance of the steps adopted by oil-exporting States, beginning with the decision of the summit of Arab States in Algeria in 1973, to impose an oil embargo against the racist régime of South Africa and subsequently emulated by other oil-exporting States. Despite this, South Africa continues to receive supplies of oil from the outside world through frequent and regrettable violations of the embargo.

20. It has been noted that many States have not introduced legislation or comparable measures to enforce the oil embargo. In some cases, even declared policies have not been fully observed.

21. Technical measures such as "end user" certification and other restrictive destination clauses in oil contracts would, if scrupulously implemented, assist in halting the flow of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. However, these clauses are in many cases either not implemented, neglected or subjected to cheating and falsification. Furthermore, legal action against companies and individuals involved in violating the oil embargo is rarely undertaken and penalties are not frequently imposed.

22. The Intergovernmental Group considers the co-operation of oil exporting and shipping States essential for its work and will continue to urge them to provide information on the issues relating to the oil embargo against South Africa and to respond to the Group's questionnaires and inquiries regarding reported cases of violations. In view of the above, the Group considers it important that the same questionnaire be sent again to those States which have not replied with a view to soliciting their replies for consideration by the Group at its 1988 session. In addition, Governments that have not yet taken legislative or comparable measures to impose an embargo against the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa are invited to do so. Furthermore, the need for exchange of information between States on the embargo and for assisting the Group in its task must be stressed.

23. The Intergovernmental Group will continue its efforts to seek close co-operation with regional organizations and other intergovernmental organizations as well as non-governmental organizations in order to enhance support for the oil embargo against South Africa.

24. The Intergovernmental Group emphasizes that, in order to ensure effective monitoring of the oil embargo against South Africa, a mechanism should be established to gather and verify information on the movements of ships to and from South Africa. Such a mechanism will depend upon available resources within the Secretariat, the input of Governments, relevant offices and bodies within the United Nations system, regional organizations, the liberation movements of southern Africa, labour unions, other non-governmental organizations and others concerned, and will be co-ordinated by the Group.

Recommendations

25. The Intergovernmental Group recommends that the General Assembly should request the Security Council to consider invoking Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to impose a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

26. The Intergovernmental Group also recommends that the General Assembly, pending a decision from the Security Council, should request those Member States which have not yet done so:

(a) To adopt legislative or comparable measures to impose an embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa;

(b) To take effective measures to enforce the embargo including, inter alia, restricting the destination and "end user" clauses to prohibit the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa;

(c) To disseminate widely and exchange information on the oil embargo against South Africa and on the violations thereof;

(d) To ensure that effective penalties are imposed on the violators of the embargo;

(e) To extend co-operation to the Group and other organizations involved in the monitoring of the oil embargo.

27. The Intergovernmental Group, aware of the complexity of the issue, intends to intensify its efforts in carrying out its mandate. It will continue to contact Governments and various organizations to ensure a more effective flow of information and co-operation in matters regarding investigation of violations of the embargo. In this respect, the Group recommends that appropriate resources be made available to enable it to carry out its task. The Group furthermore recommends that its mandate be renewed.

ANNEX I

Questionnaire addressed to all Member States and non-member States
regarding the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to
South Africa and Namibia

1. What are the measures, including legislative, technical and administrative, taken by your Government to prevent oil and shipping companies, whether national of your State or foreign, operating in your country from supplying and/or shipping oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia in implementation of relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and in particular paragraph 4 of resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"4. Requests all States concerned, pending a decision by the Security Council, to adopt effective measures and/or legislation to broaden their scope of the oil embargo in order to ensure the complete cessation of the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly, in particular:

"(a) To apply strictly the 'end users' clause and other conditions concerning restriction on destination to ensure compliance with the embargo;

"(b) To compel the companies originally selling or purchasing oil or petroleum products, as appropriate for each nation, to desist from selling, reselling or otherwise transferring oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly;

"(c) To establish strict control over the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia by intermediaries, oil companies and traders by placing responsibility for the fulfilment of the contract on the first buyer or seller of oil and petroleum products who would, therefore, be liable for the actions of these parties;

"(d) To prevent access by South Africa to other sources of energy, including the supply of raw materials, technical know-how, financial assistance and transport;

"(e) To prohibit all assistance to apartheid South Africa, including the provision of finance, technology, equipment or personnel for the prospecting, development or production of hydrocarbon resources, the construction or operation of oil-from-coal plants or the development and operation of plants producing fuel substitutes and additives such as ethanol and methanol;

"(f) To prevent South African corporations from maintaining or expanding their holdings in oil companies or properties outside South Africa;

"(g) To terminate the transport of oil to South Africa by ships flying their flags, or by ships that are ultimately owned, managed or chartered by their nationals or by companies within their jurisdiction;

"(h) To develop a system for registration of ships, registered or owned by their nationals, that have unloaded oil in South Africa in contravention of embargoes imposed;

"(i) To impose penal action against companies and individuals that have been involved in violating the oil embargo;

"(j) To gather, exchange and disseminate information regarding violations of the oil embargo."

2. What arrangements exist to co-ordinate with other oil-exporting and oil-shipping States exchange of information and action to prevent the violations of the oil embargo?

3. Does your Government maintain a list of oil companies or tanker companies that have violated the contracts of sale or shipping by supplying or shipping oil and petroleum products to South Africa? (A copy of the list may be attached.)

4. What has been done to inform the oil and shipping industries, as well as governmental agencies, port authorities and oil workers, about the embargo or comparable policies against the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia?

5. Are there any additional suggestions for enforcing the oil embargo?

ANNEX II

Replies received from Governments

ALGERIA

[Original: French]

1. The denunciation and condemnation of the policy of apartheid and unflagging support for the just struggle of the South African people are basic elements of Algeria's foreign policy.
2. This position, which dates back to the time of the national liberation struggle, is in keeping both with the provisions of the Algerian National Charter and with the Constitution, which reject and condemn all forms of racial discrimination.
3. Chapter V, Part V of the National Charter in particular stresses Algeria's commitment to "fulfil its duty to eliminate the after-effects of colonial and racial domination in Africa".
4. In a similar vein, article 92 of the Constitution stipulates that:

"The struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination is basic to the revolution.

"Algeria's solidarity with all the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America in their fight for political and economic liberation, and their right to self-determination and independence, is an essential part of national policy."
5. In this connection, it is particularly significant that one of the first legislative measures enacted by Algeria after achieving independence was Act No. 64-167 of 8 June 1964, giving effect to the decisions of the Summit Conference of Independent African States and Madagascar held from 22 to 25 May 1963 at Addis Ababa, which adopted the Charter of African Unity and six resolutions, including one on decolonization, paragraph 9 of which asks for an effective boycott of the foreign trade of Portugal and South Africa.
6. With the achievement of independence by the former Portuguese colonies and the normalization of relations between the latter and Portugal, the provisions of that law no longer apply to that country, but they do remain fully relevant for South Africa and have subsequently been strengthened by many measures governing, in particular, the relations between Algeria and its various trading partners as well as their possible intermediaries.
7. The text of the Act of 8 June 1964, which clearly sets forth Algeria's position, is as follows:

"Act No. 64-167 of 8 June 1964 prohibiting all trade relations
with Portugal and South Africa"

"EXPLANATORY STATEMENT"

"The Summit Conference of Independent African States and Madagascar, held from 22 to 25 May 1963 at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, adopted the Charter of African Unity and six resolutions on decolonization, apartheid and racial discrimination, Africa and the United Nations, general disarmament, economic problems and the CCTA (Commission on Technical Co-operation in Africa).

"The National Constituent Assembly ratified the Charter in Act No. 63-221 of 28 June 1963.

"Algeria is implementing the resolutions through specific measures adopted to achieve the Charter's aims.

"The resolution concerning decolonization, in paragraph 9, asks for an effective boycott of the foreign trade of Portugal and South Africa.

"The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria will do everything within its power to help the African peoples that are still not independent to achieve national sovereignty. It intends to implement the decisions taken at Addis Ababa fully and speedily.

"The purpose of this Act is strictly to prohibit any trade relations with Portugal and South Africa.

"Hence, independent Algeria, in addition to refusing to have any diplomatic relations with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa, will impose against those countries the economic sanctions decided on at Addis Ababa.

"This is the purpose of the present Act.

"The National Assembly has considered and adopted, and the President of the Republic hereby promulgates, an act having the following provisions:

"Article 1. The importation of any goods originating in or coming from Portugal and South Africa is prohibited.

"Article 2. The exportation of any goods to Portugal and South Africa or the re-exportation to those countries of goods for which duty has been suspended is prohibited.

"Article 3. The above prohibitions apply to all commercial transactions with Portugal and South Africa even if their origins pre-date the promulgation of this Act.

"Article 4. Any violations of the provisions of this Act shall be punished in accordance with the existing laws and regulations.

"This Act shall be enforced as a law of the State."

ARGENTINA

[Original: Spanish]

The Argentine Government wishes to announce that it carefully monitors compliance with the oil embargo against South Africa, using machinery associated with the purchase and sale of foreign exchange and the levying of import and export duty to prevent any violation of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F.

AUSTRALIA

[Original: English]

1. On 19 August 1985, the Minister for Foreign Affairs announced that the Government would prohibit exports to South Africa of petroleum and petroleum products; a copy of the press release announcing the decision is attached.
2. The Government's decision has been implemented through administration of the export control régime on petroleum and petroleum products under the Customs (Prohibited Exports) Regulations. Exporters of petroleum products are required to specify country of final destination in respect of all petroleum exports or provide a written declaration that the export is not destined for South Africa. A previous approval for Customs to clear individual shipments not exceeding \$A 2,000 in value does not apply if the destination is South Africa.
3. No formal arrangements are in place with other oil-exporting or oil-shipping States to exchange information and the Government does not independently maintain a list of oil companies or tanker companies who have supplied oil and petroleum products to South Africa.
4. The Government's decision to prohibit petroleum exports to South Africa was widely reported. In addition, individual petroleum exporters were advised of the decision by the Department of Trade and the Australian Customs Service was asked to instigate amended procedures to give effect to the Government's decision.

ATTACHMENT

Press release issued by the Government of Australia

Cabinet met again today to review the situation in South Africa. It did so in the light of the decisions reached on 12 August concerning measures to be taken by the Australian Government and the statement made by South Africa's President Botha on 15 August.

Ministers expressed their grave concern and extreme disappointment that President Botha's statement was so negative and unhelpful. It did not offer the majority of the South African people a commitment to clear and defined progress towards a genuinely multiracial society. It held out little hope that the state of emergency will be lifted in the near future. It gave no commitment for the release of Nelson Mandela and other political detainees who will be necessary participants in any negotiations with the South African Government on black rights. Indeed, it failed to provide a credible basis upon which any representative black leaders

could play an effective part in South Africa's political process. The statement missed the opportunity to create the atmosphere which could help lessen the present violence in South Africa.

Ministers were assisted in their discussions today by the Australian Ambassador to South Africa, Mr. Birch. They decided that Mr. Birch should return to South Africa in order that the Government should continue to have his advice on developments there, including steps the South African Government might take to implement its stated commitment to press ahead on a reform programme.

They noted that the South African President's statement was unlikely to bring about significant early reforms and that effective action in the form of mandatory and comprehensive economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council are unlikely to be achieved in the near future. Consequently, Ministers decided to confirm the measures that were previously agreed at their 12 August meeting.

Accordingly, the Government has decided that, while continuing to work closely with other Governments in the United Nations and Commonwealth contexts for positive action to foster peaceful change in South Africa, Australia will introduce a range of selective economic and other measures consistent with recent Security Council resolutions.

Ministers have decided that:

1. The Minister for Foreign Affairs develop a strategy to seek positive action in the United Nations context for effective sanctions against South Africa for presentation by the Prime Minister at the forthcoming Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Nassau, including proposals for consideration at the Meeting (and, if appropriate, the United Nations General Assembly) for:
 - the appointment of a group of international authorities to advance proposals for the peaceful transition of South Africa to a multiracial society based on universal adult suffrage; and,
 - the appointment of an international expert group to study how the suspension of new investment in South Africa might be implemented and co-ordinated;
2. Australia, conscious of the inadequacy of unilateral sanctions, reaffirms its preparedness to work at the United Nations for the imposition of effective, mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa;
3. Australia's current policies on sporting contacts and civil aviation policies be maintained;
4. Australia maintain its diplomatic representation in South Africa at current levels but close the Trade Commission in Johannesburg from the end of September 1985;
5. Normal trade relations with South Africa be maintained but avoiding official government assistance and that the Government also;

- prohibit exports to South Africa of petroleum and petroleum products, computer hardware equipment and any other products known to be of use to the South African security forces, and
 - prohibit the import from South Africa of Krugerrands and all other coins minted in South Africa and all arms, ammunition and military vehicles;
6. All new investment in South Africa by the Australian Government and public authorities be suspended, except for that which is necessary to maintain Australian diplomatic and consular representation in South Africa;
 7. All Australian banks and other financial institutions be asked to suspend making new loans, either directly or indirectly, to borrowers in South Africa; and
 8. Direct investment in Australia by the South African Government or its agencies be prohibited.

In addition, and as a corollary to an earlier Government decision to deny Government construction contracts to majority-owned South African firms operating in Australia, Ministers have decided:

- to place an embargo on all new Government contractual dealings with majority-owned South African firms for contracts above \$20,000; to terminate all export facilities available through EFIC*, EMDGS**, and AOPC*** and certain industry assistance to such firms; to avoid Government procurement of supplies from South African sources, save that necessary for the maintenance of Australian diplomatic and consular representation in southern Africa and to restrict Government sales of goods and services to South Africa. South African Government agencies are included in this embargo.

Furthermore, Ministers have decided that the way be prepared, through amendments to be proposed to relevant legislation, for the facilities available through EFIC, EMDGS and AOPC, and tourism assistance under TOPS**** to be withdrawn in respect of South Africa at short notice in the light of the Government's assessment of developments in South Africa and international responses to these developments.

These measures should be viewed in the context of actions taken earlier against South Africa in such areas as civil aviation, sporting contacts, business conduct and positive programmes to help disadvantaged black South Africans. They show the Government's complete and unambiguous rejection of apartheid and its intention to demonstrate its rejection in as effective a way as possible.

* EFIC (Export Finance Insurance Corporation).

** EMDGS (Export Market Development Grant Scheme).

*** AOPC (Australian Overseas Projects Corporation).

**** TOPS (Tourism Overseas Promotion Scheme).

Ministers emphasized that, in implementing these further economic and other measures, the Government wished to contribute to international pressure to accelerate a process of reform and peaceful change in South Africa. Ministers saw the Government's actions as part of a graduated step-by-step process, with the pace and nature of any further Australian Government action being conditioned by the South African Government's own response to the political aspirations of its black community.

Australia wished to avoid a further deterioration in the situation in South Africa and believed that the establishment of a multiracial society based on universal suffrage should be the goal of Australian policy.

AUSTRIA

[Original: English]

Austria is neither an oil-exporting nor oil-shipping country. Therefore, no legislative measures are being envisaged to maintain the already existing compliance with General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986.

BAHRAIN

[Original: English]

The Government of the State of Bahrain does not supply crude oil. Furthermore, the contracts of the Bahrain National Oil Company include a clause forbidding the transfer of petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.

BARBADOS

[Original: English]

1. By the Imports (Restriction) Act 1939 and the Importation and Exportation of Goods (Union of South Africa) (Prohibition) Order 1960, Barbados imposed a total ban on trading with South Africa. Trading relations were severed with effect from 1 September 1960.
2. All government agencies have been apprised of the embargo and appropriate port and security authorities are charged with the responsibility of monitoring all trade flows from or through Barbados, to ensure that neither oil nor any other cargo destined for South Africa originates in or transits through the island.

BELGIUM

[Original: French]

The Government of Belgium is applying the decision taken on 10 September 1985 by the Governments of the 12 States members of the European Economic Community to impose a strict embargo on exports of crude oil to South Africa.

[Original: Spanish]

1. The Government of Bolivia has neither supplied nor shipped, directly or indirectly, any oil or petroleum derivatives to South Africa or Namibia.
2. Bolivia possesses no ships or public or private enterprises that might have rendered such services to the South African régime.

BRAZIL

[Original: English]

Decree signed on 9 August 1985 by the President of Brazil

The President of the Republic, using the powers conferred upon him by article 81, item III, of the constitution, and

Considering that the apartheid régime is in flagrant contravention of the principles of democracy and racial harmony existing in Brazil and thus merits the just repulsion of the most varied sectors of Brazilian society,

Considering that the policy of apartheid assaults the conscience and dignity of humanity, is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Having in mind resolution 418 (1977) of the Security Council of the United Nations, which imposed a mandatory embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa,

Considering also all other pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly as well as of the Security Council of the United Nations, particularly resolutions 473 (1980), 558 (1984), 566 (1985) and 569 (1985) of the Security Council, which urge Member States to impose voluntary sanctions against South Africa by reason of the policy of apartheid of the Government of that country,

Recalling that Brazil has been scrupulously abiding by the prohibition of arms sale to South Africa,

Recalling also that Brazil has been following a policy of curbing all contacts with South Africa in the fields of sports, culture and art, as recommended by the United Nations,

Taking into account the deterioration of the situation in South Africa and the violent repression unleashed by its Government against the legitimate claims of the black South African population, which has incurred the severe condemnation of national and international public opinion,

Considering therefore the advisability of consolidating in a single legal instrument the political decisions and administrative measures taken by the Brazilian Government with regard to the application of mandatory or voluntary sanctions against South Africa,

DECREES

Article 1. Any activities involving cultural, artistic or sportive exchange with South Africa are prohibited.

Article 2. The export of petroleum and its by-products to South Africa and to the illegally occupied territory of Namibia is prohibited.

Article 3. It is prohibited to supply South Africa with arms and related matériel of any kind, including sales or transfers of arms and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary police equipment, as well as spare parts for any of the above products.

Article 4. Likewise prohibited is supplying South Africa with equipment, material, licences and patents for the manufacture and maintenance of the products cited in paragraph 3 of this Decree.

Article 5. The shipment and transshipment, under any grounds or conditions whatsoever, of such equipment or materials as cited in articles 3 and 4 of this Decree, if bound for South Africa or the territory of illegally occupied Namibia, are hereby prohibited throughout the national territory, including air space and territorial sea.

Sole paragraph. Any violation of the terms of this article shall result in the apprehension and confiscation of the goods in question.

Article 6. The Ministries and other competent Public Administration departments shall take the necessary measures to guarantee the implementation of the terms of this Decree.

Article 7. Any and all provisions to the contrary are hereby revoked.

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

[Original: Russian]

1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a firm and consistent supporter of the complete and final eradication of the vestiges of colonialism and racism, strongly condemns the policy of apartheid pursued by the régime of South Africa, which policy is a crime against humanity incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the principles of international law, and constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

2. The Byelorussian SSR, which unswervingly advocates the eradication of the shameful system of apartheid, complies with all United Nations decisions designed to accomplish this goal. It entirely supports the demand by the African and other States that the Security Council should introduce comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, including an embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. At the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the Byelorussian SSR co-sponsored resolution 41/35 F on the oil embargo against South Africa.

3. Pursuant to the relevant decisions of the United Nations, including the aforesaid General Assembly resolution, the Byelorussian SSR has never maintained any relations with South Africa and does not now, be they political, economic, military or in any other area; likewise, it has no contractual or licensing arrangements with the Pretoria racist régime.

4. The competent organizations and governmental bodies of the Byelorussian SSR strictly monitor compliance in day-to-day activities with the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly whose purpose is to isolate the apartheid régime of South Africa.

CANADA

[Original: English]

1. In September 1985, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada announced several measures respecting trade and commercial relations with South Africa to express the opposition of Canadians to the policies of racial discrimination practised by the Government of South Africa.

2. Included among these was the application by the Government of Canada of a voluntary ban on the sale of crude oil and refined oil products to South Africa. To this end, Canadian companies were asked not to enter into any contracts for the sale and export of these goods to South Africa. Canada's petroleum exports to South Africa were not significant but the Government's intention was to indicate that Canada was not willing to become an alternative source of petroleum for South Africa in the face of widespread international efforts to apply an oil embargo.

3. The Canadian Government remains fully committed to halting the export of Canadian crude oil and refined oil products to South Africa.

CHILE

[Original: Spanish]

Since Chile does not export oil or petroleum products, there is no need to adopt legislation to ensure the implementation of the oil embargo against South Africa imposed by the General Assembly at its forty-first session. Likewise, for the same reason, there are no arrangements in this regard with oil-exporting countries.

CHINA

[Original: Chinese]

The Government of the People's Republic of China has all along resolutely opposed and strongly condemned the policies of racial discrimination and apartheid pursued by the South African authorities, and firmly supported the South African people in their just struggle against the racist rule and for fundamental human rights and racial equality. Strictly abiding by and implementing the United Nations resolutions and decisions on South Africa, the Chinese Government has

always refused to enter into contacts of any kind with South Africa, be they political, economic, military, cultural or in sport activities. Proceeding from the above-mentioned principled stand of the Chinese Government, the Chinese oil and shipping departments never supply and/or ship oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.

CUBA

[Original: Spanish]

1. Cuba is paying great attention to the delicate and important task and the efforts being made by the United Nations with a view to the effective application of the measures taken in various United Nations bodies to end the many horrors and misfortunes which the majority black population of South Africa and the whole of southern Africa are suffering because of the Pretoria racist régime.
2. To that end, the Government of Cuba firmly supports the embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa imposed by the General Assembly and is at present participating in the Intergovernmental Group set up for that purpose.
3. Cuba has broken all links and ties with the racist Government of South Africa and maintains the firm and clear position of condemning both that régime, for its continuing violation of international law and the most elementary principles of humanity, and those other Governments which, despite repeated calls from the international community for relations and ties with South Africa to be suspended, do maintain such relations, obstructing the noble endeavour to put an end to the racist Government's excesses. For that reason, Cuba regards the work of the Group to be of enormous importance and believes the Group should redouble its efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the embargo, which is a measure of great importance within the totality of moves against the abolition of apartheid.
4. The Government of Cuba takes this opportunity to reiterate its position and attitude towards the South African racist régime. In the matter of oil and petroleum products, there is no need to take specific measures, given the total absence of ties or reactions to the South African régime and the strict general measures which Cuba applies in that regard.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Original: English]

The Government of Czechoslovakia resolutely condemns the racist policy of the Government of South Africa. As long ago as 1963, it interrupted its diplomatic, economic, cultural, sports and any other contacts with the régime of South Africa. It has been continuously and consequently pursuing a policy of boycott of South Africa in accordance with the respective General Assembly resolutions. It fully endorses the requirements for adoption by all States of effective measures designed to broaden the scope of the oil embargo as contained in Assembly resolution 41/35 F. Czechoslovakia is neither an exporter nor supplier of oil and no oil company has its seat in Czechoslovak territory. Therefore, the activity of Czechoslovakia in the question of the oil embargo against South Africa focuses on pushing ahead this measure in the framework of bilateral relations and in multilateral forums.

[Original: English]

1. According to Act No. 289 of 4 June 1986, trade in goods and services between Denmark, on the one hand, and the Republic of South Africa and Namibia, on the other hand, is forbidden. The act became effective on 15 December 1986.
2. The ban on trade applies to transport of mineral oil and mineral oil products on Danish vessels to and from South Africa and Namibia.
3. In Denmark's view, an oil boycott must be respected by producers and transporters alike to be effective. Accordingly, Denmark and the other Nordic countries have agreed to undertake consultations with other shipping countries in order to reach agreement on a joint boycott of oil transports to South Africa.
4. In case Danish companies violate Act No. 289, they will be prosecuted in accordance with the said act as well as normal Danish legal procedures, which includes rules on publicity of legal proceedings.
5. Act No. 289 is - like all Danish acts - published in the Danish legal gazette.

EGYPT

[Original: English]

1. Egypt was among the first countries to enact laws prohibiting any contacts between Egypt and South Africa in diplomatic, economic, cultural and any other fields in view of the policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa.
2. As a consequence of these laws, the Egyptian authorities have been taking all the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of a strict oil embargo against South Africa.
3. All the contracts between the Egyptian General Petroleum Corporation, the sole exporter of Egyptian oil, and any foreign buyer contains the following clause: "in accordance with the seller's request the buyer declares and assumes the full responsibility that no goods under this contract will be sold or transported to any country to which the laws of Egypt prohibit shipment (mainly South Africa)".
4. The Egyptian authorities are not aware of any breaches of this clause by any of its buyers and therefore no Egyptian petroleum is being exported to South Africa or Namibia.

ETHIOPIA

[Original: English]

1. The position of the Government of Ethiopia on the question of apartheid and the policies of the racist régime is quite clear and uncompromising. On several occasions before and recently in one of its periodic reports, as a State party to the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of

Apartheid, Ethiopia has indicated that already existing legislative measures have not necessitated the need for new ones.

2. Ethiopia has no link whatsoever with the racist régime of Pretoria, nor does it permit ships flying the South African flag, or those flying other flags but bound for South Africa, to enter its territory. This also applies for airlines. Individuals carrying South African passports cannot enter Ethiopia. Goods processed or manufactured in South Africa cannot be imported, nor does Ethiopia export anything to South Africa, directly or indirectly. Ethiopian banks are also prohibited from undertaking any transactions directly or indirectly with banks in South Africa.

3. This traditional anti-apartheid and anti-racism position of the people and Government of Ethiopia is further strengthened by the new constitution of the country, which in Article 28 (3) states:

"The People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia staunchly struggles against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and other forms of oppression and exploitation."

4. As the supreme law of the land, the effect the new constitution may have on existing laws pertaining to apartheid and racism is obviously predictable. The foreign policy of the Workers Party of Ethiopia, as stated in the Party's Programme, which was adopted in September 1984, further reinforces this, not only by prohibiting all forms of contact with the apartheid régime, but also underlining the determination of Ethiopia to struggle against it both individually and in league with all peace-loving forces.

FINLAND

{Original: English}

1. In January 1986, the Finnish Parliament passed a law restricting the export and import of goods and commodities to and from South Africa and Namibia. The law prohibits the granting of loans and furnishing of securities to South Africa, as well as the trade of patents and licences. The law also forbids new Finnish investments in South Africa in accordance with the recommendation of the Security Council given in 1985.

2. A new law passed by the Parliament in June 1987 supplements the law of January 1986 by imposing a ban on all commercial and similar contacts with South Africa and Namibia. Commercial transactions can only be executed under specific authorization of the Council of State.

3. These legislative provisions apply equally to the oil and shipping industries. Since the cessation of trade with South Africa has been for the last year almost complete, and trade of major amounts of oil has never been conducted between Finland and South Africa, an oil embargo has in fact been established.

[Original: French]

1. The German Democratic Republic has on several occasions expressed its categorical repudiation of the crimes committed by the racist régime of South Africa, its policy of apartheid, destabilization and aggression against sovereign States of the region, and its policy of continued illegal occupation of Namibia. This policy constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The German Democratic Republic therefore supports the call to the Security Council to apply comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to bringing about the elimination of the racist régime and promoting the peaceful development of sovereign States of the region. However, as a result of the obstructionism of certain Western members, the Security Council has not yet been able to take appropriate measures against South Africa. This is encouraging the racists to escalate their policy of both internal and external State terrorism.

2. Given this situation, partial sanctions can contribute to the international isolation of the apartheid régime. It is for that reason that the German Democratic Republic endorses the voluntary oil embargo against South Africa decided upon by the General Assembly and the Assembly's decision at its forty-first session to establish an Intergovernmental Group to monitor compliance with the embargo. As a member of that Group, the German Democratic Republic will help to ensure the maximum effectiveness of the oil embargo.

3. The German Democratic Republic reaffirms that it maintains no relations whatsoever with South Africa. The Minister for Foreign Trade has declared a general ban on all trade with South Africa, which applies both to direct trade relations with partners in South Africa and to commercial dealings with South Africa through partners in third countries. The ban on trade with South Africa precludes the export and import of any goods or services. It therefore also applies to the export, import and shipping of oil and petroleum products.

4. Compliance with the trade embargo against South Africa is monitored by the Ministry of Foreign Trade. Under its statute of 9 August 1973, published in the Official Gazette of the German Democratic Republic (part I, No. 41, p. 420), the Ministry of Foreign Trade, which administers the State of monopoly of foreign trade is mandated and duty-bound to give appropriate instructions to all the bodies and enterprises engaged in foreign trade, and to monitor their implementation.

GREECE

[Original: English]

1. Greece has unequivocally and in the strongest possible terms condemned the inhuman system of apartheid, has actively participated in the international mobilization for its elimination and has always kept its relations with South Africa at a minimum. A more extensive account of Greece's position vis-à-vis apartheid can be found in the reply to the letter of the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid (see A/41/506/Add.1).

2. Greece, in particular, abides by the oil embargo imposed on South Africa and does not export oil to this country. Moreover, a decree prohibiting such exports was issued on 13 February 1986 by the Ministry of Commerce in conformity with the restrictive measures agreed upon at the 58th EEC ministerial meeting held at Luxembourg on 10 September 1985.

HOLY SEE

[Original: English]

The Holy See does not entertain commercial relations of any kind with the Republic of South Africa or with Namibia.

INDONESIA

[Original: English]

1. The Indonesian Government prohibits the export or shipment of Indonesian crude oil and other petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia. The prohibition is contained in the export permit for crude oil and other petroleum products issued by the Government. In addition, all sales agreements with existing and potential buyers include a similar restriction.

2. Technically, safeguards are also provided by another procedure which requires buyers to submit a declaration one week prior to loading, stating therein the port of destination or unloading. This serves as a further strict restriction on any possible violation of the embargo. Further, sanctions have been and will be imposed on companies or those parties selling Indonesian crude oil and other petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.

3. In 1981, the Department of Mines and Energy of the Republic of Indonesia circulated instructions to the Indonesian State Owned Oil Company and all production-sharing contractors and their affiliates forbidding them to deal directly or indirectly with and/or through Galaxi Oil Limited, Bermuda and Stardust and Company International Limited, Monaco. These companies were found to have engaged in dealing Indonesian crude oil to South Africa.

4. In the same year, the Government of Indonesia circulated the name of a company and an oil broker suspected of shipping oil to South Africa. The name was sent to all oil companies operating in Indonesia. This action was taken after the company had refused to state where the tanker, Cherry Vesta, discharged its cargo of oil, and thus had all of its business terminated by the Indonesian Government.

5. Steps have also been taken to co-ordinate such efforts with other oil-exporting countries in order to prevent any possible violation of the oil embargo. The co-ordination is being conducted by the Department of Mines and Energy.

6. According to our records, so far no production-sharing contractors who produce and export their Indonesian crude oil entitlement nor the existing buyers have violated the government restriction on supplying or shipping oil and other petroleum products to South Africa. Indonesia applies the Free on Board or F.O.B.

system and thereby has limited access. However, throughout the sales procedure, Indonesia has always emphasized the importance of the restriction on transferring oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.

7. Instructions have been widely disseminated to all the parties concerned, such as production-sharing contractors, as well as to all the loading ports and relevant government agencies, which directly or indirectly are involved in the export of Indonesian crude oil or other petroleum products.

8. To a large extent, General Assembly resolution 41/35 F and the related resolutions provide a strong framework for international action to strengthen the oil embargo against South Africa. Ultimately, the effective application of the resolutions depends largely on concerted action by all the parties concerned, including shipping companies, which may divert oil shipments at some point along the line to South Africa and Namibia.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

[Original: English]

One of the standard conditions for the sale of oil by the Islamic Republic of Iran to purchasing companies is the undertaking not to deliver it to prohibited destinations, including South Africa. In order to monitor the effective implementation of this clause of the contract, the discharge certificates of sold cargo are obtained and closely investigated. Of course, in the light of the current policies of the National Iranian Oil Company with a view to effecting an increase in sales to the ultimate consumers of crude oil, who possess refineries, the monitoring of the destination of the cargo has become easier and more effective than in the past. Naturally, those companies which, in contravention of the said prohibition and the text of the contract, deliver Iranian oil to South Africa will be immediately placed on the black list of the National Iranian Oil Company. In conclusion, the requirements of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986 have been complied with in their entirety.

IRELAND

[Original: English]

1. Ireland is not an oil-producing or exporting country. However, a limited trade, for technical reasons, is carried on in the case of certain fuel and lubricating oils. This trade is closely monitored by Ireland's Department of Energy and there are no such exports to South Africa. The Government is determined to use its licensing powers to maintain this situation. These powers derive from the Fuels (Control of Supplies) Act 1971 and 1982 and the Petroleum Oils (Regulation or Control of Acquisition, Supply, Distribution or Marketing) (Continuance) Order 1986.

2. Ireland, together with its partners in the 12 member States of the European Community has, since September 1985, been committed to a ban on oil exports to South Africa.

3. There are no official scientific or technological relations between Ireland and South Africa and such private relations are discouraged. Ireland does not encourage emigration to South Africa and it is its policy to discourage Irish citizens from visiting there. The Government is not aware of any significant direct Irish investment of any sort in South Africa. All new investment is prohibited in accordance with the European Economic Community decision of September 1986.

ISRAEL

[Original: English]

Israel is not an oil-producing country, and does not supply or ship oil to the Republic of South Africa.

ITALY

[Original: English]

1. As a member State of the European Community, Italy fully adheres to the restrictive measures on oil trade with South Africa decided by the Community.
2. Oil exports from Italy are subject to an authorization by an ad hoc committee, the "Comitato Petroli". This committee denies authorization whenever the destination of exports is South Africa and expressly excludes South Africa when the destination is indicated as "third countries".
3. Italian exports to South Africa have declined by 29 per cent over the past five years and do not include sensitive products. Italy does not provide South Africa with financial or technological assistance that could contribute to strengthening the South African capability in the field of energy production.
4. All cases in which Italian ships have been charged with being involved in oil trade with South Africa have been duly investigated and all the charges have been cleared.
5. Oil imports to Italy are free and the re-export from third countries is not subject to control because, under Italian legislation, oil is not considered a strategic product.

JAMAICA

[Original: English]

1. Question 1 of the questionnaire: The Government of Jamaica wishes to reiterate its policy, in effect since 1959, of forbidding any contract whatsoever with South Africa. The Government is in the process of enacting legislation to give effect to the provisions of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, so that violators may be effectively dealt with.

2. Question 2: This is not relevant since Jamaica is not an oil-exporting or oil-shipping State.

3. Question 3: The Government does not maintain a list of oil companies or tanker companies which have violated the oil embargo, but does seek to ensure that those companies with which it deals are not in violation of the embargo.

4. Question 4: The Jamaican Government has kept the public and private sector agencies, as well as the general public, informed of the Government's policy towards South Africa. There is close monitoring to ensure compliance with this policy.

5. Question 5: Jamaica has no further suggestions at this time for enforcing the oil embargo.

KUWAIT

[Original: English]

1. Kuwait has a national policy against apartheid, of which a total embargo against South Africa is a component part. This policy is regulated by legislative decrees, ministerial decisions and administrative directives.

2. Kuwait supported international efforts, with no exception, calling for the adoption and implementation of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

3. Kuwaiti legislation enacted in 1963 prohibits Kuwaiti vessels from calling on South African ports and closes all Kuwaiti ports to vessels of South African registration. Kuwaiti legislation enacted in 1965 prohibits the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

4. Oil sales are regulated by contracts between the Kuwait Petroleum Corporation and the buyer. A model contract includes destination restrictions and end-user clauses. One of the clauses in a model contract is attached to this letter.

5. Kuwait refrains from dealing with companies known for slackness in their commitment to honour the final destination stipulation agreed to in a contract.

6. Kuwait transports most of its oil and petroleum products on vessels of the Kuwait Petroleum Corporation. Should a vessel be leased from another company, its records are checked and a clause is included in the lease contract prohibiting calls to embargoed ports. All shipping contracts include restrictive clauses.

7. Kuwait terminates contracts when restrictive clauses are violated by the contracting parties.

8. Kuwait attends the periodic meetings of the oil companies of the Co-operation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf Countries. At these meetings, information is exchanged and violators of contracts with Council members are identified.

9. Kuwait has informed its customers that violation of the embargo against South Africa and Namibia shall lead to a boycott of the concerned customer by Kuwait.

ATTACHMENT

Clause - The crude sold and purchased not for resale
or other trading purposes

(a) The Buyers hereby undertake not to dispose of any quantity of the crude sold and purchased hereunder, through resale, or exchange or barter arrangements, or otherwise, except to their own affiliates and that neither they themselves nor any of their affiliates to which any quantity of the said crude is disposed of would utilize such crude except for use by a refinery or other industry in which they themselves or an affiliate/s of theirs have a majority interest and not for trading purposes in any form whatsoever. The Buyers also undertake to provide the Sellers with all evidence reasonably required to satisfy the Sellers of the Buyers' adherence to this condition in respect of every bill of lading issued hereunder, including telex advice of customs clearance from the customs authority at the port of discharge, to be followed by despatch to the Sellers by airmail of a photocopy of the clearance document obtained from the customs authority, as well as an acknowledgement by refinery to which the quantity covered by the bill of lading is destined that it has received the said quantity for use exclusively within its own industrial structure.

(b) The Buyers shall formally advise the Sellers, for their prior approval, of the port/s of discharge of each vessel at least 30 days before the arrival of the vessel at Mina Al Ahmadi for loading.

(c) For the purpose of this Clause, a company shall be deemed an affiliate of the Buyers if a majority of its issued voting share capital is beneficially owned by the Buyers, directly or indirectly.

A company shall be deemed indirectly owned by the Buyers when a series of companies can be specified, commencing with the Buyers and ending with the particular company, so related that each company of the series, except the Buyers, is owned as to the majority of its issued voting share capital by one or more companies earlier in the series.

(d) Violation by the Buyers of the provisions of this Clause shall be deemed a serious breach of the Contract entitling the Sellers to its cancellation.

MALAYSIA

[Original: English]

Malaysian laws and regulations bar any sale or shipment of Malaysian oil and petroleum products to South Africa. PETRONAS, the Malaysian National Petroleum Company, in accordance with Malaysian laws and regulations, imposes destination restriction clauses in its contracts with third parties in particular reference to South Africa. In fact, Malaysia has no trade relations with South Africa.

[Original: English]

By the decision of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the 12 member States of the European Community of 10 September 1985, the Twelve agreed to take a series of restrictive measures against the Republic of South Africa. One of those measures refers to the cessation of crude oil exports to that country. The Netherlands, of course, strictly complies with the provisions of that Decision.

NEW ZEALAND

[Original: English]

1. Question 1 of the questionnaire: New Zealand is an oil-importing country. From time to time, there is an excess of refined product from the Marsden Point refinery, which is usually sent to Australia. Last year, some crude was exported while the refinery was closed. Small quantities of product manufactured from natural gas have also been exported. (Statistics for 1986 attached.)

(a) Though sales are for the most part to established markets, destinations clauses prohibiting sales to South Africa and Namibia are written into export contracts.

(b) and (c) The Government has instructed the oil companies not to trade with South Africa and has received assurances from them that they will comply.

(d) and (e) New Zealand does not co-operate with or assist South Africa in any of these areas.

(f) No South African corporations have holdings in any New Zealand oil companies.

(g) and (h) No ship under the New Zealand flag or owned by a New Zealand company is involved in transporting oil to South Africa. A registration system is therefore not called for.

2. Question 2: None.

3. Question 3: The information available to the New Zealand Government on oil dealings with South Africa is limited to that available from public sources (e.g., Shipping Research Bureau reports).

4. Question 4: The Ministry of Energy has informed the companies concerned of the Government's policies (see 1 (b) and (c) above). The policy has also been the subject of public announcements.

New Zealand exports of oil and petroleum products, 1986

(in New Zealand dollars)

333 Crude oil and synthetic petrol

Australia	67 128 398
Singapore	51 981 602

334 Processed oil

American Samoa	31 465
Australia	49 696
Chile	81
Cook Islands	69 196
Fiji	985 253
Hong Kong	144 983
India	1 041
Japan	19 209
New Caledonia	2 430
Niue	16 898
Nauru	1 798
Pitcairn Island	710
Papua New Guinea	39 507
Singapore	45 753
Solomon Islands	9 784
United States	2 234
Vanuatu	109 373
Western Samoa	13 507

335 Other processed oil products

	18 296
	115 758
	-
	47 279
	110 331
	-
	-
	-
	-
	18 000
	-
	-
	99 236
	-
	40 753
	-
	31 177
	88 166

NICARAGUA

(Original: Spanish)

1. The Government of Nicaragua faithfully supports the measures recommended by the General Assembly and the resolutions of the Security Council aimed at eradicating the ignominious apartheid régime in South Africa. In this context, Nicaragua supports Assembly resolution 41/35 F concerning measures and/or legislation to broaden the scope of the oil embargo in order to ensure the complete cessation of the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly.

2. With regard to the questionnaire presented by the Chairman of the Group, it is not really applicable in the case of Nicaragua, since Nicaragua does not maintain any form of either diplomatic or commercial relations with the Pretoria régime. Nicaragua is not an oil-exporting country: it does not export petroleum products and it has no sea route close to South Africa that might enable it to take direct measures to promote the embargo.

3. The Government of Nicaragua strictly applies the "end users" clause for each and every product exported by Nicaragua, thus ensuring that none of its products reach South Africa, directly or indirectly.
4. In accordance with its commitment to the struggle to eradicate apartheid, the Government of Nicaragua has issued instructions with a view to preventing South African corporations from investing or maintaining holdings in Nicaraguan companies.
5. Nicaragua maintains as up-to-date a list as possible of oil companies and tanker companies that have violated sales or shipping contracts by supplying or shipping oil or petroleum products to South Africa. This list has been distributed to the appropriate authorities.
6. Nicaragua encourages and promotes effective support for measures to put an end to the illegal régime of South Africa and, in that connection, urges other countries to take action with respect to the oil embargo, including the measures listed in General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of 10 November 1986.
7. The Government of Nicaragua has faithfully transmitted the contents of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, and especially those of paragraph 4, to the Nicaraguan authorities, particularly to those with responsibility for ports, in order that they might remain vigilant and so ensure compliance with the oil embargo against South Africa.

NIGERIA

[Original: English]

1. There is a provision in the Crude Oil Sales and Purchase Contract (General Conditions: paragraph 21 - Prohibited Destinations) that forbids that Nigerian crude oil be exported to South Africa.
2. Directives were issued to all producing companies to ensure that vessels that had nationals of South Africa on their crew or crew members who had visited South Africa should not be allowed to load oil from Nigeria.
3. Every customer is obliged (under the aforementioned Purchase Contract) to send the Discharge Certificate of all crude oil lifted from Nigerian National Petroleum Company (NNPC) Equity Crude Oil. By so doing, NNPC can ascertain that the crude oil was not discharged in any South African port or any other ports in prohibited countries as may be so declared by the Federal Government of Nigeria.
4. The Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria has continuously kept its public and private sector agencies, as well as the public at large, informed of its policies towards South Africa and monitors closely compliance with the extant regulations on the matter of the oil embargo and other apartheid-related sanctions.
5. At present no further suggestion for enforcing the oil embargo is being made. However, Nigeria will utilize the opportunity of its membership on the Intergovernmental Group of the oil embargo to make suggestions on this matter if the need arises.

Question 1, paragraphs (a) to (c)

1. Considering Norway's position as an oil-producing country, the Norwegian Government has felt a special commitment to prevent oil originating in Norway from being sold to South Africa. Already in 1979, an understanding was established between the Government and the companies exporting oil produced on the Norwegian continental shelf that crude oil should not be delivered to South Africa.
2. In order to strengthen Norwegian policy regarding oil exports to South Africa, a Parliamentary Act banning the sale, transfer etc. to South Africa and Namibia of petroleum originating in Norway was adopted on 16 June 1986. A seller who fails to ascertain that the buyer does not intend to resell the oil to South Africa or Namibia contravenes this Act and is liable to penalties as stated in the Act, that is, imprisonment up to three years, or fines, or both.

Question 1, paragraphs (d) and (e)

3. Since 1 January 1986, all exports of goods to South Africa have been subject to automatic licensing.
4. On 19 March 1987, an Act relating to an economic boycott of South Africa and Namibia in order to combat apartheid was adopted by Parliament. The Act entered into force on 20 March this year, and the provisions contained therein took effect from 20 July. The Act includes, inter alia, provisions prohibiting trade, extension of credits, performance of services in and transfer of patents and production rights to South Africa and Namibia (see attachment).

Question 1, paragraph (f)

5. There are no South African holdings in oil companies registered in Norway.

Question 1, paragraph (g)

6. According to the Boycott Act of 20 March 1987, it is prohibited to carry crude oil to or from South Africa or Namibia by a Norwegian ship. Such carriage is also prohibited for anyone domiciled or resident in Norway or any legal person registered in Norway who, by charter, proprietary shares or in any other way, manages or has at his disposal a ship under a foreign flag.
7. One year after the Act has entered into force, the King shall appraise the effects of the prohibition and may lay down other restrictions on such carriage as mentioned in the first paragraph.

Question 1, paragraphs (h) and (j)

8. In accordance with the Boycott Act of 20 March 1987, the Ministry of Commerce and Shipping will issue regulations concerning registration of tankers to which the Act is applicable. In this respect, regulations issued under the Boycott Act replaced a registration system for Norwegian-owned tankers established by the Norwegian Shipowners' Association in 1986.

9. It can also be mentioned that, since 1986, Norway has contributed to the funding of the Shipping Research Bureau.

Question 1, paragraph (i)

10. Anyone who wilfully contravenes or is wilfully accessory to the contravention of the Act of 16 June 1986 banning the sale, transfer etc. to South Africa and Namibia of petroleum originating in Norway or any provisions issued pursuant thereto, or the Act of 20 March 1987 relating to an Economic Boycott of South Africa and Namibia or any provisions issued pursuant thereto, is liable to a fine or a maximum term of three years' imprisonment or both.

11. Anyone who through negligence contravenes or is through negligence accessory to the contravention of these Acts or any provisions issued pursuant thereto is liable to a fine or a maximum term of six months' imprisonment or both.

Question 2

12. No formal arrangement exists. Norwegian authorities have, however, initiated bilateral discussions with several other oil-exporting countries in order to make the embargo more effective.

Question 3

13. There is no concrete evidence indicating that petroleum originating in Norway has been sold to South Africa or Namibia.

14. As to transport, the Government is committed to ending all carriage of crude oil to South Africa and Namibia by Norwegian companies.

Question 4

15. The Norwegian laws and regulations concerning this matter have been announced in all major national newspapers, and there have been extensive parliamentary and public debates on the issues involved. The Norwegian policy on oil deliveries to South Africa is thus well known.

ATTACHMENT

Act of the Government of Norway relating to an Economic Boycott
of South Africa and Namibia to combat apartheid

Paragraph 1

It is prohibited to import goods originating in South Africa or Namibia into Norway.

It is prohibited to export goods from Norway to South Africa or Namibia, or to enter into any agreement concerning the export of goods from Norway if, when entering into the agreement, it is contemplated or foreseeable that the destination of the goods is South Africa or Namibia.

For the purpose of this section, "goods" shall mean all kinds of goods and objects, including live animals.

The first and second paragraphs do not apply to medicines or equipment for medical purposes, news items, printed matter or electronic audio or visual recordings.

Paragraph 2

It is prohibited to carry crude oil to or from South Africa or Namibia by a Norwegian ship. Such carriage is also prohibited for anyone domiciled or resident in Norway or any legal person registered in Norway who, by charter, proprietary share or in any other way, manages or has at his disposal a ship under a foreign flag.

The prohibition set out in the first paragraph applies to any carriage that was contemplated or foreseeable when concluding the carriage agreement. One year after the Act has entered into force, the King shall appraise the effects of the prohibitions, and may lay down other restrictions on such carriage as mentioned in the first paragraph.

Paragraph 3

It is prohibited to carry passengers or goods to or from South Africa or Namibia by a Norwegian aircraft, or to carry passengers or goods to or from Norway by a South African or Namibian aircraft.

Paragraph 4

It is prohibited for anyone domiciled or resident in Norway or Norwegian companies, foundations and associations:

- (a) to perform services in South Africa or Namibia, or to perform services at the request of persons domiciled in South Africa or Namibia when the request is made by a public authority or is connected with any commercial activity,
- (b) to grant loans, credit or guarantees to, or enter into insurance contracts with, persons domiciled in South Africa or Namibia,
- (c) to make investments in, lease capital equipment to persons domiciled in, or invest in shares or other securities issued in South Africa or Namibia,
- (d) to transfer patent or production rights to persons domiciled in South Africa or Namibia, or
- (e) to organize and offer to the general public tours to South Africa or Namibia, or to act as an agent for such tours as are organized by others.

Persons shall mean both natural and legal persons.

Litra a of the first paragraph does not apply to the carriage of passengers or goods by ship.

Litra a and b of the first paragraph do not apply to payment or transactions connected with payments for activities that are not prohibited by this Act.

Paragraph 5

Sections 1-4 apply only to transactions that are part of any commercial activity.

Paragraph 6

The King may grant dispensations for a period not exceeding two years from any of the prohibitions of sections 1-4 if the prohibition would be detrimental to essential public interests, or if there is no reasonable proportion between the interest to be protected by the prohibition and the damage entailed by the prohibition. The King may also grant permission for agreements concluded prior to the entry into force of the Act to be fulfilled notwithstanding the provisions of this Act. Conditions may be stipulated for granting dispensations and permission according to this section.

Paragraph 7

Anyone who wilfully contravenes or is wilfully accessory to the contravention of this Act or any provisions issued pursuant thereto is liable to a fine or a maximum term of three years' imprisonment or both.

Anyone who through negligence contravenes or is through negligence accessory to the contravention of this Act or any provisions issued pursuant thereto is liable to a fine or a maximum term of six months' imprisonment or both.

Shipmasters, officers or crew are not liable to a penalty in terms of section 2 unless they have made or participated in making decisions concerning such carriage as mentioned in the said section. The provisions of section 3 shall be similarly applied to captains or crew of aircraft.

If the offence is committed by someone who has acted on behalf of a company, a foundation or an association, a fine may also be imposed on the company, foundation or association.

Section 12 a of the Penal Code is not applicable.

Paragraph 8

Objects which have been imported or exported, or the import or export of which has been attempted, in contravention of this Act or any provisions issued pursuant thereto, as well as any means of payment and securities employed in the contravention of said provisions, may be confiscated by court judgement irrespective of ownership and regardless of whether criminal proceedings have been

or could be instituted against any person. If such confiscation cannot be effected, an amount corresponding to the full or partial value of the said objects may be confiscated by court judgement from the offender or the party on whose behalf he has acted, regardless of whether criminal proceedings might have been or could be instituted against any person.

Confiscation in terms of this provision is not to be considered a penalty.

Paragraph 9

The Act applies subject to such restrictions as are recognized under international law or which derive from international agreements.

Paragraph 10

The King may issue regulations to supplement or implement this Act, including provisions concerning the duty to disclose information about commercial contact with South Africa or Namibia.

Paragraph 11

The Act enters into force immediately.

Sections 1-4 are not applicable to transactions which take place within four months of the entry into force of the Act.

PAKISTAN

[Original: English]

Pakistan is fully committed to the embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa, and the Government of Pakistan has ensured strict compliance, in letter and spirit, with General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, adopted on 10 November 1986, on the subject. It may be pertinent to draw attention, at this point, to the fact that Pakistan is neither an oil-exporting country nor does it participate in the international shipping of oil and petroleum products.

POLAND

[Original: English]

Concerning General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, adopted on 10 November 1986, on an oil embargo against South Africa and having in mind Security Council resolution 591 (1986) on the question of South Africa, the Polish Government strictly implements the above-mentioned resolutions. Poland maintains no trade relations with South Africa and it neither exports oil or oil products to that country nor permits the Polish flagged ships to transport such products to South Africa.

1. The State of Qatar is strictly following and implementing paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of November 1986 to the best of its knowledge and intentions. The measures taken to boycott South Africa and Namibia are strictly monitored by the Boycott Office of the Ministry of Economy and Trade. Legislative measures have long been introduced by the State to prohibit any shipment of oil, other hydrocarbon products or other goods to these countries and any violation of these prohibitions entails appropriate legal measures.

2. All oil and gas products in Qatar are marketed by the State-owned Qatar General Petroleum Corporation (QGPC) and foreign oil companies are not involved in the marketing of these products at all at present. QGPC insists on the "end users" condition by insisting on a discharge certificate which is a condition in all sales contracts. In the case of both contract and spot sales, discharge in South Africa is prohibited. The clauses relevant to this prohibition and the methods by which it is implemented are evident from the following clauses of Qatar's Standard Sales Contract:

"9.1: Not later than twenty-eight (28) days prior to each month BUYER shall provide SELLER with a lifting programme for that month containing the following information:

"...

"d: Destination of each cargo, both interim and final destination shall be specified if and when applicable.

"e: Detailed and specific instructions and informations needed by SELLER and/or SELLER's representatives to issue all documents required in connection with the shipments of crude oil.

"9.2: If the name of the nominated tanker is not known or finally determined at the time the nominations shall be given to SELLER, such name of tanker shall be given to SELLER as soon as possible thereafter, and shall in no instance be later than seven (7) days before the tanker's arrival in loading port.

"...

"10.6: The Qatar Crude Oil and Products derived therefrom shall not be resold or supplied directly or indirectly to Israel, South Africa, or any other country, territory or companies as may be defined from time to time by the Government of Qatar.

"The Crude Oil purchased under this Contract shall be discharged and used in _____ and shall not be resold to third party outside _____.

"10.7: SELLER's Terminal Superintendent in loading port shall provide the Masters of tankers nominated by BUYER with blank forms of SELLER's Discharge Certificate, same to be filled in by the Master and be verified and signed by the Customs or Port Authorities in the port of discharge, and returned within two (2) months from the date of Bill of Lading.

"10.8: Furthermore, BUYER shall advise telegraphically SELLER's Terminal Superintendent and Marketing and Transport Department upon completion of discharge particulars for each cargo, or part cargo if more than one (1) discharge port is used."

3. In the case of special processing arrangements with overseas refineries, companies originating in or having known affiliations with these countries are carefully avoided.

4. At present, co-ordination exists at the OPEC and OAPEC levels. It is hoped that in future co-ordination at the Gulf Co-operation Council (GCC) level will be possible.

5. The Ministry of Economy and Trade maintains all details in this regard and takes appropriate actions when instances come to its attention.

6. The Boycott Office in Doha is always providing QGPC with a list of companies or tankers which are under blacklist.

7. That Office has advised all customers and terminal operations to embargo the following ships:

1. Berge King
2. Staland
3. Neptune World

8. The following suggestions are presented:

(a) When vessels change their names or flags, the histories of those vessels are to be given publicity. The United Nations should take the lead in this regard;

(b) Periodic lists of blacklisted vessels/companies should be circulated widely;

(c) The local United Nations offices should act as focal points for information and advice.

SAUDI ARABIA

(Original: English)

1. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is firmly committed to an economic embargo against South Africa in all areas, including oil.

2. The following procedures with respect to guarding against shipments of Saudi Arabian oil to destinations prohibited by the Saudi Arabian Government are currently in effect and are applicable for purposes of the embargo on South Africa:

(a) Cargo nominations received from an offtaker containing instructions for unloading in a prohibited destination are rejected and the offtaker concerned so notified;

(b) Upon arrival of each tanker at the loading port, and before pratique is granted, the tanker is boarded by Saudi Arabian Government port authorities and is required to provide certain information, including names of ports of call of the tanker during the past 30 days and destination of the cargo to be loaded. Pratique would be denied to a vessel scheduled to take cargo to a prohibited destination;

(c) Among cargo shipping documents delivered to the tanker's agent for delivery to the tanker's master is the Customs Export Goods Manifest together with a letter instructing that a copy of the Manifest must be returned duly bearing the official testimony by the Customs or port official of the port of destination originally nominated in witness of receipt of that port;

(d) The consignees at the final ports of discharge are under obligation to mail back the certified original of the Oil Export Declaration;

(e) The concerned authority in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia verifies the returned certified Declaration, and makes the necessary follow-up on those that are delinquent.

3. No arrangements currently exist for co-ordination between Saudi Arabia and other oil-exporting and/or oil-shipping States in the area of possible violations of the oil embargo and their prevention.

4. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not maintain a list of oil companies or tanker companies that have violated the contracts of sale or shipping by supplying or shipping oil and petroleum products to South Africa.

5. An official announcement in this regard has been issued in the Official Gazette dated 20 September 1968.

6. The Government of Saudi Arabia has no suggestions to put forward.

ATTACHMENT

Press Release issued by the Government of Saudi Arabia

An official spokesman of the Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources noted that rumours are circulated from time to time to the effect that South Africa has obtained Saudi Arabian oil.

The Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources categorically affirms that South Africa, like Israel, is boycotted by Saudi Arabia and cannot obtain a single drop of Saudi Arabian oil. To ensure that this does not happen, any tanker calling at the Kingdom, before being loaded, must specify the port of unloading, which is recorded on all shipping documents. In addition to this, a document is issued by

the Customs Authorities in the Kingdom which is certified at the port of unloading specified on the bill of lading.

"We follow up this process until our oil arrives in the country to which we export it, where our jurisdiction ends. Should we learn that any country or company re-exports our oil to any other country, we will take the necessary measures against the country or company to prevent the repetition thereof."

SINGAPORE

[Original: English]

1. The Singapore Government is unequivocally against apartheid and the racist policies of the Pretoria régime. It has on many occasions expressed in the strongest terms its opposition to the repression of the South African people on racial grounds. On 16 June 1987, the Foreign Minister of Singapore, together with the other Foreign Ministers from the ASEAN countries, issued a joint statement on the situation in southern Africa at a meeting in Bangkok, Thailand. In the joint statement "the Foreign Ministers reiterated their condemnation of the repressive policies and practices of the racist Pretoria régime" and their conviction that "the inhuman apartheid system is the source of the conflict in the region" (see A/42/477-S/19048, annex III, dated 17 August 1987).

2. The position of the Singapore Government on the apartheid question is also reflected in its votes on the relevant General Assembly resolutions. In conformity with those resolutions and as a demonstration of solidarity with the African people, the Singapore Government on 6 May 1965 passed legislation banning imports from South Africa known as "The Prohibition of Imports (South Africa) Order 1965" under the control of imports and exports ordinance. The Singapore Government firmly discourages contacts of any kind, including political, economic, military, cultural and sports, with South Africa. The oil companies in Singapore have been made aware of the United Nations resolutions on the oil embargo on South Africa.

3. The Singapore Government is prepared to co-operate in any collective international effort that will be effective in preventing oil trade with South Africa and Namibia.

SPAIN

[Original: Spanish]

1. The Government of Spain has in recent years aligned its policy towards South Africa with that pursued by the countries of the European Community.

2. Prior to Spain's formal entry into the European Community, on 1 January 1986, the Minister for Foreign Affairs participated in the Council of Ministers of the Community which, within the framework of European political co-operation, adopted on 10 September 1985, a series of restrictive policy measures with respect to South Africa. At that meeting, the 10 member countries of the Community at that time, together with Spain and Portugal, decided to adopt a series of measures, among which was the suspension of oil exports to South Africa. Spain has complied scrupulously with that decision.

SWEDEN

[Original: English]

1. Sweden, not being an oil-producing country, does not export any oil or petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.
2. During recent years Swedish shipping companies have not been involved in the shipping of oil or petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia.
3. In this context, it is worth mentioning that Sweden was one of the first industrial countries to take economic measures against South Africa by enacting legislation prohibiting new investments in 1979. Recently, legislation prohibiting trade with South Africa took effect on 1 July 1987.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[Original: Arabic]

1. The Syrian Arab Republic has not in the past and will not engage with the racist régime of South Africa in any kind of relation, in compliance with its established policy and its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.
2. All contracts concluded by the competent Syrian authorities with various foreign parties for the sale or purchase of oil and petroleum products prohibit any form of direct and indirect transaction with South Africa. That prohibition is normally verified by means of the cargo delivery certificates, which must be provided by the contracting parties to the competent Syrian authorities following their certification by the customs authorities in the country of destination. The embargo also applies to all tankers that transport oil and petroleum products and fly the South African flag or belong to maritime transport companies in that country.

THAILAND

[Original: English]

The policy of the Government of Thailand with regard to South Africa has been and remains consistent in opposing and condemning Pretoria's policy and practices of apartheid. The Government of Thailand has steadfastly supported and strictly adhered to all relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations on South Africa and has supported the demand for mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to eradicate apartheid. With regard to measures on the oil embargo against South Africa and Namibia, particularly paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, the Government of Thailand gives full support to and is strictly implementing the provisions of said resolution by neither importing from, nor exporting oil and petroleum products as well as other energy sources to South Africa and Namibia. It also refrains from carrying out any activity which would in any way assist or enhance South Africa's economic potential, thereby constituting a threat to its neighbours. These measures are in accord with the Thai Cabinet's decision of 27 June 1978, prohibiting bilateral trade between Thailand and South

Africa, and with the Thai Ministry of Commerce regulations of 1982 (No. 12) and (No. 17) prohibiting imports from South Africa and exports from Thailand to South Africa, violation of which is punishable according to penalties specified in the Importing and Exporting Act.

TURKEY

[Original: English]

The Government of Turkey, which voted in favour of the resolution on oil embargo against South Africa, has not been and is not involved in the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa and Namibia, whether directly or indirectly.

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

[Original: Russian]

1. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic condemns and rejects without reservation the policy of apartheid pursued by the racist régime of South Africa, which constitutes a crime against humanity and contravenes the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the universally recognized principles of international law.
2. The Ukrainian SSR, which firmly favours the complete and immediate elimination of the shameful apartheid system in southern Africa, supports and strictly observes all United Nations decisions and recommendations designed to bring about the isolation and boycott of the Pretoria régime. Firmly adhering to this position of principle, the Ukrainian SSR maintains no relations with South Africa in the political, economic, military or other fields.
3. In its activity within the United Nations and other international organizations, and specifically in the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid, the Ukrainian SSR accords great significance to the need to adopt genuinely effective measures against the racist régime of South Africa, and particularly to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against it under Chapter VII of the Charter, including the imposition of, and strict compliance with, an embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa.
4. The Ukrainian SSR voted in favour of the adoption by the General Assembly, at its forty-first session, of resolution 41/35 F relating to the oil embargo against South Africa. Pursuant to the provisions of that resolution and other relevant United Nations decisions, the Ukrainian SSR provides no direct or indirect supplies of oil or petroleum products to South Africa and believes that it would be useful, with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of the embargo against South Africa, to arrange for an exchange of information between States Members of the United Nations with respect to all cases involving such supplies.

1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics supported the Security Council resolutions and other United Nations decisions which reaffirm that the policy of apartheid conducted by the Pretoria régime is a crime against humanity, is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the principles of international law, and represents a threat to international peace and security.
2. The Soviet Union unswervingly advocates the elimination of the shameful system of apartheid, supports all United Nations decisions aimed at achieving this goal, and considers that an effective way to do so would be the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, including the imposition of an embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa.
3. The Soviet Union voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 41/35 on the oil embargo against South Africa.
4. In implementing the decisions of the United Nations, including the resolution referred to, the Soviet Union does not maintain any relations with South Africa in the political, economic, military or other fields and, accordingly, has no treaty relations or licensing arrangements with the Pretoria régime.
5. The competent organizations and departments of the Soviet Union strictly monitor the observance in practice of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and decisions aimed at isolating the racist régime of South Africa. In accordance with resolution 1761 (XVII) of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade issued orders requiring foreign-trade organizations not to carry out any trade operations or services either directly with South African firms and organizations or through the firms and organizations of third countries.
6. The foreign-trade organization Soyuznefteexport, the sole exporter of Soviet oil and petroleum products, has instructions to refrain from all contacts with South Africa.
7. All the contracts of Soyuznefteexport contain a specific provision prohibiting the supply of Soviet oil and petroleum products to South Africa.
8. Most Soviet oil and petroleum products are supplied under the conditions of cost, insurance and freight (c.i.f.) or cost and freight (c. and f.). In making free-on-board (f.o.b.) deliveries, Soyuznefteexport usually monitors the ports of debarkation. Soviet ports do not receive tankers which have stopped in South African ports. The foreign-trade organization does not deal with contractors who conduct business with South Africa.
9. The subdivisions of the USSR Ministry of the Merchant Marine that are responsible for chartering foreign tonnage to transport Soviet foreign-trade cargoes and leasing vessels of Soviet steamship companies to transport the cargoes of foreign shippers are instructed to include, when concluding contracts, a provision guaranteeing the non-participation of Soviet ships in the delivery of oil

and petroleum products to South Africa. In hiring foreign ships, there is a requirement to guarantee that the ships in question have not participated in the past in such shipments.

10. Soviet tankers are prohibited from stopping in South African ports.

11. According to information provided by Soyuznefteexport, no arrangements exist with other oil-exporting and oil-shipping States to co-ordinate exchange of information and action to prevent violations of the oil embargo.

12. The Soviet Union considers that the sharing of information by the States Members of the United Nations concerning all deliveries of oil and petroleum products to South Africa would be very useful in order to enhance the effectiveness of the embargo against South Africa.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

[Original: English]

1. Import of crude oil and refined products: The State, being the sole importer of petroleum products, requires suppliers to declare that the source of products shall not be from South Africa and that suppliers do not supply such products to South Africa.

2. Sale of petroleum products: Specifically, the United Republic of Tanzania exports residual fuel oil (RFO) which it does not use. When floating tenders for disposing of the product, bidders are required to declare that they do not deal with South Africa and that the product shall not be resold to South Africa.

3. Exploration for oil: In case of oil discovery, under the Production Sharing Agreements between the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, the Tanzania Petroleum Development Corporation and International Exploration Companies (Contractors), the Contractors undertake and guarantee that no part of the petroleum to which the Contractors may be entitled hereunder, and no product refined in Tanzania, will be delivered by the Contractors, or any of their affiliates, to South Africa, or, until such time as the Government may notify the Contractor to the contrary, to Namibia.

4. In case of a sale of a Contractor's petroleum to a third party, the Contractor, or its affiliates, is required to secure the Agreement of such party that the petroleum will not be sold or delivered to South Africa or, until such time as the Government may notify the Contractor to the contrary, to Namibia.

5. It is also relevant to mention that the TAZAMA Oil Pipeline in which Tanzania holds 33 1/3 of the shares, and which runs from the Port of Dar-es-Salaam to Zambia, has made it unnecessary for oil needed by Zambia to pass through South Africa.

Question 1 of the questionnaire

1. Venezuela has always maintained a position that supports and endorses all oil and other embargoes against South Africa. Accordingly, it applies the "end user's" clause in all its oil sales, thus ensuring that no supplies reach that country either directly or indirectly.
2. In order to facilitate such monitoring, Venezuela has developed a system for registration of ships, registered or owned by its nationals, that have in any way unloaded oil in South Africa.
3. Lastly, it should be pointed out that, from May 1982 up to the present time, the Venezuelan Ministry of Foreign Affairs has reiterated its position suspending all forms of exchange with the Republic of South Africa in the commercial, cultural, political and all other fields, expressing its intention to impose penal action against those companies and individuals that violate the embargo.

Question 2

4. In actual fact and in the strict sense of the word, there are no specific arrangements in this regard. Nevertheless, Venezuela has actively participated in both international and regional organizations and conferences that have adopted measures not only to prevent violations of the oil embargo, but also to oppose the merciless régime based on racial discrimination.
5. To this end, Venezuela pledged its support for all the relevant decisions taken by the United Nations. Furthermore, during a conference held at Caracas from 13 to 15 May 1981, the Group of 77, together with the other participants, condemned apartheid and voted to carry out, with respect to agenda item 51, an action in support of the struggle of the developing countries against that horrible practice.

Question 3

6. Yes. The list is restricted material.

Question 4

7. Venezuela has initiated an information campaign through the Bureau of International Affairs of the Ministry of Energy and Mines, which maintains constant contact with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Institute of Foreign Trade, embassies and Petróleos de Venezuela and its affiliated companies in order to publicize all the details concerning policies and actions to be taken in accordance with what has been agreed upon at the various conferences of the above-mentioned organizations whenever Venezuela attends such conferences and casts its concurring vote.

Question 5

8. Venezuela suggests strengthening all the sanctions to be imposed in cases of violation of the oil embargo by extending them to all the members of the

international community through such hemispheric and regional organizations as the Latin American Integration Association, the Latin American Energy Association, the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and the European Economic Community in order to stress the possibility of taking joint action against the racist South African régime, which causes conflict and international unrest, thereby halting all forms of exchange (economic, energy, oil, political, cultural and commercial) with South Africa.

YUGOSLAVIA

[Original: English]

Yugoslavia has pointed out that it carries out a complete and comprehensive boycott of the racist régime of South Africa. Proceeding from the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as from the provisions of its own legislation, Yugoslavia maintains no political, economic, financial, military, sport, cultural or any other relations with South Africa, which fully relates to trade in oil and petroleum products as well.

ANNEX III

Cases of alleged violations

1. A number of cases have been reported to the Intergovernmental Group since 16 March 1987. Upon receiving information on an alleged violation, the Chairman in each case addressed a letter to the permanent mission and/or permanent observer mission concerned. The Group received responses on a number of cases. The presentation of those cases does not entail concurrence by the Group on the accuracy of the information received. A brief description of the cases and the responses is given below.

2. The ships Thanassis M. and Manhattan Viscount allegedly shipped oil from Brunei Darussalam to South Africa in January-February 1983 and September 1983, respectively. The matter was brought to the attention of the Permanent Mission of Brunei Darussalam to the United Nations on 3 April and 24 June 1987. On 28 October 1987, the Permanent Mission responded as follows:

"The Government's investigations have established that Brunei Shell Petroleum Company Sendirian Berhad has at all times strictly complied with the Government's policy of an embargo on deliveries to South Africa and has imposed suitable destination restrictions in its contracts for the sale of oil. These destination restrictions have been, and continue to be, accepted by all its customers.

"Our investigations have not enabled us to establish whether any crude oil from Brunei Darussalam has in fact reached South Africa. Any Brunei Darussalam oil which did reach South Africa could only have done so in defiance of the policy of His Majesty's Government and in breach of contractual obligations which have been imposed by Brunei Shell Petroleum's customers on their subsequent purchasers."

3. Actor, which is registered under the Liberian flag and whose registered owner is Actor Maritime Corporation of Liberia, whose managing company is Federal Motorship Corporation of the United States of America and whose apparent beneficial owner is Mosvold Shipping Company of Norway, is alleged to have arrived on 5 April 1986 at Fateh terminal in the United Arab Emirates and to have left on 9 April. It arrived at Mina Al Fahal in Oman on 10 April and left on 11 April 1986, then called at one or more South African ports in the same month. Then it was alleged that the ship arrived at Fateh terminal on 10 May 1986 and left on 15 May and called at one or more South African ports in June 1986. Later in the same year, it was alleged that the ship arrived at Fujairah anchorage and Fateh terminal in the United Arab Emirates on 10 and 27 November 1986 and departed on 22 and 30 November 1986, respectively, calling in December 1986 at one or more South African ports.

4. It was alleged that in 1987 the same ship arrived at the port Singapore Roads on 1 February 1987 and departed on 5 February 1987 and called at South Africa in February/March 1987. It was also alleged that the ship departed from Juaymah port in Saudi Arabia on 13 April 1987 and called at South Africa in the same month. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 25 June, 31 July and 16 September 1987.

5. The Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations informed the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Group in a letter dated 6 July 1987 as follows:

"As both the purchasers and the shippers of Saudi oil are prohibited from transferring their quota of crude oil, or any of its derivatives to racist South Africa, I am sure the necessary measures will be taken in this case.

"We shall always give serious and careful consideration to any report originating from a credible and responsible agency concerning a possible breach of the Kingdom's law by a buyer of Saudi oil."

6. The Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations in a note dated 6 October 1987 stated that:

"The information embodied in the two notes [of 31 July and 16 September 1987] was conveyed to the Government of the U.A.E. for investigation. Upon receipt of the results of such investigation, it will be promptly transmitted to the Chairman.

"The Permanent Representative, however, wishes to reiterate that his Government's policy has always been and continues to be of a strict adherence to the oil embargo imposed against South Africa. It even goes beyond that to encompass full severance of any and all relations with South Africa. No interaction or transaction, whatsoever, takes place between the U.A.E. and South Africa. As regards oil, the U.A.E. Ministry of Petroleum insists, on a regular basis, upon the oil companies operating in the U.A.E. to fully comply with the regulations pertaining to the boycott of South Africa. The Ministry also inspects very thoroughly the documents of every vessel that anchors at any port in the U.A.E."

7. The Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations in a reply dated 7 October 1987 stated that:

"As you are well aware it is a priority issue for the Norwegian Government to stop the sale and transport of oil to South Africa. This has concretely been followed up by the adoption of the Act on Economic Boycott against South Africa and Namibia, which took effect 20 July this year. As of this date it is prohibited to carry crude oil to or from South Africa and Namibia on Norwegian ships.

"Calls by Norwegian tankers at South African ports before 20 July this year have, however, not been illegal according to Norwegian law. Efforts made by Norwegian authorities to discourage transport of oil to South Africa on Norwegian ships were not sufficient, and we are consequently aware that some transport did take place before the new Act took effect. The Norwegian authorities have taken due note of the contentions presented by the Shipping Research Bureau attached to your letter of 25 June, the note of 31 July and the note of 16 September.

"As a consequence of the new Act previously referred to, regulations have now been issued. According to these, the Authorities will investigate any alleged contraventions, and offenders will be prosecuted. If found guilty in court, they will be punished in accordance with the provisions of the Act."

8. The case of the ship Berge Prince, which is registered under the Liberian flag; its registered owner is General Ore International Corporation of Norway. The same company was reported registered in Liechtenstein. Its apparent beneficial owner is General Ore International Corporation or Bergesen A/S of Norway and its managing company is Bergesen A/S.

9. It was alleged that the ship departed from Juaymah terminal in Saudi Arabia on 14 December 1984 and arrived at Fateh terminal in the United Arab Emirates on 15 December and departed after two days and called at one or more South African ports in January 1985.

10. It was also alleged that the ship arrived at Suez port in Egypt on 23 January 1985 and left after two days, then arrived at Ras Misalla port in Egypt on 26 January 1985 and left on the same day. Then it called at one or more South African ports in February 1985.

11. It was then alleged that the ship left Sirri Island in the Islamic Republic of Iran at an undisclosed date and arrived at and departed from Fateh terminal in the United Arab Emirates on 1 and 14 March 1986, respectively, then called at one or more South African ports in April 1986. It was also alleged that the ship left Hormuz terminal in the Islamic Republic of Iran on 1 April 1987 and called in the same month at one or more South African ports. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned and the Principality of Liechtenstein on 25 June and 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates referred in their respective replies mentioned above to this case.

12. The Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations informed the Intergovernmental Group on 10 August 1987 that:

"the previous information had been already brought to the knowledge of the Egyptian authorities by the Shipping Research Bureau. ... Subsequently, the Shipping Research Bureau was informed at that time that the Egyptian authorities are conducting a thorough investigation into the matter and that if these allegations proved to be true, the shipping companies concerned would be barred from any future dealings with the Egyptian Government and would be subject to penalties as stipulated in the contracts between them and the Egyptian Government which clearly prohibit the exportation of any Egyptian oil or petroleum products to South Africa. The Permanent Representative of Egypt would like to seize this opportunity to reiterate the Egyptian well-known position concerning the prohibition of any dealings or contacts in any field with the racist régime in South Africa ..."

13. The case of the ship Thorsholm, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner Thor Dahl Hvalf - A/S, A/S Odd and Ornen of Norway. Its apparent beneficial owner and its managing company Thor Dahl A/S of Norway. It was alleged that the ship called at Juaymah terminal in Saudi Arabia on 9 February 1985 and then on 13 February at Fujairah anchorage in the United Arab Emirates. In March 1985 it called at one or more South African ports. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates, in their respective replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

14. The case of the ship Eyita, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner, apparent beneficial owner and managing company is

Uglands Rederi A/S of Norway. It was alleged that the ship called at Ras Tanura terminal in Saudi Arabia from 19 to 20 March 1985, then called at one or more South African ports in April 1985. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Norway, in his reply mentioned above, referred to this case.

15. The case of the ship Berge Pioneer, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner, apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Bergesen A/S of Norway. It was alleged that the ship arrived at Fujairah anchorage in the United Arab Emirates on 18 April 1985. After one day it went to Mina Al Fahal in Oman and departed from there on 24 April 1985. In May 1985 it called at one or more South African ports. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates, in their respective replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

16. The case of the ship Berge Bragd, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner, its apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Sig. Bergesen D.Y. & Co. of Norway. It was alleged that the ship arrived at Khor Fakkan anchorage in the United Arab Emirates on 12 July 1985, then after eight days it went to Fujairah anchorage in the same country. On 5 August 1985, it left and in the same month called at one or more South African ports. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates, in their respective replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

17. The case of the ship Neptune Pavo, which is registered under the flag of Singapore; its registered owner is Neptune IOTA Lines PTE Ltd., Singapore. Its apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Neptune Orient Lines Ltd. of Singapore. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. It was alleged that the ship left Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 8 May 1985 and 2 March 1986 and in each of the same months called at one or more South African ports. It was also alleged that Brunei Shell Petroleum sold the oil to a local Brunei trader who resold it to Marubeni of Japan which resold it to Marc Rich. The latter delivered it to South Africa. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations, in a letter dated 25 August 1987, stated the following:

"1. The Marubeni Company referred to in the summary data sheets is the Marubeni International Petroleum Co., Ltd. (MIPCO), a firm based in Hong Kong and incorporated under Hong Kong law. MIPCO's contracts for the purchase of crude oil from Brunei are F.O.B.; except for pricing adjustments, it in turn sells the oil to its customers, in principle, under the same conditions as it purchased the oil from Brunei, including F.O.B.

"2. As MIPCO's contracts for the sale of the oil are F.O.B., it is not involved in the shipping arrangements. It does require, however, that the buyer notify it of the destination of the shipment before loading; according to the company, its records show that South Africa has never been given as destination."

18. The case of the ship Liberator, which is registered under the flag of Greece; its registered owner is New World Shipping Corporation of Liberia, its apparent

beneficial owner is Stenakas Shipping Corporation and its managing company is Diamantis Pateras Ltd., both of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. As in the previous case, Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland, Brunei Shell Petroleum and Marubeni (Japan) were reported involved. It was alleged that the ship departed from Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 21 April 1985 and called at one or more South African ports in May 1985. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan included in his reply mentioned above a reference to this case. On 31 August 1987, the Permanent Mission of Greece informed the Intergovernmental Group that "Leandros Shipping Company", the representative company of the tanker in Greece, would provide the Greek authorities with data in due time.

19. The case of the ship Jahre Transporter, which is registered under Liberian flag; its registered owner is Beatty Shipping Ltd. of Liberia. Its apparent beneficial owner is unknown, the correspondence is addressed c/o Wallem Shipmanagement Ltd., Hong Kong. The ship's managing company is Wallem Shipmanagement Ltd. (technical), Hong Kong. As in the previous cases, Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland, Brunei Shell Petroleum, and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved. It was alleged that the ship left Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 31 May 1985 and presumably called at one or more South African ports in June 1985. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan included in his reply mentioned above a reference to this case.

20. The case of the ship Neptune Pegasus, which is registered under the flag of Singapore; its registered owner is Neptune ETA Lines PTE Ltd. of Singapore. Its apparent beneficial owner and its managing company is Neptune Orient Lines, Ltd. of Singapore. As in the previous cases Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland, Brunei Shell Petroleum and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship left Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 27 July and 27 December 1985 and called at one or more South African ports in August 1985 and January 1986. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan included in his reply mentioned above a reference to this case.

21. The case of the ship Berge King, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner, apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Sig. Bergesen D.Y. & Co. of Norway. The company apparently owning the oil is Marimpex of the Federal Republic of Germany. It was alleged that the ship arrived at Europoort/Rotterdam, Netherlands, on 25 June 1985 and went on 27 June 1985 to port Wilhelmshaven in the Federal Republic of Germany. It arrived there on 29 June and left on 1 July 1985 going back to Europoort; it arrived there on 5 July and left on 7 July 1985. In July/August 1985 it called at one or more South African ports. It was also alleged that the ship arrived at Europoort with crude oil from the Islamic Republic of Iran. Part of it was discharged in this port and the remainder in Wilhelmshaven. The ship then returned to Europoort to collect a new cargo of crude oil with reported destination Wilhelmshaven; however, it went to South Africa instead. It was reported that the second cargo was Iranian oil. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. On 27 August 1987, the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Intergovernmental Group that:

"The Federal Republic of Germany did not vote for United Nations resolutions concerning an oil embargo against South Africa. The Federal

Government did, however, join in a decision by the Council of Foreign Ministers of the European Community of 10 September 1985 on the cessation of oil exports to South Africa. The 'German Shipowners' Association' has been advised of the Federal Government's policy and of the decisions taken by the foreign ministers of the European Community on 10 September 1985. No crude oil shipments to South Africa are being carried out, either directly or in transit from ports in the Federal Republic of Germany or by vessels flying its flag.

"The 'Marimpex' company was the owner of four oiltankers that were registered abroad and have meanwhile been either sold or scrapped. The Federal Government is not aware of any crude oil shipments by the 'Marimpex' company to South Africa."

22. The Permanent Representative of Norway, in his reply mentioned above, also made a reference to this case.

23. The case of the ship Monemvasia, which is registered under the flag of Greece: its registered owner is Metropolitan Nav. Corporation of Liberia and its apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Metropolitan Shipping Ltd. of Greece. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship left Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 4 December 1985, then stopped at Singapore Roads on 8 December 1985. It then left Singapore Roads on 9 December 1985 and called at one or more South African ports that month. This information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987.

24. The Permanent Mission of Greece informed the Intergovernmental Group in its above-mentioned reply that the oil tanker Monemvasia called during December 1985 on the port of Mombasa, Kenya, to unload. It did not call on any South African port. The Permanent Representative of Japan included in his response mentioned above a reference to this case.

25. The case of the ship Lauberhorn, which is registered under Liberian flag: its registered owner is Trade Ventures, Inc. of Liberia, its apparent beneficial owner is Trade and Transport, Inc. of Greece and its managing company is Brokerage and Management Corporation of the United States of America. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship left Seria port in Brunei Darussalam at an undisclosed date and arrived at Singapore Roads on 4 October 1985, then left the next day and called at one or more South African ports in October 1985. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan, in his reply mentioned above, included a reference to this case.

26. The case of the ship Mospoint, which is registered under Norwegian flag: its registered owner is K/S A/S Mospoint of Norway and its apparent beneficial owner as well as managing company is Mosvold Rederi A/S of Norway. It was alleged that the ship left the port Ras Shukheir in Egypt on 14 January 1986 and called at one or more South African ports in the same month. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Egypt and Norway, in their replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

27. The case of the ship Janniche, which is registered under Norwegian flag; its registered owner is K/S A/S Norman Tankers I, its apparent beneficial owner is Kloster's Rederi A/S and its managing company is Norman International A/S, all of Norway. It was alleged that the ship arrived at Fateh terminal in the United Arab Emirates on 27 February 1986 and left on 1 March 1986. Then it arrived at Fujairah anchorage also in the United Arab Emirates on 7 March 1986, and after one day it left and called at one or more South African ports during the same month. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates, in their respective replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

28. The case of the ship Hawaiian Monarch, which is registered under Liberian flag; its registered owner is East Pacific Carriers, Inc., of Liberia and its apparent beneficial owner as well as managing company is Groton Pacific Carriers, Inc., of the United States of America. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. It was also reported that Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were involved as mentioned above. It was alleged that the ship left Brunei Darussalam on 25 May 1986 and called at one or more South African ports in June 1986. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan included a reference in his reply mentioned above to this case.

29. The case of the ship Neptune Subaru, which is registered under the flag of Singapore; its apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Neptune Orient Lines, Ltd. of Singapore. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship arrived in Brunei Darussalam on 5 July 1986 and left on 10 July and arrived at Singapore Roads on 12 July and left after one day. It called at one or more South African ports in July-August 1986. The information was communicated to the Missions on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan, in his reply mentioned above, included a reference to this case.

30. The case of the ship Elmina, which is registered under the flag of Greece; its registered owner is Marine Industrial Transports Ltd. of Liberia. Its apparent beneficial owner is an unknown company. Its address is c/o Thenamaris Ships Management, Inc. of Greece, which is the managing company of the ship. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship departed from Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 26 August 1986 and called at one or more South African ports in September 1986. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Mission of Greece, in its above-mentioned reply, informed the Group that "the ship Elmina did not call on South African ports ... The shipping company 'Thenamaris' has already addressed a letter to this effect, on 3 December 1986, to the Shipping Research Bureau". The Permanent Representative of Japan referred in his letter mentioned above to this case.

31. The case of the ship Neptune Otome, which is registered under the flag of Singapore; its apparent beneficial owner and its managing company is Neptune Orient Lines Ltd. of Singapore. The company apparently owning the oil cargo is Marc Rich and Co. A.G. of Switzerland. Brunei Shell and Marubeni of Japan were also reported involved in the case. It was alleged that the ship arrived at Seria port in Brunei Darussalam on 25 September 1986, then after one day departed to

Singapore Roads and arrived on 29 September 1986. On the same day it left and arrived the next month at one or more South African ports. This information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 31 July 1987. The Permanent Representative of Japan, in his reply mentioned above, included a reference to this case.

32. The case of the ship Fidius, which is registered under the flag of the United Kingdom; the ship's apparent beneficial owner is Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Ltd. of Bermuda and its managing company is Canadian Pacific Bulkship Services Ltd. of the United Kingdom. No registered owner was given. It was alleged that the ship arrived at the Fujairah anchorage in the United Arab Emirates on 14 February and 8 March 1987 and then left on 8 March and called at one or more South African ports that month. This information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 25 June 1987. The Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates, in his reply mentioned above, referred to this case.

33. The case of the ship Berge Princess, which is registered under Liberian flag; its registered owner and apparent beneficial owner is General Ore International Corporation of Liechtenstein. The managing company of the ship is Bergesen A/S of Norway. It was alleged that the ship left Hormuz terminal in the Islamic Republic of Iran on 10 March 1987 and called at one or more South African ports in the same month. The information mentioned above was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned and to the Principality of Liechtenstein on 25 June 1987. The Permanent Representatives of the United Arab Emirates and of Norway, in their replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

34. The case of the ship Berge Enterprise, which is registered under Norwegian flag; it is owned and managed by Bergesen A/S of Norway. The cargo of the ship was apparently originally owned by Marubeni of Japan and was apparently eventually delivered to British Petroleum of South Africa. It was alleged that the ship left the ports of Ras Tanura in Saudi Arabia and Das Island in the United Arab Emirates on 8 and 11 April 1987, respectively, and then called at one or more South African ports in the same month. It was also alleged that the ship left Jebel Dhanna/Zirku Island in the United Arab Emirates and Mina Al Fahal in Oman on 22 and 25 May 1987, respectively, and called at South Africa in June 1987. This information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 25 June and 16 September 1987.

35. The Permanent Representative of Japan in a letter dated 25 August 1987 stated, inter alia, that:

"The conditions, including FOB delivery, stipulated in MIPCO's contracts for the purchase of crude oil from its supplier, Abu Dhabi National Oil Co. (ADNOC) and in its contracts for resale to MIPCO's customers are, in principle, identical. Due to the FOB provision MIPCO is not involved in the shipping arrangement of its sales of crude oil.

"MIPCO's sale on 25 March 1987 of 500,000 barrels of crude oil of Abu Dhabi origin was likewise effected FOB. It was shipped from DAS Island (U.A.E.) on 11 April 1987 as part of the cargo on the vessel Berge Enterprise, whose destination was Singapore."

36. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and the United Arab Emirates, in their replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

37. The Permanent Representative of Oman to the United Nations in a letter dated 6 October 1987, stated that:

"[the information has] been referred to the concerned authorities in Oman and [that he] was advised that the matter will be investigated thoroughly. Meanwhile, this Mission would like to emphasize that the Government of Oman abides by the policy of sanctions against the trade with the apartheid régime of South Africa.

"The Permanent Representative of Oman to the United Nations has further the honour to inform that the Government of Oman appreciates the concern of the Chairman in this matter and would like to point out that Mina al Fahal is an international parking area for most of the tankers passing through, to and from, the Gulf awaiting for either instructions for loading in other ports of the Gulf or designated markets for their cargo, and as such, the Government of Oman has no jurisdiction over the control of destinations of those tankers."

38. The Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia in a letter dated 8 October 1987 stated that:

"The Berge Enterprise carried a shipment of 836,798 barrels of Arabian Medium Crude from Ras Tanura on 8 April 1987, which represented partial fulfillment due to the Government of Bahrain from its part in the Abu Safa field. This shipment was contracted to the Singapore Oil Company (to be delivered to Singapore). After loading from Ras Tanura the Berge Enterprise moved on to the Island of 'Haloul' in Qatar on the 10th of April 1987. The tanker then added 854,201 barrels of Qatar Crude for Mobil Oil to be delivered in the Far East. The ship confirmed delivering its shipment of the Arabian Medium Crude from Ras Tanura mentioned above to Singapore".

39. The case of the ship Berge Chief, which is registered under Norwegian flag: no details were submitted about ownership of the ship, except that it was owned by a Norwegian company and was possibly under charter to Transworld Oil of the Netherlands. It was alleged that the ship departed from Mina Al Fahal in Oman on 18 March 1987 and called at South Africa in April 1987. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 16 September 1987. The Permanent Representatives of Norway and Oman, in their respective replies mentioned above, referred to this case.

40. The case of the ship Patriotic, which is registered under the flag of Greece: its registered owner is Moonset Shipping Co. S.A. of Panama and its apparent beneficial owner and managing company is Nereus Shipping S.A. of Greece.

41. It was alleged that the ship left the port of Jebel Dhanna in the United Arab Emirates on 12 April 1987 and called at one or more South African ports in the same month.

42. The information was communicated to the Permanent Missions concerned on 25 June 1987.

43. The Acting Permanent Representative of Greece, in his letter dated 14 August 1987, stated the following:

"The oil tanker Patriotic was chartered to a Singapore company from January to May 1987. On 11 May 1987 the said vessel sailed off Singapore after having unloaded her cargo there. This fact is proved by the ship documents which were certified by the competent port authorities of Singapore.

"According to the information attached to your letter and provided by the Shipping Research Bureau, the vessel left the United Arab Emirates on 12 April 1987. It is obvious that it was technically impossible for the Patriotic, given the short time available to her (12 April-11 May 1987), to cover the distance between United Arab Emirates and Singapore and in the meantime to have deviated its course in order to visit South Africa."

44. The Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates referred to this case in his letter.